CHAPTER 1

History and Theory

Prologue

It is generally held by historians of slavery that Roman slaves left little to express their feelings and ideas about their experience. The main goal of this book is to suggest that they left quite a bit, and that historians can find in the remains of the *palliata* much that testifies to the experience of the bottom layers of central Italian society in the 200s BCE, not only in Rome but in other Latin-speaking cities and towns. Within the *framework* of the plays, which, as the prologue speakers sometimes tell the audience, derives from the Greek plays known as *Nea*, the *fabric* of the plays is Italian, and low. However, "low" itself is complicated. In what follows, the reader must bear in mind that slavery was a civil status, not a social class, and that, as a status, in Rome at this time, it was fluid; slaves were not a caste, whatever philosophers may have said about natural slaves; slavery, then, was a lived process. At the same time, Rome had, in the census, a clearly defined class system that ranked male citizens according to property and thereby slotted them into voting classes and military ranks; the plays also class people according to the kind of labor they do. A "Roman audience," then, included not only slaves but freed slaves, alongside other free persons, from poor to wealthy; people who self-identified across status lines by neighborhood or trade. Slaves and the free poor onstage overlap.[1] Moreover, in this period all people, of any social class, were vulnerable to enslavement or might have lost kin to enslavement. Each audience member existed at the intersection of relationships: ascendants and descendants, neighbors,

[1] On the fluid nature of slavery in Rome in this period, see Taylor 2013[1960]: 132–49; on slavery as a "logical or juridical" class but not a social class, Finley 1998[1980]: 145; on slavery as process, Stewart 2012: 48–79, esp. at 78–9. On the census, see Brunt 1971a: 15–16; on class as relational, see Rose 2012: 36; on distinctions made onstage between skilled and unskilled labor, and between labor and begging, see chapter 2. For a detailed historical argument on the issues in this chapter, see Richlin 2014b: 202–19.

employers, owners, former owners, slaves and freed, and sexual partners of all kinds, both paid and unpaid. As this book will make evident, "owner" and "slave" are relational terms, and "owner" does not imply "upper-class," or even "free," although "rich owner" does. Modern readers must work to realize that slavery structured all these relationships; we live after abolition, but they did not. As comedies do, the *palliata* put the audience's world onstage. It was popular comedy in the literal sense that it showed the world of the *populus*, not restricted to Roman citizens, and with a decided emphasis on life at the bottom of the heap, which is where freed slaves tended to wind up in Rome in the 200s. Things had changed in Italy by the time Terence came on the scene in the 160s, after Pydna, so this book goes only to the death of Plautus in 184, an event, so his epitaph claims, that caused Comedy herself to grieve.[2]

"Slave Theater in the Roman Republic": this book, then, has a tendentious title. More accurately, it should be called "The *Palliata* from 300 to 184 BCE as the Performance Art of Urban Slaves, Displaced Persons, and the Free Poor in Central Italy." Even "Plautus and Popular Comedy" is problematic: Plautus holds center stage here only because we have twenty complete plays ascribed to him, while, as John Wright showed, the writers of the early *palliata* are indistinguishable in terms of content, style, and language; the *palliata* was shaped by oral performance forms and by improvisation by the whole troupe, so that any given extant play cannot accurately be ascribed to a single author. The dates: despite the widely accepted start date of 240 BCE (first public performance of a play by Livius Andronicus), this genre must have been developing for some decades before that date, and kept on adapting; nor were plays performed only once, so material in any given extant play cannot be assigned to a single date of performance. The location: it is an accident due to later events that the plays we have were preserved as Roman, by later Romans, rather than as belonging to, say, Praeneste, or to Latium in general, for Latin was not the exclusive property of Rome. The personnel: we do not know for sure who was under the

[2] On the shared life of slaves, freed slaves, and the working poor, see Finley 1998[1980]: 149, 170–1 (for earlier and later periods); evidence in Richlin 2014b: 206–10. Birth and death dates for Plautus are insecure, based on Cicero's claim that Plautus died in the year 184 BCE (*Brut.* 60), and that he lived to be an old man (*Sen.* 50); the epitaph comes from Gellius 1.24.3, attributed to Varro *De poetis*, who thought it was genuine. On the tenuous nature of all data on writers in this period, see further below. Many have perceived a marked difference in kind between the early writers of the *palliata* and Terence; this was a main part of John Wright's argument (1974). For a sample opinion, see Slater 1985: 169: "Such a belles-lettreist was Terence. His plays show the marks of his lack of practical theatre experience. He evidently thought little of the native Italian traditions, and used elements of them only grudgingly in his plays."

masks, or even that there were masks. Of all these points, the most secure is that at least some of the actors were slaves, as evidenced by jokes in the plays about actors' status. It was, then, of great importance to historians of slavery when C. W. Marshall clarified the part played by group improvisation in the formation of the text: hence "slave theater."[3] Actors, of course, are performers, not witnesses at a tribunal, and they told their stories in the form of jokes, a mode of communication with rules of its own. But performance is a joint creation of actors and audience, and in the *palliata* the actors – themselves from the bottom layers of society – gave the people what they wanted and joked about a life that was familiar to all present. As the slave/god Mercurius says in *Amphitruo*, kings are for tragedy, slaves are for comedy: high and low, in life and onstage. In a century racked by war throughout the Mediterranean, mass enslavements and city sackings filled the landscape with people who had lost everything.[4]

If we could see that landscape from space and then zoom in on a road in central Italy around 260 BCE, we might see a team of men walking alongside a cart pulled by a donkey. The men are short and wiry; they look tough, even the two youngest ones, who are only about fifteen. They are not only tough but thin, because their world has been at war for their whole lives and they hardly ever get enough to eat. Their bodies are marked with scars, and one has been tattooed across his face, souvenir of an old failed escape. Two of them are singing; they sing very well, and somebody riding in the cart starts to play along with them on a *tibia*, an instrument like two oboes played together. This is a *grex* of comic actors, walking along the via Latina through Latium, because they have just put on a show at the market day at Anagnia and are heading south to Frusino to put on a show at the market day there. Four of them grew up speaking Greek – one came from Sicily, one came from southern Italy, one came from a city in northern Greece, one came from Alexandria. One of them grew up speaking Umbrian in the hinterlands of Ariminum, a new *colonia* on the northern Adriatic coast. Two of them grew up speaking Oscan in small towns in

[3] On the stylistic unity of the *palliata*: Wright 1974. On indigenous oral performance: essays in Benz, Stärk, and Vogt-Spira 1995; Lefèvre 2014 (a summary); Wallochny 1992; Marshall 2006: 263–6 for a critique and overview. On improvisation by the troupe working together: Marshall 2006: 268–79. On the evidence for old formulae in the comic fragments of Livius Andronicus: Richlin 2017b: 186–8. On the presentation of the plays: Goldberg 1998. On masks: Marshall 2006: 126–58. The acting troupe as *grex*: *As*. 3, *Cas.* 22, *Ps.* 1335, cf. *Cist.* 731–3 on a *grex venalium*; jokes on actors' slave status, *Am*. 26–31, *Cas*. 84–6, *Cist*. 784–5. See Marshall 2006: 84 on the "network of economic ties" laid out in *As*. 1–3, and further below.

[4] For a survey of mass enslavements in this period, see Volkmann 1990, supplemented for Rome's actions in Italy in the 290s by Harris 1979: 59 n. 4, and see Appendix 1 below.

the far south. One of them, the one with the red hair, grew up speaking a Celtic language, because he comes from the far north, in the Po Valley, and nobody else in the group can speak his language. One of them grew up speaking Punic, because his mother came from Carthage. Two of them grew up speaking Latin, which is the language they are all speaking now, as they talk and tell jokes and rehearse. Of these eleven, six grew up bilingual, through mixed parentage or enslavement.[5] Most of them are either slaves or freed slaves, and the five slaves belong to their fellow actors; all of them either were raised as performers or were made so at an early age. The group leader bought the two boys at a market a few years ago because they could both carry a tune, and one of them was an acrobat. The leader has sex with the pretty one when he wants to.

All along the way they meet up with groups of people on the road; a lot of them are refugees, because their town has been sacked or their land has been appropriated, and they have to find a new home. Some of these people have been allowed to leave their homes just with what they can carry. A lot of them are on their way to Rome, which is the biggest city nearby, and they have relatives there. The actors know that in all the towns they come to there will be people in the audience like these, who have been violently displaced by the wars and by what goes along with war in the world they all know: the enslavement of captives after an army sacks a town – sometimes only the women and children, who have to watch when the men are killed; the rape of these captives by soldiers; the poverty or shame that can make a woman abandon a child who is then picked up and enslaved; the kidnapping and human trafficking that thrive when the world is at war. Comedians have often remarked that comedy starts with anger, which is a way of saying that comedy springs from history, from lived experience; this book sees how that is so in the *palliata*.

Biographies of ancient writers are generally viewed with suspicion, but some more than others, and some aspects more than others. For example, there is no evidence outside the ancient biographical tradition and authors' self-statements, now also rarely trusted, on the social status of the writers of the *palliata*, but scholars generally agree that their status, as the lives say,

[5] On the advantages of donkey-carts over ox-carts in transport, see Adams 2012: 230. On interactions among languages in Italy during the Republic, see Langslow 2012, although, like many surveys, his treats the entire Republic synoptically, which obscures historical shifts important to the present argument. On the size of the troupe, see Marshall 2006: 94–120; he estimates a maximum size of nine, and I have added a *tibicen* and an apprentice/stagehand/stage manager. On the *tibia* and *tibicines*, see Moore 2012: 26–63.

was low.[6] Yet Plautus' biography, which appears in Aulus Gellius by way of Varro, is often dismissed. Here it is (Gell. 3.3.14):

> *Saturionem* et *Addictum* et tertiam quandam, cuius nunc mihi nomen non suppetit, in pistrino eum scripsisse Varro et plerique alii memoriae tradiderunt, cum pecunia omni, quam in operis artificum scaenicorum pepererat, in mercatibus perdita inops Romam redisset et ob quaerundum victum ad circumagendas molas, quae trusatiles appellantur, operam pistori locasset.
>
> Varro says, and many others have handed down the story, that he wrote *Fatso* and *Wage Slave* and a third play, the name of which now escapes me, in a mill. He had lost in trading ventures all the money that he had made in jobs related to the theater, and had returned to Rome, penniless, and in order to make enough money to eat he had hired out his labor to a miller, for turning the mill (the kind they call a push-mill).

Folkloric this story may be – Gellius says as much, in the words *plerique alii memoriae tradiderunt* – but folklore has a significance of its own, and the elements in the story link the *palliata* with the world of the 200s BCE. The two plays Plautus writes in the mill have significant titles: *Saturio*, the name of the hungry man in *Persa*, a name always evoking the dream of enough food; *Addictus*, the word for a person who has been adjudged to his creditor to pay off his debt (see chapter 3). Both plays have extant fragments. Gellius goes on to recount that Naevius, too, is said to have written two plays in dire circumstances – in his case, when he was in prison for insulting the *principes civitatis* "in the fashion of the Greek poets," that is, by name (3.3.15). (This story is sometimes held to be incredible, but plenty of books have been written in prison: *Mein Kampf*, 1923; Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks*, 1929–35; *Letter from Birmingham Jail*, 1963; *Soul on Ice*, 1965: political, if not funny.[7]) Like many characters in the plays, Plautus is involved in trade; he has lost his money, becoming *inops* – destitute; he

[6] Representative is Manuwald 2011: 90–2, who says the dramatic poets were "of low social status … slaves, freedmen or free foreigners." Gruen 1996b: 87–91, claiming these poets gained high status by proximity to the Greek theatrical guilds, has been influential among historians, but is wrong on this point; see Le Guen 2014: 370–3 (no Dionysiac *tekhnitai* in the western Mediterranean in this period).

[7] Opinions vary as to whether to believe the stories about Naevius and political critique: Beta 2014 (yes); Boyle 2006: 53–5 (cautiously); Fantham 2005: 219–20, 222 (focuses on Naevius' "advocacy of speaking out"); Goldberg 2005: 162, 165, 169 (yes, but not related to drama); Gruen 1996a: 92–106 (no); Gunderson 2015: 50–1 (as a thought experiment); Moore 1998: 62, 73 ("almost certainly"); Williams 1982: 4–5 (entirely); Wiseman 1998: 39 (yes, against Gruen); cf. Kruschwitz 2013, who includes Naevius among those who fostered the political dimensions of Roman theater and interactions with the audience. Boyle rightly observes (55), "What is not speculation is that Naevius … made the implicit imbrication of politics and drama overt." Well attested in the fragments, both comic and tragic.

has been working in *operis artificum*, both words tainted with the idea of manual labor for pay; he has indeed hired himself out for pay; and to a miller, to work in a mill, one of the paradigmatic slave punishments. In fact it is partly the consonance of the life with the work that has caused critics to doubt it, perhaps illogically. More damningly, Friedrich Leo in 1912 pointed out the resemblances between the lives of all the early Latin poets and biographical traditions about contemporary Greek philosophers. Like Plautus in the mill, the Stoic Cleanthes is said to have worked at night not only for a gardener but for a woman flour-dealer, for whom he used to grind the barley-groats; Menedemus, along with his best friend Asclepiades, is said to have worked at night in a mill, although both later rose to fame as colleagues in the Eretrian school of philosophy. Leo concludes, "Die Geschichte von Plautus ist nichts als eine Variante dieser von niemandem geglaubten Anekdoten" (1912: 76, "The story of Plautus is nothing but a variant of these anecdotes, which are believed by no one"). Varro, he argues, is not reliable. But what is most fascinating about Leo's comparison is that the comic writers, as well as the jokes that circulate under their names, are part of the circulation of cultural cargo in the Hellenistic Mediterranean, as in the story of Stratonicus (below) – who (in one version) is said to have been killed by the same king who threatened Menedemus.[8] Just barely a part, though, and only in Latin. In Leo's view, most of the dates, most of the stories about Plautus and his fellow comedians are too poorly attested, indeed too contradictorily attested, to be believed; in which case, on the timeline in Appendix 1, all data on writers must bear an asterisk. Still, the dates must be approximately right, nor are clichés *ipso facto* false. These little-known men, along with unknown others, were vying for the *palma* mentioned in the plays as the prize for the *artifex* – the playwright: *omnes illacrimabiles*, for, in Latium, there was

[8] Leo on the lives of Livius, Naevius, Plautus, and Terence: 1912: 63–86. On Leo's rationalizing approach and its sources, see Pansiéri 1997: 98; Pansiéri goes on to examine each element in the life to see if it is historically plausible (99–146), concluding that "l'insignifiance, la sécheresse même de ces anecdotes … sont des gages de crédibilité" (146). On Cleanthes (331–232 BCE), Diogenes Laertius 7.168–69; on Menedemus (345/4–261/0) and Asclepiades, Diogenes Laertius 2.125 (a builder, a poor man, a scene-painter) and 2.129–30 (trouble with Nicocreon king of Cyprus), and Athenaeus 4.168b (the mill). The two Greek stories are marked by similar structural elements, and the version in Athenaeus leads with the formula ἱστόρησαν [X and Y] ἄλλοι τε πλείους; compare Gellius *Varro et plerique alii memoriae tradiderunt*. On the other hand, both the Greek stories are embedded in much larger anecdotal-patchwork biographies, while for Plautus and the rest there are just these isolated bits. For ways of reading "floating" stories like these, see Langlands 2016; on anecdotes about comedians, see Richlin 2016.

no list of prizewinners.[9] As with actors (below), the very lack of evidence attests to the writers' low status.

There is nothing in Plautus' biography that is any more improbable than what is said about Livius or Caecilius Statius or Terence; a life story like this is about what you would expect for someone in the theater in the 200s BCE. In a time before either authorship or acting acquired prestige in Italy, authors acted alongside actors in their plays. As for the story that Plautus was an Umbrian from Sarsina, which comes from Pompeius Festus (274L): like the origins of the other playwrights, it seems too random to have been invented. Terence, we hear, was highly paid for his work; Ennius had a patron; nothing like that for Plautus, who chose as his identity for all time the most clownish of stage names (see chapter 2).

* * *

This book about low theater is divided into two parts: "What Was Given" (chapters 2–3) and "What Was Desired" (chapters 4–8). Part I starts from Paul Willis's idea that social agents begin from "what was given" – the hand they have been dealt – and form their identity in reaction. Plautus' characters are often assumed to be static, their identity a legacy from Greek New Comedy. The character-types in the plays were already classified in antiquity, and thus have often been treated by modern scholars as a set of cardboard cut-outs that persist from fourth-century Athens into the late Republic; this is facilitated by a tendency to lump together everything from Menander to Terence as "New Comedy." A survey of the most common *experiences* in the early *palliata*, however, shows something both lively and local: a preoccupation with the bodily sufferings of slaves and the free poor through beatings, sexual exploitation, and hunger (chapter 2). A chief example: the character of the Greek *parasitos*, the comic hanger-on, zooms in on hunger as his defining trait as he translates himself into the *parasitus*. In addition, the characteristic *language* of the plays, tied to traditional Italian oral forms by Eckard Lefèvre and the scholars of the Freiburg school, fills them with a kind of speech that audience members knew from lower-class street performance: cheering, verbal dueling, cries for help, the charivari, and the peculiarly Italian form of dunning known as *flagitatio*, strongly associated in the plays with debt (chapter 3). In the

[9] Cf. *Am.* 69–70, *sive qui ambissent palmam <his> histrionibus/ seu quoiquam artifici*; *Poen.* 37, *ne palma detur quoiquam artifici iniuria*; and (fig.) *Trin.* 706, *facile palmam habes … vicit tua comoedia*, with discussion at Moore 1998: 86. See Manuwald 2011: 88, who focuses on "single actors," with some later sources.

chaos of the 200s in the Mediterranean, debt was pervasive, and was often the cause of popular unrest. Roman slaves could buy their way out of slavery, if they practiced the top-down virtue of being *frugi*, as the plays often remark; they do so with irony, for one of the constitutive elements of being a slave, even more so than for the poor, was limited access to money, and this need haunts the plays.

Part II shows how, in reaction to what was given, the plays express the desires of people at the bottom: not only do the powerless say what it is they want, but they also talk about how the powerless can say what they are not allowed to say. As social practices like corporal punishment marked off slave from free, so the plays work to make slaves whole, and claim honor for those who by definition had none. Slaves onstage elevate themselves at the expense of owners (chapter 4); they engage in various kinds of double speech, often self-consciously, pointing to the general nature of the plays themselves as double speech (chapter 6); they engage the audience in the memory of home and family in the time before enslavement (chapter 7); they wish for freedom, sometimes in the practical form of manumission (much more common onstage than is generally stated), sometimes in the form of fantastical escape (chapter 8). They act out the experience of slave-women as well as of male slaves, although the experience of actual women is emphatically at a remove; the actors, as men in drag, convey a complex set of gendered desires among slaves and owners, boys and adult males, appealing in different ways to different audience members (chapter 5). Interaction with the audience, as in many forms of comedy, is central to the *palliata*; in Althusserian terms, "*the plays interpellate the audience segmentally and intermittently.* That is, different lines of the play address different audience members in their various social roles, thereby reinforcing those roles, and not all audience members are being addressed at any one time."[10] Comedy is a prime method by which people form their identities; in the mass trauma of ongoing war, those thrown to the bottom needed to be addressed, and their roles needed to be "reinforced," not in Althusser's closed sense, but in a way that gave them a voice. In the 200s, this is what the *palliata* did.[11]

[10] Richlin 2005: 2–3; cf. Moore 1998: 1–4 and *passim*, Revermann 2006: 38 on "sequentiality," Richlin 2013a: 352–3 (a clarification). Cf. Rebecca Langlands's concepts of "serial multivalency" and "simultaneous multivalency" (forthcoming).

[11] The term *palliata*, short for *comoedia palliata*, is earliest attested by the antiquarian Varro in the first century BCE (*Gram.* 306), but is often used by modern scholars, as I will do here. It denotes comedies acted in Greek dress – the *pallium*. The prologue speakers just call what they are performing *comoediae*, a Latinized Greek word, thus perfectly self-reflexive.

Models of the *Palliata*

Eduard Fraenkel's 1922 *Plautinisches im Plautus* is the foundation of all subsequent understanding of the *palliata* as the product of its own time and place. Fraenkel was arguing with the then standard reading of the plays, in particular as fostered by his teacher, Friedrich Leo, which held that they were translations of the *Nea* into Latin, as indeed the plays claim to be, and are, in a way; Leo's goal was to reconstruct as much as he could of those lost Greek originals. Fraenkel's goal was to show that by far the bulk of the plays, and what made them funny and charming, was comic style and language *in Latin*. Elements that had been seen, from the time of Gellius, as coarse accretions to the fine bones of the Greek plays, were in fact something new and worthy of appreciation in themselves.[12] We have no contemporary witnesses but the self-conscious remnants of the *palliata* itself; the silence is again suggestive. An emerging scholarly consensus has moved away from a linear, stemmatic model for the *palliata* whereby a single Latin playwright translates a play by Menander or Diphilus – somehow, like Terence in Suetonius's biography, getting his hands on a script, which he copies. Our understanding of the circulation of performance genres is no longer so often based on text, as consciousness of the multiple components of performance has grown.[13] An important tenet of the Freiburg school has been its emphasis on the status of Italian forms as improvisatory, unscripted performance (*Stegreifspiel*), which would explain the paucity of contemporary traces. Positions now vary according to the degree to which a scholar believes the plays translated Greek originals, or represented improvisation through a scripted play, or allowed actual improvisation onstage, as part of the play (see Petrides 2014 for an overview).[14]

[12] Gellius 2.23, on Menander's *Plokion* and Caecilius Statius' *Plocium*. Quintilian (10.1.99–100), rejecting Aelius Stilo's admiration for Plautine Latin, held that Latin itself was incapable of reproducing Attic charm. On translation as transformation, see Bettini 2012: 32–60; Feeney 2016: 45–91; McElduff 2013: 61–82.

[13] Forcefully and lucidly laid out by Martin Revermann (2006: 8–17); his focus is almost entirely on Old Comedy, but his arguments can well be applied to the *palliata*. My summary here jumps over an old question on the construction of the individual plays of the *palliata*: did each play derive from a single Greek "original"? W. Beare, in a classic discussion, opined that "there is no evidence at all that Plautus, Naevius or Ennius drew on more than one original at a time" (1964: 312). It is a premise of this book that comedy circulated orally, through actors, who combined jokes and scenes from their repertoire; so Leigh 2004: 37 n. 55, "the comic gag or routine is an important unit of composition for Plautus." See McElduff 2013: 85–94 on the question of translation and multiple sources, taking it back to Leo.

[14] For theory on the circulation of oral performance forms, see Davis 2011 on burlesque, with examples illustrating how oral material was taught and learned.

I do not engage here with scholars who treat Plautus as a read text; probably that is how Gellius knew Plautus, and this approach might well be fruitful for understanding the reception of the *palliata* in antiquity, but, as Niall Slater observed in his influential study of metatheater, a purely text-based approach is inadequate, for "the performance is as important as the poetry"; "a play is not a text but rather a total artistic event which exists only in a theatre during a performance," the actors and the audience being essential components (1985: 4–5). Obviously my book depends on scholars whose chief interest was in words, Fraenkel above all, but very importantly John Wright on the stylistic unity of the *palliata*, and Gonzalez Lodge, whose brilliant *Lexicon*, compiled eighty years before computers, makes it possible for scholars to understand the networks of meaning in the Plautine corpus.[15]

C. W. Marshall, who argues that the texts we have are not scripts but performance transcripts, begins his book with a spiderweb chart showing all the performance genres that influenced the *palliata*, organized century by century. Along with Greek comedy from Old to New, he lists mime, Atellan farce, and Latin tragedy (Marshall 2006: 2). The Freiburg school adds various kinds of verbal dueling and insult: *flagitatio*, Fescennine verses, the songs soldiers sang at triumphs. To this we can usefully add the *thaumata* that show up in Xenophon's *Symposium* (late 360s) and in Theophrastus's *Characters* (probably datable soon after 319 BCE): variety shows at street fairs.[16] If Herodas, as scholars believe, picked up the unscripted mime for his literary mimes in Alexandria in the 270s – so that, in his work, we can see what it might have looked like – the mime added a large portion of sex and violence to the mix. At the other end of the social scale, actors and comedians like the *gelôtopoios* in Xenophon performed at the dinners of rich men and the courts of Hellenistic kings, especially at banquets (Panayotakis 2014: 379–81; Richlin 2016). In the pages below, we will encounter the musician Stratonicus, famous for his barbed jokes, who was killed in the late 300s for insulting a king (which king, what year, different reports), and the poet Sotades, inventor of cinaedic verse, who was killed some time in the 270s for insulting Ptolemy II Philadelphus. Or so

[15] On Lodge, see Mavrogenes 1994. He taught at Teachers College of Columbia University, 1900–30, and is best known for the *Gildersleeve-Lodge Latin Grammar*, written with his teacher, the famous Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve, champion of the German style in advanced education. Mavrogenes describes Lodge: "progressive in the best sense: He wanted to relate schoolwork to life, place language in its context of history and ethnology." On Gildersleeve, who fought for the South in the Civil War, see duBois 2003: 13–18.

[16] On Theophrastus, see Rusten and Cunningham 2002: 68–9, 130–1. For details on Xenophon and Theophrastus, see Richlin 2017b: 173–4.