

CLS 101: GREEK CIVILIZATION

Spring 2010
CRN: 70851
MWF 2:15-3:05
Irvin 24

INSTRUCTOR:
Peter W. Rose
Office 108 Irvin
Phone: 529-1484
Email: rosepw@muohio.edu
Office Hours: MWF 3:30-5
and by appointment

REQUIRED TEXTS (Buy ONLY these translations/editions--otherwise you will be unable to follow in class and be disadvantaged on exams and quizzes! The bookstores can be quite shameless in trying to get rid of other translations and old editions that they have bought back from other courses)

Finley, M. I., *The Portable Greek Historians*

Frazer, R. M. *The Poems of Hesiod*

Greene, David and Richmond Lattimore, eds. *Sophocles II: Ajax, The Women of Trachis, Electra, and Philoctetes*.

Lattimore, Richmond, tr. *The Iliad of Homer*

Lattimore, Richmond, tr. *The Odyssey of Homer*

Miller, Andrew M. *Greek Lyric: An Anthology in Translation*

Osborne, Robin, *Archaic and Classical Greek Art*

Podlecki, A.J., tr. *Euripides' Medea*

Pomeroy, S., S. Burstein, W. Donlan, J. T. Roberts, *A Brief History of Ancient Greece: Politics, Society, and Culture 2nd Edition (42 pages longer than first edition)*

Meineck, Peter and Paul Woodruff, trs., *Sophocles' Oedipus Tyrannus*

Vellacott, Philip, tr. *Aeschylus: Prometheus Bound, The Suppliants, Seven against Thebes, The Persians*

GOALS OF THE COURSE: My “goals” aim at several levels: skills, values, and content:

SKILLS: I want you to learn how to *read* more deeply, actively, and consciously very different sorts of texts. Each kind of text has its own implied codes or system of rules that largely determine what it can and cannot express. In this course we will encounter an impressive array of literary genres: heroic epic, cosmogonic poetry, wisdom literature or didactic epic, lyric (with subgenres iambic poetry, elegy, personal lyric, choral lyric), tragedy, history, philosophic dialogue, and oratory. I want you to develop a sense of what can and cannot be expressed in each genre as well as in the different styles of visual arts. **Genre** could well be considered a seventh “Issue” along with the issues listed below under “content.”

By giving exclusively essay as opposed to multiple choice quizzes and exams I hope to improve your skill in *writing*, the single most important skill you are supposed to acquire in college. In these exams I want you to make a conscious effort to write as clearly and effectively as possible in complete sentences and organized paragraphs—no shorthand

lists, “cute” slang, macho obscenities, or abbreviations. Write as if your text will be published or read aloud in class (it might be). [a footnote: please write all quizzes and exams with pens, not pencils. My eyes will thank you. Legibility matters: I can’t give you credit for what I can’t read.]

VALUES: I want you to learn how to think *critically* about the values associated with Greek civilization--those we have *inherited*, those we have *forgotten*, and those we may never have previously been aware of. I don’t view the Greeks as an ideal society or wish to suggest that the Greeks were “right” about everything or said everything worth saying. Unlike one Classicist I know of, I don’t at all urge my students to “be like the Greeks.” But a set of specific historical circumstances have made us in many ways heirs of the ancient Greeks:

- the Hellenization of the Mediterranean world after Alexander the Great’s conquests
- the Romans’ extraordinary appropriation of Greek culture
- the Romans’ domination of so much of Europe and England
- the Renaissance glorification of classical antiquity as an alternative to medieval art and thought

As a consequence our society remains heavily influenced by Greek civilization in art, literature, philosophy, and political thought--in our very conceptions of what it means to be male, female, human, beautiful or “civilized” or “democratic.” Thus it is worth your time to try to come to grips with these values--to become conscious of the various historical forces that have contributed to who you think you are and to assess what you feel needs to be combated, rejected, cherished and retained. At the same time a full critical appreciation of the “otherness” of the Greeks—e.g., their dependence on slavery, their degrading views of and actual treatment of women, their celebration of male nudity and pederasty, their elevation of military prowess above all other values, their relentless, sometimes fatal competitiveness especially between their small communities—is an essential part of aiming at a “complete” conception of another culture. Clearly no single semester course can be “complete” in this sense, but I hope at least to foster your understanding of what that would entail by focusing on a number of decisive components essential to understanding *any* society—definitely including our own.

CONTENT: Studying a “civilization” implies trying to understand the whole range of data available about a particular society and how its different elements interrelate. Since this is a 100-level course, it is by definition *introductory and assumes no prior knowledge*. This course aims primarily at introducing students to the *history, literature, and visual arts* of ancient Greece from the Mycenaean Period to the Classical Period. We will not treat all the periods listed below: we will cover in detail the Archaic Period and the Classical Period down to 399 BC.

Literature and *visuals arts* require developing (as noted under “skills” above) a sense of genre and forms (see further discussion of art below).

History requires developing a sense of time and an eye for issues. Henry Ford defined history as “just one damned thing after another.” Without a sense of time (what comes before *can* but does not necessarily impact upon what comes after) and specific issues about which one is seeking understanding, that’s all it is. As the Spanish-American Harvard philosopher George Santayana famously put it, “Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.”

Chronology: Although, as noted above, this course will focus primarily on the Archaic and Classical periods down to 399 BC, you will find it useful to have a broad

chronological framework (“chronology gives us the pegs on which we hang history”) of major periods (all dates BC):

The Bronze Age 2400-1100

The Dark Age (or Early Iron Age) 1100-750

The Archaic Period (or Lyric Age or Greek Renaissance or Age of Revolution) 750-500/480

The Classical Period 480-323

The Hellenistic Period 323-30 (the point at which Rome consolidates its control of the whole Mediterranean World)

Within the period from 1500 to 399 BC it is useful to have a sense of the chronological order of major events: something that comes later cannot influence something that precedes it, but what precedes may have enormous consequences.

MAJOR ISSUES: As noted above, we cannot cover everything potentially relevant to understanding Greek Civilization, but the following list is not random: it aims at an analytical coverage that is relevant to the serious study of any society. *The assignments and class discussions are primarily organized around the following questions*, though obviously the emphasis will vary depending on the specific assignments:

Art: What is the relation of artistic representations to the other realities of the period? Does art develop entirely in response to its own inner logic or, while respecting its own internal aesthetic logic, does it also represent a creative response to the world around it? For example, the development of the form of Archaic statues of a nude young man (*kouros*) follows a certain internal logic from close adherence to its initial Egyptian model to greater and greater subtlety in moulding human flesh. But isn't fair to ask as well what does this type of statue tell us about the religious, political, class, gender or aesthetic values of the people who created it and the people for whom it was created? Is there anything about the work that appeals to you or repels you? Why? (see further questions on art below).

Politics: Who has what kind of power over whom and what claims justify it or challenge it? For example, most “heroes” in Homer are also “kings” or chieftains in their hometowns: how did they get this role? On what grounds do they claim legitimacy for their power? What are their ruling functions? What limits or threats are there to their positions? What “rights” if any, do those not in the ruling elite have? Who participates in basic decisions that affect the whole of society? Is there a specific institutional framework for the distribution of power and rights? Is there any aspect of power relations in a given period or work that you can compare with power relations in your own society? How are conflicts resolved? Who establishes what constitutes “justice”?

Role-models, i.e., Heroes/Heroines: There was no centrally imposed orthodoxy in Greek culture, which meant that different city-states (*poleis*, sing. *polis*) and different artists presented their own versions of myths and conceptions of the meaning of different heroes and even of gods and goddesses. From the rich store of Greek mythic stories, our readings and art images offer us a number of different versions of such major potential role-models as Achilles, Ajax, Helen, Odysseus, Penelope, Heracles, and Prometheus. How do different images of these figures reflect changing concerns of different historical periods, different classes and different individual visions of what matters in life and society? How do these patterns of exceptional lives compare with the patterns that are offered you by your culture (i.e., who are your heroes and heroines and what do they stand for?)?

Religion: In any given period how do human beings conceive of the forces perceived of as beyond human control? What determines the line that differentiates things for which human beings are held responsible and those that are felt to be imposed on them by these

suprahuman forces? For example, it seems fair to assume the behavior of weather (sunshine, thunder, lightning, rain [before sowing clouds]) is recognized by everyone as external to human even if some may believe that divine lightning strike evil-doers. But how “external” are phenomena like anger, stupidity (“delusion”), sexual desire? What sorts of communication is posited as possible between the suprahuman forces and human beings? What sort of relationship exists between human conceptions of right behavior, of “justice,” and the behavior of the suprahuman forces? How systematic is the body of thought about these forces, i.e., to what extent can we speak of a “theology” or “philosophy”? Are there significant changes or conflicts in religious conceptions in the periods we study? Do different classes relate differently to suprahuman forces? How do Greek religious ideas and practices compare with religion as you know it?

Social/Economic Organization: In any given period, what seem to be the major social groupings? Who does the work that sustains human life and produces whatever social surplus there is beyond bare survival? Who controls that surplus and how is it distributed? What determines one’s membership in specific classes? Is it fixed for life or is there some basis for social mobility? What ideas (or ideologies) are offered to legitimate social hierarchies? For example, in Homer’s poems almost all the ruling figures claim descent from *gods* as a key legitimation of their privileges; within a hundred years or so Alcaeus and Theognis complain bitterly that *money* is the only criterion of human worth: what happened? Aristotle defined a slave as a tool with a soul and women as “naturally” ruled by men (see below). Slavery is taken for granted throughout this period, but is rarely discussed: you have to be on your toes to get a sense of how slaves are acquired, how they are treated, what sorts of work they perform, etc. How do the bases of social division in Greek society compare with the divisions you are aware of in your society?

Gender: Central to any social organization are the roles, rules and statuses assigned to biological males and females. In examining any particular period, you will note what sorts of jobs are regularly done by men and which are regularly done by women, what sort of respect and/or power is attached to these jobs, whether there is any blurring of roles, what rules seem to govern sexual behavior, marriage, child-rearing, the ‘legitimacy’ of children. What ideological justifications are offered for the specific gender relationships of Greek civilization? Under what circumstances are women in any sense given a voice? How do Greek gender relations and roles compare with the patterns of gender identities offered you by your society?

COURSE ORGANIZATION:

These five broad issues, genres or “media,” and visual arts are key to the organization of this course, class discussions, and all quizzes and exams. Obviously any particular text is likely to be more relevant to some topics than to others. This means that in dealing with any given assignment we must often “jump from topic to topic.” That is a necessary consequence of the whole organization of the course. Each assignment will give you important data about *some* of these issues or about art. As the course progresses, you should be developing a deeper and deeper understanding of each of these issues (a good reason to go back regularly to the above set of questions). In every case, whether explicitly asked for or not on a particular quiz or exam question, the educational value of this course for you depends upon the degree to which you are willing to rethink your own society in the process of trying to understand a different society. That is probably the only way significant details about a long dead society will stick in your minds and provoke critical thinking. Every society tends to present its politics, its religion, its chief roll-models, its socio-economic structure, and its gender relations as “natural.” Studying these issues in

another society is thus both potentially threatening and potentially liberating to the degree that it raises questions about what is “natural.”

GENERAL WORK EXPECTATIONS

To me “100-level” implies “Introductory” and means that I should try very hard not to take for granted that you know anything about the subject matter of the course. You get the same number of credit hours for a 100-level course as for a 400-level course. The difference is primarily in the level of knowledge presupposed by each level, not the amount of work. It does NOT imply “superficial” or “light-weight” treatment of the subject matter. I continually get evaluations complaining that I take this course too seriously. If I didn’t take it seriously, I’d be cheating you and your parents. If you are looking for a gut course, take something else, *please!* I expect a **MINIMUM OF TWO HOURS SERIOUS PREPARATION OUTSIDE OF CLASS FOR EVERY HOUR IN CLASS.**

TEXTS

The chief emphasis of the course is on the “primary” texts, i.e., those that are either written in antiquity or survey the visual remains from antiquity. Only by engaging seriously with the actual remains of ancient Greece can you engage directly with the minds, personalities, emotions, moral and aesthetic values, institutions, and life-experiences that constituted its civilization. The only exception is the *Brief History* (Pomeroy et al.), which aims at periodically putting data and issues in some sort of organized perspective and covering archaeological evidence that supplements the lack of full texts for periods before and after Homer and Hesiod.

I realize that for many of you these primary texts may be somewhat disorienting. Not only are there lots of unfamiliar places and names which may be difficult to sound out (see below on Greek names), but Greek authors begin with all sorts of different assumptions and presuppositions from those you are familiar with in both your “entertainment” and educational texts. Moreover, a significant portion of the course is devoted to the study of fragmentary remains of Greek lyric poetry—fragments preserved mainly by historical accidents. But as noted above, to a large extent the *differences* between one culture and our own constitute a major reason for studying that other culture--to liberate you from the naive assumption that everybody thinks and feels just the way we do or the more dangerous assumption that any departures from our norms are by definition inferior. Ralph Waldo Emerson once proclaimed optimistically that “Where one mind has gone, any other mind can go.” We can go as far as we do with the Greeks because of a chain of historical events (described above) that have made Greek civilization our source for many elements in our own. But gaining new perspectives on your own lives and your own civilization as well as fully appreciating the Greeks means also trying to enter their minds where they are *not* like us as.

GENERAL QUESTIONS ON ART

Because many of you will never have studied visual art systematically before, I have added these questions which you should review before reading any art assignments. In distinguishing works of art it is always helpful to ask: What is the **material** (e.g., wood, stone, clay, bronze, other?)? What is the **specific technique** (e.g., it makes a difference whether one paints vases free-hand or with several brushes fixed together, whether one paints a background on clay or leaves the clay as the background, whether one beats a solid lump of bronze into a shape or pours molten bronze into a mold, etc.)? What is the **subject**

matter? Some cultures specifically forbid representations of living creatures: (cf. Deuteronomy 5.7: “Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image, even any manner of likeness, of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth”). What do the choices of Greek artists say about the values of the society as a whole? What is the **scale** (miniature? life-size? greater than life-size?) and what are the consequences of the scale chosen? In the case of three-dimensional works, what is the **point of view** (purely frontal, i.e., one-dimensional, in silhouette or fully “in-the-round” so you have to walk around the piece to grasp fully the artist’s achievement)? A related question for sculpture is whether it is part of an architectural work or free standing, and if free-standing, where was it intended to be seen? What **period** is it from (at least approximate dates are important)? How does it exemplify the **general characteristics of its period**? How does it show continuity with the past and/or point towards tendencies that become dominant later? **Where** was it made? In the case of some painted vases and sculptures and a few buildings we know the name of the artist, but I don’t normally expect you to know that. Finally, what was its **function**? Was it for private or public exhibition? Is it religious or secular? Is it for the whole community or for one particular portion of it? Don’t be in too big a hurry to decide whether you *like* a particular work or not: expanding your understanding of how art is made and the range of functions and meanings it can have expands your capacity for pleasure in art.

MIAMI PLAN

Since this is a Miami Plan Foundation Course, I would like to point out here that my goals are in harmony with the goals of that plan: this course aims at fostering *critical thinking* about the implications of the strong Greek influence on modern European and North American institutions and culture. Genuine critical thinking about issues like politics, religion, or gender is not always pleasant, but it distinguishes truly human beings from programmed robots. A major focus of the course is the interaction of historical developments--including interactions with other Mediterranean cultures--with social structures, literature, the visual arts, and the quest for systematic knowledge. It is thus centrally concerned with *understanding contexts*. this class size in particular should facilitate questions and discussion. Occasionally I may ask you to evaluate each other’s papers as a way of appreciating each other’s perspectives on the assigned material. Thus discussion and questions--*engaging with other learners*--is strongly encouraged. While direct opportunities for *civic participation* are not embedded in the course, much of the literature we read focuses on the questions of what constitutes a good society, who should participate in and how should individuals participate in shaping their society and what is the nature of the best sort of political leadership. Thus it is hoped that the critical perspectives offered the students will provoke ample *reflecting and acting*.

CLASS FORMAT: Given the size of this section, discussion should central. This presupposes you show up to class not only having done the assigned reading, but having *thought* about in a disciplined way. The brief topics attached to each assignment are designed to guide your reading so that you will be posing questions to the text that can be explored in class. These topics are not necessarily *all* we will discuss, but they should give you some focus points for organizing your thoughts as you read and listen. Normally you may expect at least **one weekly 5-10 minute quiz**. In keeping with my concern for your developing reading skills pertinent to the texts of this course, occasionally I will simply ask you to explain the relevance of a short passage from a primary text assigned to one of the questions. Sometimes I may also ask you to define briefly a term or identify a figure

discussed in the classes since the last quiz. After art assignments I may ask you to analyze a specific work discussed in the art text. (See above for “General Questions on Art”).

Note: As indicated above, on these quizzes I expect complete sentences—not strings of random phrases, no abbreviations (e.g., w/ for “with” w/out for “without”) and a serious attempt to communicate not with someone presumed to be omniscient about the questions asked, but someone assumed to be intelligent and genuinely interested in the issues, who would like some indication of the grounds for your value judgments.

A missed quiz averages in a zero with your other quiz grades; showing up and handing in a quiz with your name on averages in a 55.

EVALUATION AND GRADING:

While I am wary of hard percentages that make no allowance for significant improvement (or degeneration...) during the semester, the following do indicate my broad priorities:

Average of weekly quizzes 20%

Hour Tests 40%

Final Exam 40%

I follow these equivalents between letter grades and numerical grades, which are inherently misleadingly precise:

A+ = 96-100 = more than I could reasonably expect

A = 93-95 = all that I can reasonably expect in terms of content and clear expression

A- = 90-92 = almost all that I can reasonably expect and clear expression

B+ = 86-89 = most of what I can reasonably expect, but some relatively minor gaps

B = 83-85 = most of what I can reasonably expect, but some serious gaps

B- = 80-82 = a fair amount of what I can reasonably expect, but some serious gaps

C+ = 76-79 = etc.

C = 73-75

C- = 70-72

D+ = 66-69

D = 63-65

D- = 60-62

ATTENDANCE: Regular attendance is essential to full assimilation of the various components of this course. You are allowed three unexcused cuts. The only excused cuts are **not** for extracurricular activities, but for health problems attested to by a doctor in writing or a death in family attested by an obituary or other objective documentation. Other absences will result in a significant lowering of your grade, i.e., one grade step lower for each cut beyond the three, e.g., from a B- to a C+. It is essential that you sign the attendance sheet that is passed around for each class. **Perfect attendance will raise your grade one step, e.g., from B- to B.**

A NOTE ON GREEK NAMES: Most of our acquaintance with Greek culture comes through the Romans, who, naturally enough, Romanized Greek names. Indeed, the “Greeks” actually called themselves “Hellenes;” it just happened that the first Hellenes with whom the Romans came in contact were a tribe they called “Graeci.” The most obvious changes in the Romanization of Greek names are endings in -us for Greek -os or -ês and Latin c for Greek k (the originally hard Latin c often went to a soft s sound in the Romance languages and English: thus the Greek Patroklos becomes Patroclus, but Greek

Kimón became English Simon). Latin also had a strong stress accent either on the next-to-last syllable (“penult”) if the syllable was long or on the syllable-before-the-penult (“antepenult”) if the penult was short. Greek had a pitch accent falling on one of the last three syllables according to complex rules that are irrelevant for you. Greek Menélâos goes to Latin Meneláus, Greek Periklês goes to Latin Péricles, etc. Starting in the nineteenth century, a number of Greek scholars began transliterating Greek names more accurately and arguing that we should avoid seeing Greece through a Roman filter (Lattimore’s translations are in this purist vein). Others argued that English literature absorbed Greek culture through the Latin versions and these are therefore more true to the idiom of English. In practice I tend to pronounce the most familiar Greek names in their Romanized versions (e.g., Achíllēs, not Achilléus) and less familiar ones in their Greek form (e.g., Kímôn, not Símon). Lattimore does have a pronouncing appendix to his Homer translations. I think that when you decide who the **main characters** are in a work, it’s a good idea to **write out** their names and **say them aloud** three times so that I can at least recognize whom you are talking about on quizzes.

SPECIFIC ASSIGNMENTS (due for the day assigned)

MON Jan 11: Introduction: goals and organization of the course; the nature of the evidence and of our textbooks; the meanings of “civilization” in the Mediterranean context; the centrality of Homer to Greek civilization. [Handout of map and place names]

WED Jan 13: Pomeroy 3-7 (sources), 10-13 (land of Greece), 17-39 (Minoans and Mycenaeans): Topics: the geography and ecology of Greece; Minoan and Mycenaean societies: their art and architecture, what we can and cannot know about their political and social structures, religions and values; the similarities and differences we can observe.

THERE WILL BE A MAP QUIZ BASED ON HANDOUT MAP WITH A LIST OF PLACES YOU NEED TO BE ABLE TO FIND. There will also be a very short quiz to reassure me that you have **carefully read the syllabus.**

FRI Jan 15: Pomeroy 41-68. Topics: what’s “dark” and not so dark about the Dark Age; the nature of pre-Homeric evidence; Homer as evidence for the Mycenaean Age, for the Dark Age and for the eighth century.

MON Jan 18: Martin Luther King Day: No classes

WED Jan 20: Osborne 22-41. Topics: the centrality of pottery to Greek history, figurative vs. non-figurative art; the meaning of horses within a specifically Greek context; the social context of funerary urns.

FRI Jan 22: Homer’s *Iliad* bk. 1. Topics: formulaic composition and literacy; Homer’s audience and Panhellenism; the role of the gods in human actions and decisions; evidence in bk. 1 about Homeric religious practice and belief; key issues in the conflict of Achilles and Agamemnon.

MON Jan 25: Homer’s *Iliad* bks. 2. lines 1-492, bk. 3 (entire). Topics: delaying the implementation of “Zeus’s plan” and the overall structure of the poem; the nature of Homeric assemblies; the source of Agamemnon’s power; Odysseus and Thersites; what the

Muses know; the relation of the theme of Achilles' wrath to the theme of the Trojan War as a whole; characterization of Helen and Aphrodite in the *Iliad*.

WED Jan 27: Homer's *Iliad* bk. 6. Topics: Elite class solidarity across "national" lines; heroism vs. the flow of nature; Hektor and Andromache vs. Paris and Helen; the question of Homer's "loyalties."

FRI Jan 29: Homer's *Iliad* bks. 9 (entire), bk. 11. lines 595-end, bk. 12. lines 290-328. Topics: Diomedes as parallel and contrast to Achilles; Nestor's handling of Agamemnon and the "catch" in Agamemnon's offer of redress; the make-up of the embassy, the differences in approach and in Achilles' response to each; the language of Achilles and the role of "negation" in his response to the heroic tradition; why Achilles sends Patroklos to Nestor; Sarpedon and the economics and metaphysics of heroism.

MON Feb 1: Homer's *Iliad* bks. 16 & 18. Topics: Achilles' tragic choice; the nature of his relationship with Patroklos; the "aristeia" (best battle performance) of Patroklos; Achilles' repudiation of divine birth; the paradigm of Herakles; the world of Achilles' shield and its relevance to the poem as a whole.

WED Feb 3: Homer's *Iliad* bks. 19.282-303; 22 & 24 (entire): Topics: Hektor as one type of tragic hero; the role of Athena in the death of Hektor; Priam's alienation; Achilles' "consolations" of Priam and the final view of the gods; a final contrast of Achilles and Agamemnon; the women's laments and summing up on Homer's representation of women in the *Iliad*.

FRI Feb 5: HOUR TEST ON MATERIAL COVERED SO FAR

MON Feb 8: Pomeroy 71-80 (excluding bit on Hesiod); Homer's *Odyssey* bks. 1 & 2. Topics: Greek colonization in relation to the rise of the polis; the nature of the early polis and who benefited most from its development; the structure of the poem as a whole; the emphasis on Ithaka; the emphasis on Telemachos; the ethical and religious questions posed by Zeus's exchange with Athena; the identity of Odysseus: what sort of "hero"?; pun in Greek; the nature of Homeric assemblies (revisited); the point of Telemachos' travels.

WED Feb 10: Homer's *Odyssey* bks. 5 & 6. Topics: the second assembly on Olympos and Zielinski's "law"; first impressions of Odysseus; female figures in the *Odyssey* and the double sexual standard; the hero reduced to zero; parallels and contrasts between Phaeacian society and the society of Ithaka; aspects of Odysseus revealed through his interactions with the Phaeacians.

FRI Feb 12: Homer's *Odyssey* bks. 7 & 8. Topics: parallels and contrasts between Phaeacian society and the society of Ithaka; aspects of Odysseus revealed through his interactions with the Phaeacians; poetry and "real" life; from zero to credible hero

MON Feb 15: Homer's *Odyssey* bks. 9 & 10. Topics: a structuralist reading of the relation of Ithaka, Phaeacia, and the world of the Cyclops; Odysseus and colonization; scary females, male chauvinism, and the double sexual standard.

WED Feb 17: Homer's *Odyssey* bks. 11 & 12. Topics: reasons for visiting the Underworld; the self-conscious poet: poets and beggars; the pattern of the adventures as a whole: ethical, allegorical, and psychoanalytic approaches to the adventures.

FRI Feb 19: Homer's *Odyssey* bks. 13, 17, 18. Topics: multiple transitions to the world of Ithaka; from hero back to zero; the relation of Athena, Hermes, and Odysseus; the nature of the suitors and Odysseus' "skills" in dealing with them.

MON Feb 22: Homer's *Odyssey* bks. 19 & 21. Topics: Odysseus' scar and his identity; the relationship of Odysseus and Penelope; Penelope as Heroine; Penelope's decision and the gates of horn and ivory; the symbolism of the bow; the suitors' response to the contest.

WED Feb 24: Homer's *Odyssey* bks. 22 lines 1-88, 23, 24. Topics: the "logic" of killing all the suitors; the sequence of recognitions; the recognitions of Penelope and Odysseus; the relevance of bk. 24; the ambiguities of the ending.

FRI Feb 26: Pomeroy 80-82; Hesiod's *Theogony* lines 1-929 (Frazer's running comments are generally helpful, but NOT required reading). Topics: the nature of cosmogonic poetry; Hesiod's relation to the Muses and the probable occasion of Hesiod's poem; Hesiod's utopian political vision of the rise of Zeus to the "kingship" of the cosmos; Hesiod and the dark side: Prometheus and the creation of women.

MON Mar 1: Hesiod's *Works and Days* lines 1-736. Topics: the new dual genealogy of Strife and the focus of Hesiod's poem; Zeus's association with justice and with arbitrary power; "kings" and middling farmers; the second version of the Prometheus myth and the creation of women; the "races" of man myth; the hawk and nightingale in relation to the vision of justice; the farmer's year and random ethical advice.

WED Mar 3: HOUR TEST ON *ODYSSEY*, *HESIOD*, AND RELATED POMEROY READINGS

FRI Mar 5: Pomeroy 82-100 (hoplite warfare, tyranny, the great games); Archilochus (Miller pp. 1-12); Mimnermus (Miller pp. 27-30); Semonides (Miller pp. 22-26); Sappho (Miller pp. 51-63): Topics: the range of the term "lyric"; lyric and Homer: what's "new" in Archilochus and Mimnermus; the invention of love and sex; Semonides and Hesiod; class and misogyny; colonization and mercenaries; hoplites and tyranny; the lone woman's voice in Greek literature.

March 6-14: SPRING BREAK: ENJOY!

MON Mar 15: Pomeroy 102-122 (Sparta); Callinus (Miller 20-21); Tyrtaeus (Miller 13-19), Alcman (Miller pp. 31-37); Theognis (Miller pp. 82-94). Topics: the macho side of the Greek aristocratic ideal and the Spartans gift for image-building; Sparta's relationship to tyranny and "democracy"; the essence of the Spartan system; Greek same-sex relations; Spartan slavery.

WED Mar 17: Osborne pp. 43-67. Topics: Orientalism in the seventh century: the Greek response to a wider world; representations of bodies (scale and materials); from figurative art to narrative art; the black-figure technique; the Daedalic style.

FRI Mar 19: Pomeroy 124-139, 164-66; Solon (Miller pp. 64-76). Topics: Class exploitation in the Archaic Age and the rise of tyranny; Solon as both anti-tyrant and de facto tyrant; the tyranny of Peisistratos and the end of tyranny in mainland Greece; the invention and nature of Athenian-style democracy.

MON Mar 22: Xenophanes (Miller pp.107-111); Simonides (Miller pp. 112-120); Pindar (please read in this order and be sure to read Miller's notes: Olympian 14 (Miller pp. 144-146), Pythian 10 (Miller pp. 164-7), Olympian 1 (Miller pp. 126-131); Nemean 1 (handout); Nemean 5 (Miller pp. 168-172); Nemean 8 (handout); Pythian 8 (Miller pp. 159-64). Topics: (Xenophanes) radical rejections of the anthropomorphic gods by the self-conscious intellectual; (Simonides) the political and intellectual flexibility of the poet as servant of a changing status quo; (Pindar) the form and nature of the victory ode; the ideology of inherited excellence; the cleaning up of the mythic tradition; the political use of myth; tyranny and the arts.

WED Mar 24: Osborne pp. 68-115. Topics: stone temples, cult statues (the Egyptian context) and pedimental sculpture; *korai* (singular *korê* = statues of young women) and *kouroi* (singular *kouros* = statues of young men); the Egyptian context & contrast; gender and class stereotypes; pots as commodities for specific markets; the relation of scale to design and content; the displacement of Corinthian black-figure by Athenian black-figure; the construction of the viewer of pots; the emergence of major painters (Amasis, Exekias); pottery outside Athens.

FRI Mar 26: Osborne pp. 116-155. Topics: The politics of art from c. 525-475 BC; "politics" as inter-city competition and as human decision-making with consequences; frontal sculpture vs. side-view = encounter vs. narrative flow; myth and politics (Herakles, Ajax, Theseus); class markers in art; sex and the aristocratic symposium; the pluses and minuses of the black-figure technique; the invention and character of red-figure vase painting; its link with scenes of daily life (parties and gymnastics) over myth; the Andokides Painter; Euphronios and virtuosity; the issue of "realism;" ridding the world of monsters vs. sacking cities; the isolated image (Epiktetos, Berlin Painter); Dionysos: sex, drink, satyrs and maenads (Makron, Byrgos Painter, Douris); gods vs. mortals in sexual pursuit (the Pan Painter).

MON Mar 29: Pomeroy 139-153, 202-4; Herodotus bk. 1 (excerpt = Finley 29-62). Topics: The rise of the Persian Empire and the overall shape of the war between Greece and Persia; Herodotus and the invention of "history": sources and agenda; the wisdom of Solon

WED Mar 31: Herodotus bk.3.80-83 (handout), bk. 7.1-117 (excerpt = Finley 81-top of 104, 111-115). Topics: the first piece of political theory in history; Herodotus' account of Xerxes' deliberative process; the decisive role of Athens.

FRI Apr 2: Herodotus bk. 7.206-232 (excerpt = Finley 142-153); bk. 8.49-88 (excerpt = Finley 174-190). Topics: the battle of Salamis and Herodotus' interpretation of it; Artemia.

MON Apr 5: Pomeroy 206-9; Aeschylus' *Persians*. Topics: the origin of tragedy, the formal structure of tragedy; the formal and dramatic structure of the *Persians*; the invention of the barbarian and the question of audience sympathies.

WED Apr 7: Pomeroy 212-217; excerpt from Plato's dialogue *Protagoras* (handout); some fragments of Protagoras (handout). Topics: the sophistic movement and Greek rationalism, the relation of "anthropology" (i.e., the account of the origin and early experiences of the human species) to democratic theory; Plato's use of Prometheus compared with that of Hesiod.

FRI Apr 9: Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*. Topics: the hero as sophist; the politics of tyranny, democracy and "anthropology;" the "Sophoclean" structure of the play; the relations to Hesiod's and Plato's version of Prometheus; the role of women in the play.

MON Apr 12: Pomeroy 156-64, 217-252 . Topics: conflicts between Athens and Sparta after the Persian Wars; the development and character of the Athenian empire; an overview of the Peloponnesian War.

WED Apr 14: Thucydides bk 1.1-23 (the "Archaeology" = Finley 218-232; bk. 1.67-88 (the first congress at Sparta = Finley 251-265); bk. 1.89-117 (the "Fifty-Year Interval," i.e., between the Persian War and "his" war, handout pp. 43-56). Topics: Thucydides' conception of history compared with Herodotus: sophistic rationalist or prose tragedian?; the speeches; the "real" cause of the war; fundamental contrasts of Spartan and Athenian societies.

FRI Apr 16: Sophocles' *Ajax*. Topics: Sophoclean tragedy vs. Aeschylean tragedy; Sophocles' conception of Ajax and Odysseus compared with Homer's and Pindar's (review Pindar, Nemean 8); myth and politics (again!).

MON Apr 19: Osborne 156-187. Topics: a new sense of autonomy in sculpture, a new level of sensuality in male form (Kritian Boy and youth from Motya); new possibilities in bronze (Riace warriors); Polykleitos' canon and classical idealism (the Doryphoros = spearbearer); pot-painters influenced by (and swamped by) wall-painting (the Niobid Painter); the sculptures of the temple of Zeus at Olympia; iconography of the sculptures of the Parthenon; sculpture from the temple of Athena Nike and the connection between art and imperialist consciousness.

WED Apr 21: Euripides' *Medea*. Topics: the date and context of the play; Euripides' approach to tragedy, the sophists, and "realism;" is this a feminist play?; the vision of Athens.

FRI Apr 23: : Thucydides bk. 2.34-46 (Funeral Oration = Finley 265-273; bk. 2.47-54 (the plague at Athens = Finley 273-278; bk. 2. 59-65 (Pericles' last speech and Thucydides' own summing up of Pericles) (handout). Topics: the utopian vision of Athenian democracy vs. the breakdown of civilization; the rhetoric of imperialist wars; Thucydides' view of Pericles and "his" war.

MON Apr 26: Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*. Topics: the meaning of *tyrannos* in the fifth-century context; Oedipus as Pericles; Oedipus as sophist; the despair of/critique of rationalism; the existentialist hero.

WED Apr 28: Sophocles' *The Women of Trachis*. Topics: versions of Herakles in Homer, Pindar (review Nemean 1), visual arts (see Osborne's index), and Sophocles; how "Euripidean" is this play?

FRI Apr 30: Plato's *Apology* (handout). Topics: the emergence of courtroom oratory; the transformation of the heroic idea; the centrality of the "soul;" the repudiation of democracy, of versatility in favor of expertise.

FINAL EXAM: Wednesday December 16 at 10:15 am (same room)