
HIM 1990-2015

2015

Colloquia Education: An Examination of Roman Second Language Education for Social Implications

Jennifer Newton
University of Central Florida



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/honorstheses1990-2015>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in HIM 1990-2015 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

Recommended Citation

Newton, Jennifer, "Colloquia Education: An Examination of Roman Second Language Education for Social Implications" (2015). *HIM 1990-2015*. 1878.

<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/honorstheses1990-2015/1878>



University of
Central
Florida

STARS
Showcase of Text, Archives, Research & Scholarship

COLLOQUIA EDUCATION:
AN EXAMINATION OF ROMAN SECOND LANGUAGE EDUCATION
FOR SOCIAL IMPLICATION

by

JENNIFER NEWTON

This thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for Honors in the Major Program in History
in the College of Arts and Humanities
and the Burnett Honors College
at the University of Central Florida

Fall Term 2015

Thesis Chair: Edward Dandrow, Ph.D.

Abstract

The expansion of the Roman Empire had compelled disparate cultures to mingle and assimilate. In relation to education this fact meant that teachers used a variety of curricula to convey an amalgamation of cultural dynamics. Evidence for this phenomenon is found in the content *Colloquia*, a fourth-century elementary language textbook, which displays aspects Greek and Roman culture through the explicit and implicit instruction of the text. The existence of this mixture education displays the motivations of the author, as well as information about the values of the contemporary culture.

Keywords

Colloquia, second language education, morality, *romanitas*, persona, hierarchy, curriculum, Roman, Greek, culture

Dedication

*Tres optimīs sororibus,
beatae quia ducitis
ad Dominum.*

母と父を愛しています

Acknowledgements

I extend my sincere gratitude to my thesis chair, Dr. Edward Dandrow for his patience, encouragement, and wonderful feedback.

I would also like to extend my thanks to Dr. Peter Larson and Dr. Gergana Vitanova, my committee, for their support.

Finally, I would like to thank the Honors in the Major Scholarship program through the Office of Undergraduate Research at the University of Central Florida for supporting my research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CONTEXT	4
DEFINING TERMS	5
<i>Colloquia</i>	5
<i>Author</i>	8
<i>Explicit and Implicit Instruction</i>	10
<i>Audience</i>	12
Discipuli.....	13
Magistri.....	16
<i>Culture</i>	18
EXISTING SCHOLARSHIP.....	18
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	21
CHAPTER 2: CURRICULA	22
GREEK EDUCATION.....	22
ROMAN EDUCATION	25
CHRISTIAN EDUCATION	34
COLLOQUIA INTERSECTIONS	36
CHAPTER 3: CULTURE	38
ROMANITAS	39
<i>Explicit Instruction</i>	42

<i>Implicit Instruction</i>	43
HIERARCHY	46
<i>Isolating the Elite</i>	47
<i>Interacting with Other Strata</i>	51
PERSONA.....	56
<i>Cast of Characters</i>	58
<i>Genre</i>	60
<i>Affecting Personae</i>	61
CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION	64
SUMMARY	64
REFERENCES	65

Chapter 1: Introduction

As early as the second century A.D., the Roman education system developed a genre of bilingual textbooks called *colloquia*. These texts consisted of parallel passages in both Latin and Greek which contained short stories of a boy or a man as they completed their daily routine. This thesis will examine a selection of these texts (the specific texts under scrutiny will be defined more specifically later but will be distinguished from the genre in general with the use of capitalization: *Colloquia* v. *colloquia*). These *Colloquia* were first published in the fourth-century A.D. and eventually students and subsequent generations used them for studying rhetoric, logic, and especially foreign language.¹ In the nineteenth century these *Colloquia* were republished by Goetz as a minor part of much larger collections of school curriculum called *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*.² Today students and scholars continue to study these *Colloquia* but with a different intent. Instead of studying the *Colloquia* as a language textbook, scholars peruse the folios in order to understand the unique ways in which these stories reveal the education system of late antiquity. The insight that the colloquia can offer is twofold: their instructions and exempla reveal teaching methodology because of their role as second language textbook; as a narration of classroom scenes they present one of the most animated, extant description of an ancient schoolroom.³ In both of these categories, the content of the colloquia

¹ A.C. Dionisotti "From Ausonius' Schooldays? A Schoolbook and Its Relatives," *The Journal of Roman Studies* 72 (1982), 86.

² George Goetz, *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* (Leipzig, Germany: 1892).

³ Other examples of ancient schoolrooms may be found in Keith Hopkins, *Everyday Life for the Roman Schoolboy*, *History Today* 43 no. 10 (October 1993); Frances Foster, "Reconstructing Virgil in the Classroom in Late Antiquity," *History of Education* 43 no. 3 (May 2014); Krystina Sarff, *Cultivating Strong Citizens through Public Educatio*:

continue to reveal much information. While there still remains significant amount unfinished research on the *Colloquia*, and a lot for scholars to learn about the rhetoric and language of the time from these texts, this thesis focuses specifically on the teaching techniques of the *Colloquia* regarding social and moral imperatives.

Specifically, the purpose of this thesis is to reflect on the *Colloquia*'s curriculum in order to better understand the cultural pressures that encouraged the creation of the *Colloquia* and how the resultant text was the culmination of interacting cultures. In order to best understand this topic, I will discuss contemporary culture and schooling along with how cultural motifs are taught through the *Colloquia*. I do not pretend or attempt to make this project a comprehensive summary and analysis of the *Colloquia*'s pedagogy as this would require a multi-volume publication and is significantly outside the scope of this project. Even after putting the immensity of the task aside, another obstacle arises; an attempt made to summarize the moral teachings of the *Colloquia*'s text would merely render a reiteration of the author's apology or re-summary of ancient writers' own pedagogical methodology of moral education. For this reason, my focus will only address morals for the purpose of better understanding the correlation between curricula and culture and this project will be limited to three particular aspects of the culture: *Romanitas*, hierarchy, and *personae* in social protocol. In this examination I hope to develop historical understanding of this period's educational curriculum while encouraging modern scholars and teachers to consider how education systems interface with their cultures in general. I will address how fourth-century education held the unique position as the culmination of a long

Greek and Roman Methodology as a Pedagogical Approach in Public Education, Orlando Florida: University of Central Florida Online, 2009.

historical process of social integration by combining Greek and Roman pedagogy and I will use the text of the *Colloquia* as the preeminent display of this phenomenon. By interlacing different scholarly fields, this research will add to the historical understanding of fourth-century period's pedagogy as well as drawing attention to the socio-linguistic aspect of second language education in general.

This introductory section describes the contents and history of the *Colloquia* by defining necessary terms and clarifying the texts' author, audience, and methodology. It also sets up a brief context before delving into a more detailed analysis. The purpose of this introduction is to make my research accessible to scholars from multiple, unfamiliar fields. In order to avoid unnecessary details the summaries contain only particularly relevant information while footnotes direct the reader to other resources for further information.⁴ Chapter two explains the differences between Greek, Roman, and Christian education. Since I will be discussing the incorporation of these different curricula styles in the *Colloquia* it is important both to understand the differences and the significance of their combination. Chapter three examines how those disparate methodologies are combined into one text. To accomplish this examination, I will scrutinize the *Colloquia*'s cultural narrative as it connects to the explicit and implicit instruction of moral and social protocol. I will support these connections with primary sources and secondary scholarship. I do not want to leave the reader with the false impression that the *Colloquia* necessarily address the themes which I will be analyzing (*Romanitas*, hierarchy, and *personae*) completely or systematically. Rather, that where these themes do appear in the *Colloquia* they affirm, display,

⁴ Eleanor Dickey, *The Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana: Colloquia Monacensia-Einsidlensia, Leidense-Stephani- and Stephani* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 1-56.

and perpetuate contemporary values so that the interconnection of cultures is apparent through ancient morals in pedagogy.

Context

By the fourth-century, the Latin language had dispersed into the outer regions of the Roman Empire, spanning three continents.⁵ As Latin spread, it carried with it a measure of prestige and the possibility of upward social mobility. However, by the time that Latin traveled eastwards, Greek regions already had a supra-regional language for their intelligentsia and so the two languages and cultures began competing for prominence in the border region in the Balkans and between Cyrenaica and Tripolitania. The eastern and western cultures became both the meeting place for the two languages and later a breaking point between halves of the empire.⁶ In the competition for prominence, Greek already had a stronghold in east and business continued to be conducted predominantly in Greek until the third century. By the fourth-century the stalwart Greek language gave way, and the tides had turned in favor of Latin. The precise point when Latin and Greek switched predominant positions in the east remains in debate because the transition was a gradual evolution over a significant period of time.⁷ There existed no moment of upheaval, but merely the assimilation of cultures from the inevitable ebb and flow of time. It was at this time of Latin prominence, when even Greek authors composed their works in Latin

⁵ The Roman Empire left each region to conduct business in their traditional language, only requiring Latin within the military for logistical reasons. For more, see Carl Darling Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (Chicago Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1933), 26.

⁶ According to Jorma Kaimio, "Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum," *The Romans and the Greek Language* 64 (1979), 86-9 and Olga Tribulato. *Language and Linguistic Contact in Ancient Sicily* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 361.

⁷ Dickey, vol.1, footnote 12, 5.

because of its universal accessibility, that the *Colloquia* were originally composed.⁸ Less than a century later Latin lost its prestige in several regions, including the Greek east, due to socio-political instability. Therefore the focus of this thesis will be the brief period that Latin stood in the limelight as a culmination of centuries of curriculum development.⁹

Defining Terms

To avoid confusion as this project progresses, I would like to begin by defining some of the most critical terms I will be using in this discussion, particularly those which retain rather fluid connotations. Less critical terms will be introduced where they are applicable.

Colloquia

The term *colloquia* is a Latin word meaning conversation or interview. As mentioned before, the colloquia as a genre are bilingual textbooks intended to teach a second language. Most frequently, each page of a colloquia manuscript contains two columns, one in Greek and the other in Latin.¹⁰ Each line of these columns contains only one, two, or three words so that the vocabulary and grammar of each columns may be easily compared. These columns are often introduced by the author's apology or reason for composing the colloquia. The apology is

⁸“Whereas Romans wrote in Greek during the second century, we now for the first time find predominant Greek authors writing in Latin. These include the historians Ammianus Marcellinus (330-395) and the poet Claudian (ca. 100), whose Latin works are among the most important of late antiquity. Both came from Greek-speaking areas. Claudian, in fact, had begun as a Greek poet.” Jurgen Leonhardt, *Latin: Story of a World Language* (London, England: Harvard University Press, 2013), 94; It has been suggested that Greeks sought Latin for the political power by Tribulato, 350.

⁹ I will not address later periods because historians disagree regarding the role of Latin in the East after the deterioration of the western Roman Empire for different sides of this debate see Averil Cameron, *The Later Roman Empire* (New York: Harvard University Press: 2009) and Fergus Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire: Power and Belief under Theodosius II 405-450* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2006).

¹⁰ Occasionally there are four columns instead of two. See Dickey, vol.1, 187.

followed by a various assortment of stories about a boy (or man depending on the scene) who completes several tasks that citizens regularly confronted. Most of the *Colloquia* that I will be examining begin with a young boy waking up, and then switches scenes to follow the boy as he attends school, returns home, and visits a bath house. Later the protagonist changes to a man who exchanges money with a debtor, speaks with friends, and hosts a banquet. These accounts are given through first- and third-person narrative, as well as imperative commands. Like some modern language textbooks, these stories utilize the pedagogical style entitled notional-functional syllabus.¹¹ At the bottom of the page there is usually a running vocabulary list containing all of the words used within the story.

Of the many *colloquia*, I focus particularly on six versions: the *Colloquium Monacensia-Einsidlensia*, *Colloquium Leidense-Stephani*, *Colloquium Stephani*, *Colloquium Harleianum*, *Colloquium Montepessulanum*, and *Colloquium Celtis*. These distinct, archetypal versions are the result of reconciling various manuscripts and manuscript fragments as initially published by George Goetz in 1892 and again recently by Eleanor Dickey.¹² The reason I limit myself to these six versions is that each of these six manuscripts – despite their unique content – all date back to a single, “original” version which was composed between the second and fourth-centuries A.D.¹³

¹¹ The notional-functional is defined by two primary elements: the notional aspect which incorporates such concepts as “time, space, movement, cause and effect” and the functional aspect which “describes and classifies the intentional or purposive use of language.” Accordingly, a notional-functional syllabus considers meaning and the connection between language and culture to be central to language learning, which explains the *Colloquia*’s grouping of vocabulary by topic and in context. Paul Raine, A Discussion of the Notional-Functional Syllabus, (Dissertation, University of Birmingham, UK, March 2010), 6.

¹² George Goetz; an illustration of the divergence of these versions can be found in Dickey vol.1, 3.2.4, 194.

¹³ There are many evidences for why historians date the *Colloquia* to the fourth-century, see Dionisotti, 95-96, and Dickey, *Monacensia-Einsidlensia*, 11c, 178. These are some of the most important rationales: The grammar used in parts of the text did not become prevalent until the late empire, see Dickey, *Monacensia-Einsidlensia*, 9n, 172. There is a distinct pagan influence, see Dionisotti, 90. The texts does not use vocabulary or cultural references that

These six extant manuscripts are the result of republications and reproductions of this original document by scholars, teachers, students, and monks.¹⁴ All of the *Colloquia* bear evidence of copyist interference – whether through transmission mistakes or editorial corrections – as a result of seventeen centuries of transmission, some versions bearing more signs of change than others.¹⁵ For the purpose of this analysis it is not necessary to recreate the original *Colloquia* document (and I dare not try). Instead I will demonstrate that lessons of morality and social protocol were present in the original and subsequent *Colloquia* by tracing them in each of the existent manuscripts. If the similar social instruction occurs in all of the extant manuscripts then it stands to reason that not only were they present in the original text, but it also suggests that their continued presence was valued by the users of the *Colloquia*. With this value in mind it will be sufficient to appraise the six *Colloquia* as a collection and to use them as they have been transmitted to modernity – manuscripts documenting alternate perspectives concerning the same pedagogy of second language education.¹⁶

occurred later than the third century AD. Additionally, a substantial portion of the text could not have been written in the Republican or medieval period, see Dickey, vol.1, 50. To see a fully fleshed argument on why *Colloquia*'s content clearly indicates its composition during the imperial period, see Dickey, vol.1, 50.

¹⁴ Dickey, vol.1, 3.

¹⁵ The content of a text can usually narrow the window for when and where the text was composed. Even after the language became standardized and strictly literary, the inclusion of new vocabulary within the document puts a composition date on the text. In the case of the *Colloquia*, grammar errors can no longer reveal the author since an editor corrected them while copying the text. Although beneficial for the education system, such corrections effectively erase the minor detail which are present in other texts and reveal the author and origins. Also see Potter, *Literary Texts and the Roman Historian*, (London, England: Routledge, 1999), 38; For a discussion of these interferences, see Dickey, vol.1, 50. One version almost without editor interference is Stephani, see Dickey, *Stephani*, 4.4, 222 and *Monacensia-Einsidlensia*, 8a.

¹⁶ David S. Potter, *Literary Texts and the Roman Historian*, 90; For more see the lucid discussion in A. Grafton, *The Footnote*, (Cambridge, MA: 1997), 57-61.

Author

The author(s) of the *Colloquia* remains unknown in name. Scholars agree that it is most probable that the original version was composed by a single man but subsequently altered and copied by numerous teachers and monks.¹⁷ Unfortunately, the original text is no longer extant and, therefore, the exact creation of the original author is lost, but the fingerprints of the original author are detectable in a few features which all of the manuscripts share, such as the format. The format of the *Colloquia* is a unified narrative connecting various, disjoint scenes. This format choice requires the student to learn language skills through implicit education with only a limited amount of explicit guidance, which harkens to both the Greek and Roman education systems. The characteristics and importance of different education systems will be discussed later, but the *Colloquia* belong in the overlapping spheres of influence between two cultural worlds.

Beyond the format clues it is impossible to discuss the singular author of the *Colloquia* with any certainty. Instead of focusing on the person of the original author, I want to zero in on the broader character of the author(s) as revealed by the content of the *Colloquia*. The term *author* throughout this examination will not refer to the literal original writer but to the sort of character that composed and perpetuated the *Colloquia* as reflected by the grammar and vocabularies and topics of the manuscripts as a collection. This character may have been an author, an imitator, or a later editor but will be referred to throughout this project as either “author” or “author(s)” for simplicity’s sake.

¹⁷ Eleanor Dickey, vol. 1, 47.

Whoever the author was, he apparently was someone “who had a good command of the written standard in both [Latin and Greek] languages....because the writer’s level of knowledge of both languages is generally good, and because the syntax is in general not elaborate, [although] there are very few passages that show evidence of translation from one language to the other.”¹⁸ In some versions of the *Colloquia* the author’s skills are better displayed than in others. In *Stephani* for example, the author demonstrates a thorough knowledge of verbs tenses and noun cases for both Greek in Latin.¹⁹ In another manuscript, *Leidense-Stephani*, “the Greek construction is an articular infinitive... and is used correctly... suggesting a writer with a good knowledge of Greek.”²⁰ It is apparent that the author was not only familiar with the vernacular forms of these languages but also their literary conventions. His utilization of a wide variety of vocabulary and grammar structures indicates that received a significant level of instruction in both Latin and Greek. The author’s bi-lingual, bi-cultural skills demonstrate his own elaborate education because literary languages could only be learned in a classroom, not acquired as a vernacular language due to antiquation. The author was a product of the same sort of education that he proscribes in the *Colloquia*. For this reason, the author would have been familiar with the Roman education system as both the instructor (the role he assumes in writing the *Colloquia*) and as a former student (where he received the same form of social indoctrination that he promotes). His evident experience with the material makes the *Colloquia* that much more valuable because it provides descriptions from an eyewitness perspective. It also is important

¹⁸ *Leidense-Stephani*, 3.2.3.

¹⁹ *Stephani*, 8a.

²⁰ *Leidense-Stephani*, 11d.

because it supplies a rationalization for the author's strong emphasis on the liberal arts. Although his liberal-arts bias is specifically discussed later in chapter three, it is worth emphasizing that the author reproduced the kind of education that had formed him. The value of his accounts must therefore be tempered with the knowledge that the author was a product of their own era and that he had a particular agenda. In order to better understand the author's method for achieving his agenda, I must address both his explicit and implicit instruction.

Explicit and Implicit Instruction

The *Colloquia* use different methods to convey messages: explicit instruction and implicit instruction. According to Rod Ellis, explicit education is a tool which the learner is “consciously aware of, is only available [to the student's memory] in non-time-pressured situations, requires a focus on form, and can be verbalized using metalanguage.”²¹ Explicit education regarding a second language consists of lessons where the student is aware of the grammar structures that are taught and understands how each task adds to their knowledge of a particular linguistic structure. Explicit grammar exercises in *Colloquia* include lists of all noun declensions using metalanguage.²² Explicit education regarding moral or social training is present in the *Colloquia* usually in the form a proverb. For example, “it is not fitting for a master to engage in a boisterous argument.”²³ Explicit instruction is thoroughly structured and relies on

²¹ R. Ellis, “Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: an SLA perspective,” *TESOL Quarterly*, 40 no. 1, (2006), 84.

²² “Nominum casus quinque: nominativus, genitivus, dativus, accusativus, vocativus, ablatives. Nomini detur numerus: unalis, uno; dualis; pluralis” *Stephani*, 23-24.

²³ “Rixam et controversiam facere non est bonum libero homini et patrifamilias,” *Harleianum*, 23i.

planned tasks, is “obtrusive, presents the target forms in isolation, uses metalinguistic terminology (e.g., rule explanation), and involves controlled practice of the target form.”²⁴

Alternatively, “implicit language knowledge is knowledge that is accessible without awareness, in time-pressured situations, when focus is on meaning rather than form, and without the use of metalanguage.”²⁵ Unlike explicit education, implicit lessons do not require as much structure. Implicit instruction can be conveyed unobtrusively, where the linguistic instruction causes only minor interruption to the speaker’s meaning. Often these lessons occur by means of communication-oriented tasks. Implicit instruction avoids metalanguage, but presents the target language within a natural context. It also encourages the free practice and repetition of the target language without the strict structure that is necessary in explicit language instruction. For example, if noun declensions are taught explicitly with metalanguage in *Stephani*, then it is taught implicitly in *Leidense-Stephani* by the inclusion of several forms of each declension, unobtrusively within the text of the story. In this situation the teacher need not declare his intentions, but merely present the material and expect the student to deduce the correct conclusions.

Some portions of the *Colloquia* utilize explicit instruction, particularly when the author explains his methodology, which is clearly composed for the benefit of other teachers (see section on audience). This explicit instruction may be found either in the introductory apology or as spontaneous interjections throughout but the predominant teaching style of the *Colloquia* is not systematic explanations. The *Colloquia*’s method favors teaching through implicit instruction

²⁴ *Stephani*, 23-24.

²⁵ *Idem*.

and immersion without the use of metalanguage, yet it is still highly systematic. Throughout the narrative, the author incorporates word repetition or synonyms to explain concepts implicitly to the audience.²⁶ An example of this practice is the review of verb conjugations and tenses within the context of the stories.²⁷ In this thesis, the goal is not to enumerate and to evaluate the grammatical pedagogy of the *Colloquia*, although such research should be done. Instead, I will use the knowledge that the author uses both explicit and implicit instruction methods for teaching grammar, and I will apply it to an examination of the moral instruction within the same text, paying particular attention to implicit content.

Audience

The intended audience of the *Colloquia* is twofold: student and instructor. The *Colloquia* include instructions which can be readily understood by students indicating that it may be utilized by the student as a practice workbook. Yet the text also avails itself to use by teachers as a guidebook, providing insight into methodology and classroom management. Modern scholars still debate whether the *Colloquia* were predominantly directed towards the student or the teachers or both, but the mere existence of this debate supports the idea that this text was a viably a resource for both.²⁸ This vicissituous role of the *Colloquia* makes it a goldmine of information which can best be quarried by understanding both the students' and teachers' perspective.

²⁶ Ray, Brian Ray, "A *Progymnasmata* for Our Time: Adapting Classical Exercises to Teach Translingual Style," *Rhetoric Review* 32, no. 2 (2013), 201.

²⁷ *Leidense-Stephani*, 5a.

²⁸ A discussion of this debate may be found in Eleanor Dickey, vol. 1, 52-53.

Discipuli

It is most likely that the students who used the *Colloquia* as a textbook were very young children who were just beginning their in-school training.²⁹ Within the school scenes both older and younger boys are portrayed as utilizing the *Hermeneumata* (and therefore the *Colloquia*) to learn their alphabet which suggests that the text could be used by more than just the entry-level student, but the younger child was the prominent target.³⁰ While the *Colloquia* were most frequently used by the youngest students who often had experience and familiarity with the target language before beginning their studies.³¹ Whether child began his classroom education in the Greek east or the Roman west he learned reading and writing in Greek before Latin.³² This order of language education is why this project focuses on the influence of the text on students who are already familiar with Greek customs but perhaps unfamiliar with Latin as was often the case in both the eastern and western halves of the Roman Empire. This preparation is mentioned

²⁹ The author identifies the students as *parvulis pueris* [young boys] in the beginning stages of their classroom education, which probably correlated with the text's intended audience, although, according to Quintilian, the student's grammatical instruction would have begun much earlier than that.

³⁰ *Monacensia-Einsidlensia*, 1o.

³¹ Dickey, *Leidense-Stephani* 3.2.1, 191; "one can suggest on the basis of [*Colloquia* passages] that the schoolbook sections of the *Colloquia* could have been used by young children to 'practice'; if these were bilingual children first learning to read, such students could have employed the text as an easy reader, trying to sound out words that would be familiar once they were audible and practicing reading a text aloud. ... [this usage] makes more sense if the children were not fully bilingual and used the *Colloquia* to improve their conversations skills in a foreign language; they might have memorized only one column, the one in the language they were learning, and used the other as a way to make sure they understood what they were saying. Alternatively they could have been given one column on its own and asked to translate it," Dickey, 53.

³² W. Martin Bloomer, *The School of Rome: Latin Studies and the Origins of Liberal Education* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2011), 4.

by Quintilian, the renowned pedagogue from the first century. Quintilian suggests that a child's rhetorical education should begin before the child could speak, read, or write.³³

The school child described in classroom scenes of the *Colloquia* is also an aristocratic boy whose parents are wealthy enough to assign him his own slave. His wealth suggests that the boy's parents were part of the elite echelon of society, concurring with modern scholarship's understanding of the most educated class in the late Roman Empire. Although not all of the boys who read the *Colloquia* were the Roman elite, many were from aristocratic families since the completion of a liberal arts education required a significant financial investment.³⁴ The student's social destination is important for understanding the *Colloquia* because they were a preparatory text for a students who were destined for a particular collection of careers. Since positions of power which that boy would most likely pursue were only accessible through a legally standardized program of progressive political offices, the boy (politician-to-be) had to be groomed for those offices from a very early age – even as early as elementary schooling. The connection between the *Colloquia* and the students' future vocations is evidenced explicitly through apologetic statements of teachers. For example, in one segment of the *Montepessulanum* the teacher-narrator states that, “I am eager to learn the dialect from Attica, I strongly desire it, because you want to be an orator, legal, pleader, debater, legal experts, and politician...”³⁵ The

³³ Elaine Fantham, *Roman Literary Culture: from Cicero to Apuleius* (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 24.

³⁴ Craig A. Gibson, “Better Living Through Prose Composition? Moral and Compositional Pedegogy in Ancient Greek and Roman Progimnasmata,” *Rhetorica: a Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, 32 no. 1 (Winter 2014), University of California Press, 4.

³⁵ “Cupio discere sermonem Atticum, cupio valde, Quoniam vis orator esse, causidicus, dicentarius, actor, iuris studiosus, iurus peritus, iuris consultus, iuris prudens, advocatus...” *Montepessulanum*, 5b.

future vocation is also implied by the text through the subjects of scenes which convey the second language skills. For instance, in a passage of particular interest to a Greek-educated, Latin-speaking student pursuing a career as a lawyer because it discusses the services that a lawyer would offer, presents an example case, and mentions the generous payment bestowed on the legal team.³⁶ From this legal scene the student (and future lawyer) could acquire vocabulary knowledge, familiarity with the cultural context, and social idioms associated with the task. Whether their vocation would include politician or simply lord of an estate, all elite boys received the same basic training through the *Colloquia* which befitted a man with power and influence.

However, a slight wrench falls into the works regarding the student audience of the *Colloquia* which I must note before continuing into the analysis. Dickey suggests that the *Colloquia* were also used like a modern travel-phrasebook to teach Latin to adult travelers who would use Latin in business, mercantile exchange, or other activities. This suggestion seems to be supported by the format of the *Colloquia* for two reasons. First, it functions well as a topical reference and second because it includes topics which with vocabulary and skills, such as banking, which were more useful tools for the traveling merchant than to the young child. Further support for the use of *colloquia* as travel-phrasebooks is found in the actions of the protagonist. Although the activities of both the boy and the man participate in activities which both the student and the merchant would find relevant, the inclusion of both ages increases the possibility that both ages were a part of the audience. After all, according to Roman pedagogues,

³⁶ *Monacensia-Einsidlensia*, 4.

the skills taught by the *Colloquia* were best acquired in youth but useful to the elite man of any age. Nevertheless, since these travelers were neither the primary audience nor as highly impressionable as the young boys, they will not be the central focus of this examination of moral instruction. Even so, the inclusion of implicit moral instruction in a traveler's book remains important because Romans viewed every form of education – whether moral, linguistic, or otherwise – as a means to create a model citizen, the cornerstone of a stable society, and therefore the moral instruction of a barbarian would have been almost as important as his linguistic development.

Magistri

In some cases, the organization and content of the text appears to be aimed at an instructor instead of a young student. In light of the idealized proscriptions which are accompanied by exempla – indicating not only the lessons but also how to convey the information to the students – it is clear that scholars should also view the *Colloquia* as an instruction manual from a teacher to his contemporaries. In the *Harleianum* sections 18 and 19 the text explains which materials an ideal teacher ought to teach and why. The author was writing to provide correct pedagogy from an educator's perspective and *exempla gratia* to use in the classroom for the benefit of other language teachers. This explanation of why reinforces the probability that the text was intended for teacher use since student instructions are often not accompanied by an explanation of why in the same way that the teacher's text can be. In many cases, the material present seems to be programmatic, a model which can be adjusted to apply more specifically to an instructor's unique cultural situation. For example, in the “morning” scenes, the boy completes task in which children universally engage – seeing the sunrise, getting

dressed – which can be elaborated with local customs.³⁷ The introduction of a mature, teacher audience is important for this project because it potentially redefines the bias of the writer suggesting that the author’s bias and intentions probably exist in the explicit instructions as well as implicit suggestions within the *Colloquia*.

The inclusion of material for the benefit of both students and teachers implies that the author expected the *Colloquia* to be disseminated in a way that would make it available to both audiences. In other words, the author expected it to be published, not just copied by hand by students.³⁸ At the time, publication required a great amount of labor which would make the *Colloquia*’s composition a large-scale endeavor instead of an individual teacher’s attempt at supplemental learning material.³⁹ The magnitude of the *Colloquia* which is hinted at through this dissemination process is important to this project because it suggests that the author wanted to do more than teach a classroom of students; he was hoping to produce a circulated curriculum which other teachers would purchase, requiring him to create a text which presented the cultural narrative of the contemporary educated elite. The *Colloquia* experienced some degree of publication, but the expensive publication process makes it unlikely that each student would create his own copy of the *Colloquia* text by copying it out for himself.

³⁷ *Leidense-Stephani*, 1 a-2c; *Monacensia-Einsidlensia*, 2; *Stephani*, 3-7.

³⁸ *Stephani*, 19.

³⁹ Potter, 33.

In this analysis the term *audience* will be used to refer to either students (specifically young, elite boys with previous experience in either Greek or both languages) or teachers (those responsible for teaching this type of student).

Culture

When I discuss a culture as the “dominant culture,” the “contemporary culture,” or the “perpetuated culture,” the culture that is referred to will be the culture of elite men in the late Roman Empire, since this would have been the culture which was applied most significantly to boy through the teachings of the *Colloquia*. This culture for whom and by whom the *Colloquia* were initially composed was most influential towards the linguistic and moral content of the text. The contemporary culture to the original *Colloquia* was the western half of the late Roman Empire in the fourth-century A.D. The identity of this culture at that time was not truly Greek, Roman or Christian but a conglomeration of the three. The relevant aspects of these cultures and their relevance will be discussed more fully in chapter three when I discuss *Romanitas*.

In this project the term Rome or Roman will not refer to the physical locale nor the political structure. Instead it is referring to the culture created by the educated elite which flourished in the Roman Empire. When referring to the political institutions I will use the phrase Roman Empire. The term Greek or Greece also refers to the socio-cultural influences in lieu of the geo-political boundaries. When referring to Greek political structures I will refer to specific city governments.

Existing Scholarship

Since the *Colloquia* are foundational texts for our understanding of Roman education, it is not surprising that researchers in various fields have already subjected them to evaluation. The

most notable historical analyses thus far are Ferri's commentaries on *Colloquia*. This thesis is important for his in-depth analysis which lays the groundwork for comparing the content of colloquia in general to the contemporary cultures. Another important texts for historical analysis is Dionisotti's article "From Ausonius' Schooldays? A Schoolbook and Its Relatives" which enumerates and assesses different school texts, including the *Colloquia*. Unfortunately, due to the format of this resource, the information regarding the *Colloquia* is broader and more cursory than the research interests of this project. A final historic analyses of the *Colloquia* is "On the Composition of the *Hermeneumata* Language Manuals" by Korhonen which is valuable for understanding document dating and therefore correctly evaluating the manuscripts' information.

The *Colloquia* have also been subjected to linguistic analysis, most notable by Eleanor Dickey, who systematically comments on the linguistic features of the text, making it a highly accessible text. J. N. Adams cursorily performed a linguistic analysis of the text. His work on *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* provides detailed explanation of the development of the Latin language due to its extended contact with other languages and cultures. Some of his work specifically addresses the *Colloquia*, although much of his work is focuses on other topics. Nevertheless, his concepts are invaluable. Another valuable resource is Chiara Gianollo's "Labile Verbs in Late Latin," which provides an in depth analyses of Latin grammar adding depth and perspective to a scholarly understanding of the text.

Despite this plethora of information specifically addressing the *Colloquia*, there remains a deficiency in scholarship regarding the examination of this text from an educator's perspective. From this perspective researchers must look not only at the character traits of the *Colloquia*, but also the implications of those traits. In other words, I will use the modern pedagogical theory to

look at the way the *Colloquia* affected the teachers and students of Rome and how the *Colloquia*'s characteristics ultimately reiterated existing cultural beliefs. Some work has been done in this department regarding Greek and Roman education in general.⁴⁰ For example, in David Fleming's work in "The Very Idea of a Progymnasmata" he examines the format of the entire *Hermeneumata* in order to incorporate it into a modern Latin language classroom. However, the scope of his project is larger than this examination and therefore lacks specific examination. Martin Bloomer also promoted analysis from this perspective when he authored the work *Schooling in Persona* which addresses the implications of literary school texts on the highest level of Roman education.⁴¹ Using Bloomer's idea as a foundation, my thesis will continue his examination. Whereas his study focused on a limited group, namely the upper echelon of educated adults, my examination will transfer his foundational research to another level of education, namely that of elementary language students. From a modern perspective, entirely isolated from the *Colloquia*, this method of textual analysis has also been suggested by Tutku Basozw.⁴² In his article Bloomer proposes that "rhetorical education of the late republic and the empire was a process of socialization that produced a definite subjectivity in its elite participants" with the intended result of socializing those students into elite men.⁴³ Using

⁴⁰ Some of the most important works include: M. Joyal, J.C. Yardley, I. McDougall, *Greek and Roman Education: a Sourcebook* (London: 2008); T. Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (Cambridge: 1998); S. Bonner, "Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny," *History of Education Quarterly* 20, no. 3 (Autumn, 1980); R. Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind, Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton, Oxford: 2001).

⁴¹ Martin Bloomer, "Schooling in Persona: Imagination and Subordination in Roman Education," *Classical Antiquity* 16, no. 1 (April 1997), 57-78.

⁴² Tutku Basozw, "Through the Eyes of Prospective Teachers of English: Explicit or Implicit Grammar Instruction?" *Pseudo-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 158 (2014).

⁴³ Martin Bloomer, "Schooling in Persona," 57.

Bloomer and Basozw's propositions as a foundation, this thesis takes that observation one step further by examining some of the aspects of socialization that the *Colloquia* allegedly and evidently taught.

In addition to these commentaries which specifically address the *Colloquia* and the Latin language, my research will incorporate research from other fields of study, particularly modern education and psychology. This aspect of my research demonstrates the continuity of language education practices throughout the millennia. It also results in a deeper understanding of the subject and will help to explain the importance of some of the content and usage of the *Colloquia*. For this reason I will reference several neuro-psychological studies and methodology textbooks. This comparison of ancient and modern foreign language-culture education will clarify the intentions and effectiveness of the *Colloquia*.

Research Questions

In the following sections I will dive into the analysis of the texts, using these questions to illuminate my path: How do the *Colloquia* incorporate Roman, Greek, and Christian curricula and why is this inclusion important? How are morality and social protocol exhibited in the explicit and implicit instructions of the *Colloquia*? How does this instruction reflect the contemporary cultural narratives? Which society did they choose to draw moral-social imperatives from? What implication does their choice of moral-social imperatives bear on the methodological development of second language education?

Chapter 2: Curricula

There must be an understanding of Greek and Roman curricula in order to fully comprehend how the *Colloquia* integrate aspects of both cultures. Therefore, in this chapter I will contemplate the similarities and differences of the education systems of the social powers of the fourth-century Roman Empire – Greek, Roman, and Christian – and how each of these appear in the *Colloquia* text. The purpose of this section is to determine the *Colloquia*'s buoyancy amidst the ebb and flow of different cultural influences.

Greek Education

The foundations of the *Colloquia* are based heavily on the heritage of the Greek education system. Initially the path of Greek education was paved by great philosophers such as Plato, Aristotle, and Isocrates with the aim to produce a holistically prepared man for leadership positions in society and the politics. Therefore, according to Aristotle, the end product of a student's education was the creation of a civilized adult.⁴⁴ The Greeks aimed “to prepare intellectually well-rounded young people to take leading roles in the activities of the state and society...”⁴⁵ For this reason, Greek education taught young men the tenets of philosophy, cultivated an aesthetic ideal and trained them in physical athleticism through the gymnasmata. Everything that a student attempted, regardless of category, was to be done with excellence because it was all done for the purpose of developing them as a successful and holistic person.

⁴⁴ Kathy Warnes, “Education in Ancient Greece,” *Salem Press Encyclopedia* (January 2014).

⁴⁵ Funk & Wagnalls “History of Education,” *New World Encyclopedia* (2014).

The ultimate, declared purpose of this education was to create the citizen who worked towards the good of the state. Although the precise requirement on the citizen varied from polis to polis, in almost every case the education of the child required not only training in oratory, philosophy, and logical argumentation, but also in moral conduct. At this point the Greeks differentiated between the ideas of “training” and “education.” According to the Greek mentality, “whereas the former referred to the teaching of skills specific to arts and handcraft, that is to say, to those activities that Aristotle called as *techne*, the latter referred to a normative task aimed at fulfilling the ideal of men as they ought to be.”⁴⁶ According to this custom, this indoctrination could be achieved by shaming them into adherence or by encouraging them with the possibility of rewards.⁴⁷ So Greek students found motivation in both *arete* (excellence) and *kydos* (praise).⁴⁸

The intellectual structure that was central to Greek education was *paideia*. *Paedeia* required the incorporation of practical and subject-based training in order to socially prepare the student for the political life. The subject portion of *paideia* were mostly mental exercises such as rhetoric, philosophy and language in addition to medicine and arithmetic. Together this skill set “was designed to endow the dominant male segment of citizens with moral norms, good and honorable ways of living, and knowledge and skills compatible with a collectivist mind set, which considered it natural that nothing else in life mattered aside from the survival of [the state]

⁴⁶ Francisco Javier Lopes Frias et al., “Procedia,” *Social and Behavioral Sciences* 197 (2015) 597.

⁴⁷ George C. Bitros, “Character, Knowledge and Skills in Ancient Greek Paideia: Some Lessons for Today’s Policy Makers,” *Journal of Economic Asymmetries* 6 (2010), 200.

⁴⁸ Frias, 598.

institutions.”⁴⁹ This bond between person and government could be cultivated, or so it was believed, by infusing into the children’s thoughts and actions the social protocol, manners, and the ethical norms of Greek society.⁵⁰ At this time it was expected that a Greek citizen would respect the law, so a primary function of Greek education was the fostering of the students opinions and behavior which that result in a citizen worthy of emulation and an orderly society.⁵¹ Therefore, *paideia* was a lifelong process of improving the bond between the citizen and the state and of acquiring measurable skills that began during childhood.⁵²

The most prominent way that the Greeks conveyed the necessary information was through repetition and emulation based tool called mimesis. Mimesis is the practice of “imitating the teacher, imitation the classic exemplars of antiquity, and, finally, imitation the socio-cultural value system embedded in these exemplars...”⁵³ Mimesis is very similar to modern behaviorism. As an illustration, the Greeks most famously utilized the text of Homer’s Iliad in their classrooms. Reading and memorizing passages would cause the students to imitate the wording and ideas of the passage by associating language with correlating activities or behaviors, similar to behavioral conditioning. The students read, memorized, analyzed, and recited large swaths of the poem so that as they matured they could emulate the grammar, vocabulary, themes, components, quotations, and characters of the Iliad. They read, compose, and recite material

⁴⁹ Bitros, 205.

⁵⁰ Idem., 199.

⁵¹ Idem., 193.

⁵² Idem., 198.

⁵³ T. Penner, “Reconfiguring the Rhetorical Study of Acts,” *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers*, 35 (1996), 432.

back to the teacher and fellow students.⁵⁴ Learning via wrote repetition was a central feature of education, according to the classroom scene of the *Colloquia*. Such quotation and emulation is currently considered the classical or traditional approach to language teaching, but within the *Colloquia* it is the central feature. Fundamentally, mimesis instruction is based on implicit education. The instructor assumes that his students can deductively reason the lesson from the text and he assumes that the best way to teach that lesson to the student is through deductive reasoning and context.⁵⁵

Roman Education

Even while the Roman Empire stretched its long shadow over its neighbors, the elite of Rome clutched at the Greek literary and academic heritage from the east. As a result, Romans constructed a curriculum around the established Greek system. This grasping for the ways of Greece was due socially to Rome's veneration of the classical culture and practically resulted from the utilization of enslaved Greeks as pedagogues and teachers. For this reason, Roman education shares many features with Greek education, or at least appears to be very similar... Although structural manifestation of the two education systems are incredibly similar – training the student from an early age, heavily relying on mimesis, and expecting to create socio-moral impact on the student – the characters developed by each system differ dramatically due to differences in values between the Greek and Roman worlds.

⁵⁴ *Stephani*, 15-17; *Leidense-Stephani*, 38b; *Monacensia-Einsidlensia*, 2j; *Harleianum*, 1i; *Montepessulanum*, 1f; *Celtis*, 22-27.

⁵⁵ “Lego...nota, summa, acceptio, superpostim, praescriptum, expositum...” *Celtis*, 24B.

As an example, Greeks and Romans promoted the education of children while they were still young because of the increased malleability in young children.⁵⁶ The exact age to initiate this education varied not only from culture to culture but also from teacher to teacher within each culture. Because both the Greeks and Roman agreed that as an early education was best, it is no wonder that the *Colloquia* also affirm that the child's education, whatever that may be, must begin in youth. Regarding mimesis, Roman education likewise relied heavily on imitation by studying literary classics in order to acquire their technique. Mimesis can be seen in the proscribed teaching practices in many contemporary works as well as the *Colloquia* itself because of its effectiveness.⁵⁷ Exercises that focus on the skills of mimesis are frequently portrayed in the classroom scenes of the *Colloquia*, underscoring its importance in the minds of the author. In the classroom scenes, the student is consumed by the task of reading, understanding, recreating, and manipulating the texts that the teacher supplies. The student is commanded to speak, read, and recite.⁵⁸ The description of these drills not only helps the teacher of the text to implement these drills in the classroom, but they could also serve to drive the concepts into the student audience.

This emphasis on the importance of imitations, particularly imitation of literary texts, is deeply embedded into the Roman way of thinking, so much so that the perpetual use of the

⁵⁶ Roberta Pearson and William Uricchio, *The Formative and Impressionable Age: Discursive Constructions of the Nickelodeon's Child Audience*, (London, England; British Film Institute; 1999), Film.

⁵⁷ Ray Archee, "Aemulatio, Imitation and Mimesis in Tertiary Education," *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences* 174 (2015), 2420-2421.

⁵⁸ "Lege cum voce, aperi os, computa" Harleianum, 5c; "Iubet me leger..." *Celtis*, 20a; "Redde" (Reddere is a technical term used to indicate a student's demonstration of his successfully completed assignment. Such a demonstration may include the recitation of material from memory, reading aloud from a page, or perhaps translation.) *Monicensia-Einsidlensia*, 2k-l.

literary canon leads to the codification of Latin language in later centuries.⁵⁹ In the classrooms the students studied the great classical authors belonging to the segment of literature deemed high culture⁶⁰ However, the format of the *Colloquia* breaks the usual pattern of a text used for mimesis, and so appears to be a unique adaptation from the standard material in either Roman or Greek education. Whereas mimetic texts were traditionally high literature (Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Virgil's *Aeneid*, etc...), valuable for their depth and complexity, the *Colloquia* are obviously simplified narratives.⁶¹ This simplification is clearly necessary because of the *Colloquia*'s role as elementary second language reading material, but it is not entirely a simplified text as it contains elements and stories from high literature. For example, in the retelling of the Trojan narrative the author uses sentences that are longer and more difficult, and the Latin portion appears to translate the Greek portion (which in turn imitates the original Greek of the Homer's work).⁶² This translation from the Greek harkens back to the original work, which was in Greek and demonstrates the author's desire to prepare the student for their study of this classical text in the original language. As a result of this unique simplification the *Colloquia*

⁵⁹ To prevent this form of codification, "today's linguists prefer corpora [data bases] based on oral communications to strictly literary models, and they believe that corpora should constantly be updated to reflect ongoing changes in a language." For more, see Jurgen Leonhardt, xii.

⁶⁰ Romans thought of literature in terms of a two-tier system: classical masters and lesser imitations of those masters. Some of the authors mentioned in the school scene include: Homer, Cicero, Virgil, Persius, Lucan, Statius, Terence, Sallust, The author of *The Three Comedies*, Theocritus, Thucydides, Demosthenes, Hippocrates, Xenophon, and the Cynics, *Celtis*, 38a.

⁶¹ Dickey, *Leidense-Stephani*, 3.1.

⁶² *Stephani*, 26-36. The reason that this circumstance is so significant is that the Latin version of the narrative does not seem to be a translation of the Greek in any of the surrounding narrative although, at times, the reverse seems to occur.

assume the specialized role of introducing young children to the classical works of high literature in an accessible way.

This system of emulation and mimesis also ensured that the student learned both the material presented while subconsciously adopting the ideology presented in the material. That was another reason that education was so valued by Romans. Like Greeks, the Romans saw education as a means of instilling moral character as well as intellectual knowledge, as a scholar notes, “No one in ancient Greece and Rome would have doubted the claim that literary-rhetorical education was intended to make the student better in both an intellectual and moral sense.”⁶³ This education system connects intellectual training to the moral indoctrination of the student, entwining both the communication necessary for public discourse and the moral values upheld by the public.⁶⁴ However, unlike the Greeks, the Romans had less emphasis on the holistic development of the student than in the cultivation of the student’s ethos. In other words, while the motivation for Greek education was the development of the students’ character, Roman education was more concerned with the **ethos** of the student or the perceived character of that child. While Greek teachers taught boys how to become good citizens, Roman teachers taught boys to appear to be good citizens.⁶⁵ According to Quintilian, “the proper training of the orator was to be organized around the study of language, literature, philosophy, and the sciences, with particular attention to the development of character ... [through the] trivium, composed of

⁶³ Gibson, 1.

⁶⁴ Idem., 8.

⁶⁵ Bitros, 194.

grammar, rhetoric, and logic...”⁶⁶ In theory, this education would create citizens which could serve their community and government, “the child of Roman education has his special duty... his learning will make him the sort of citizen to sustain family and empire.”⁶⁷ However, in reality the result of Roman education was for the development and benefit of the child of an aristocrat because it taught them the necessary skills to compete in Roman politics. Social power belonged to those who had a rhetoric education, as demonstrated by an argument between two men who are equal in all ways yet one secedes to the other because of his skillful speech, “We are the same, you and I... you have friends and I have friends, but you speak well. Observe, I will submit to you.”⁶⁸ Although the men are the same in every other respect, the disparity in their rhetorical skills is enough to cause one to forfeit his pride and concede to his opponent. This phenomenon of presenting a different facade than the truth was promoted by the Romans but virulently attacked by the Greeks. According to Plato in *Gorgias*, the cultivation of a false persona “is the typical education which is based not on truth but on sheer appearance... routed in dramatic defeat of [opponents]...” Rhetoric is subsequently accused of triviality, particularly when contrasted with a training in dialect which was considered “the true art of persuasion.” The Romans did not completely disagree with this criticism from the Greeks, but they also understood a unique connection between appearance and actual rhetoric worth of an orator. This connection was a result of the expectation that an audience could tell the skill and intellectual

⁶⁶ Funk & Wagnalls “History of Education,” *New World Encyclopedia* (2014).

⁶⁷ *Idem.*, 54.

⁶⁸ “Aequum est ego et tu...amicum habes et me invenies habentem. Bene dicis. Ecce concede ti bi” *Harleianum*, 24e.

integrity of a speaker by his existent reputation and appearance. The correlation between this visual appearance and the true character of a man is evidenced by one of the idiomatic phrases in *Harleianum*, “I am the master of an estate, as my face clearly shows.”⁶⁹ This quote demonstrates that, in Roman culture, they believed that they could tell the true character of a man not only by his actions and reputation, but even by his face.

In order for a boy to mature into his position as an orator, he needed to learn how to cultivate his appearance and reputation to portray the characteristics that an audience would want to see, especially since the audience valued the speaker’s ethos as highly as the logic of his words. A reputation was an invaluable asset, and so the cultivation of a good reputation was an invaluable skill. In this respect, the objective of the Roman student’s training was to appear good but not necessarily to be good. Of course, Romans believed that the development of this outward appearance would ultimately result in a transformation of the true character, but they did not create a way to verify that assumption.⁷⁰ Nevertheless, it is easy to find segments of the *Colloquia* which convey moral imperatives as more than a means to a good reputation. This greater purpose could be due to the believed connection between projected character and true character but is more likely the result of Greek influence.⁷¹ In either case, moral and reputational education infiltrates the text, if not predominantly in explicit instruction, then in the sequencing and content of the *Colloquia*, even when those moral concerns are not explicitly

⁶⁹ “Ego...paterfamilias. [response] Apparet a facie tua,” *Harleianum*, 18j, translated by Dickey in vol. 2, 30.

⁷⁰ Leonhardt, 113.

⁷¹ For an example, see the passage encouraging debt repayment in Dickey, *Monacensia-Einsidlensia*, 6a.

identified.⁷² However, because practice is never black and white as theory, an interesting scene undercuts the *Colloquia* as a moral instruction book. The student lies to the teacher about where he spent the previous day, and the teacher clearly recognizes the lie but does not punish the boy. Instead, he is lenient.⁷³ Such a scene might have been included either to demonstrate limitations to the hierarchy and structures of society for the student's understanding, or for intrigue and comedic effect.

This education not only improved a student's reputation but also developed another crucial tool for a Roman man's political career – their social connections. Through mimesis the students learned to write well, reason and speak well, by reading and rehearsing the literary classics that, over time, had been selected and preserved by Roman and Greek elites as high culture. It allowed the people with superior finances to pursue an education based on the trivium and to gather and mingle with colleagues of equal education, isolated from the rest of society.⁷⁴ This social identification necessitated an intensive study of literary Latin and Greek. As students learned from classical texts through mimesis, they were expected to imitate and integrate those texts into every aspect of their lives. According to Leondhart, “the ability to express oneself correctly in a language intimately tied to Latin literature became a mark of distinction acquired not through birth or social status but through education. Language cultivated by intensive

⁷² Gibson, 3.

⁷³ “Bene valde dingus es vapulare. Ecce, concede tibi hodie autem vade...”*Harleianum*, 10d-f.

⁷⁴ Potter, 1.

instruction conferred social prestige.”⁷⁵ This social prestige of higher education set elite citizens apart from the common rabble, accentuating class distinction through language distinction.

As activities transferred from body to mind, loyalty in Rome shifted from political submission to the government and transitioned to an emphasis on aesthetic enjoyment and happiness of self as a balance between physical and psychological skill.⁷⁶ Instead of molding a holistically skilled person, practical skill became merely a means for achieving greatness of mind.⁷⁷ Trivium was designed to instruct students on “how to learn.”⁷⁸ By the fourth-century, a man pursuing a prestigious political position was expected to prepare for that career with a liberal arts education and particularly to focus on the trivium. Roman education saw a rise in preference for the trivium’s contribution to liberal arts education in exclusion of the quadrivium. This correlation between grammar skills and general ability also appears throughout the *Colloquia*, and is noted with particular strength in the *Harleianum* manuscript. They expected an education in the trivium beginning at an early age. The educators’ shameless promotion of the trivium within the *Colloquia* may not have been intentional on the part of the author. The author (as discussed above) was likely a product of this system of education himself and so he was no more aware of his social conditioning in support of the trivium.

The *Colloquia* project the Romans’ value on this distinction, usually in authoritative sections wherein the student is receiving other imperatives or moral instructions. E.g., in

⁷⁵ Leonhardt, 76.

⁷⁶ Kathy Warnes, “Education in Ancient Greece,” *Salem Press Encyclopedia* (January 2014).

⁷⁷ *Idem*.

⁷⁸ *Idem*.

Harleianum the father instructs his son, “Don’t you see...that nothing is as essential as learning.”⁷⁹ Roman culture held education in such high esteem, that the *Montepessulanum* text describes his initiation into reading with great ceremony and religious overtones.⁸⁰ The high value of education was due partially to the difficulty of the task since it required dedication, wealth, and a natural gift. This gifting towards education was associated with the good birth since Romans believed that high social status beget good character. “I shall show you, son that it is not for just anyone to master it, but that it is the attainment of one who is well educated and naturally intelligent.”⁸¹ This correlation between social standing and ability is reinforced by the *Colloquia* when the when the father compliments the son, “You spoke well, as your good birth deserves.”⁸² This statement demonstrates the interconnection of education, skill, and reputation which were each developed and valued by the liberal arts education. Together these examples and the existing context reveals the *Colloquia*’s support for a rhetorician’s education for both useable skills and reputation building.

Like the circuit of political offices, a Roman education was standardized in incremental progressions of subject as seen in the division between trivium and quadrivium. The trivium was composed of the fundamental speaking arts – as mentioned earlier – and the quadrivium was a collection of the other liberal arts including arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy. The

⁷⁹ “Ide ne quam consuetudinem facias; nihil enim ita necessarium esse nisi studia.” *Harleianum*, 1g; “nihil enim ita necessarium esse nisi studia,” *Montepessulanum*, 1f, as translated by Dickey, vol. 2, 96.

⁸⁰ “Incipio ... bona fortuna dii propitii,” *Montepessulanum*, 1d.

⁸¹ “Demonstrabo tibi, fili, quoniam non est cuiuslibet hominis deprehendere, sed docti et ingeniosi ess dectrinam.” *Montepessulanum*, 2d as translated by Dickey, vol. 2, 96.

⁸² “Bene dixisti, ut decet ingenuitatem tuam.” *Harleianum*, 4e.

content of the *Colloquia* indicate that it was aimed at the entry level of this literary education, serving as a preparatory text for this education. The elements of *ethopoeia* that appear in the text particularly suggest this specialization. *Ethopoeia* was a practice used in the education of older students in order to teach students logic and personification and argumentation and does not itself occur within the *Colloquia*, but elemental precursors of *ethopoeia* appear in the *Colloquia* which prepared the students for that sort of work in the future. It also indicates that students of the *Colloquia* were expected to continue on to *ethopoeia* work. Significantly, this highly directed training demonstrates by its existence in the *Colloquia* that the author relied heavily on the Roman curricula in contrast to Greek. Whereas Roman education was reserved for citizens with enough finances to complete the training – such as sons of the senatorial or centurion classes – the Greeks were in favor of education to all boys since the final goal of the Greek system was a good citizen, a commendable occupation for various social strata. Both Greek and Roman education were strongly political entities both claimed to produce good citizens.⁸³ However, the achieved goal of the Roman system was not the production of good citizens as much as excellent rhetoricians.

Christian Education

Whereas Greeks taught (mostly) universal equality of citizens and Romans gave special privileges only to the elite few who could afford an education, the later Christian church taught a combination of the two. It kept the elevated status of an elite but made it an attainable quality to

⁸³ W. Martin Bloomer, *The School of Rome*, 55.

anyone since its one condition required that people adhere to its own theology.⁸⁴ Within this church theology the institutions of education and government both still held considerable sway, but now subjected to the ultimate authority of the church. Yet, to some degree both citizenship and education remain valuable as means to produce a better devotee because, according to the Christian worldview, they were not sufficient ends in and of themselves.⁸⁵ Nevertheless, it was difficult for the fathers of the church to undermine the deeply ingrained Roman reverence for education as indicated by the (frequently, but not universal) continued praise of the pagan philosophers. One source goes so far to label the pagan teachers as honorary Christians because of the “extent and quality of the work he contributed to the theological learning of his race.”⁸⁶ Christians continue to honor education and citizenship under the new, theological hierarchy, but rhetoric loses prestige since its value reduced. Instead of an honorable goal that is worthy of pursuit it became a means to achieve an even greater objective. In the church the idea that the Greek and Roman education systems had golden nuggets of truth to be collected, but not to be accepted in their entirety prevailed.⁸⁷ This opinion is organized by Theodoret, a churchman, many years after the composition of the *Colloquia*.⁸⁸ Two men who authored a Christianized series of manuscripts that imitated the Greek classics reemphasize this idea again at a later

⁸⁴ Runar M Thorsteinsson, “Roman Christianity and Roman Stoicism: A Comparative Study of Ancient Morality,” *Oxford Scholarship Online* (September 2010).

⁸⁵ Pauline Allen, “Some Aspects of Hellenism in the Early Greek Church Historians,” *Traditio* 43 (1987), 370.

⁸⁶ Allen, 370.

⁸⁷ *Idem.*, 373; also N.G. Wilson, *Saint Basil and the Value of Greek Literature* (London: 1975) 20, 24-28.

⁸⁸ Theodoret, *Ad Adulescedes*, 2.

point.⁸⁹ A great indicator that this belief was more than just orthodoxy, Christian authors continue to quote heavily from Homer, Herodotus, Thucydides, Plato, etc. in the Greek east. Another difference between Greco-Roman education and Christian education is the format used to teach the student. Instead of the tried-and-true system which both the Greeks and Romans built on mimesis, the church chose to use a system of catechism (pre-written questions and answers to recite). In lieu imitating the form and content of classical text, student were required to learn through a question and answer dialogue. Catechism relies much more heavily on explicit instruction instead of allowing students to deduce answers for themselves.

Colloquia Intersections

This brief overview of fourth-century curricula and their incorporation into the *Colloquia* begs the question, what caused all of the cultural aspects to integrate, resulting in an amalgamation like the *Colloquia*? In some part it was the result of the spreading Roman Empire which provided a framework under which various cultures could intermingle. Partially it is due to the political instability of the fourth-century which began a transitional period after the functional collapse of the Roman Empire, issuing in the centuries-long evolution and the emergence of medieval Europe.⁹⁰ Partially it is due to the objective veneration that Romans gave to Greeks because of their long and illustrious heritage. Other factors also contributed to the intermingling of curricula within the *Colloquia*, all of which add to the confusion among the elite as to where their loyalties lie: to Greece, Rome, and Christianity.

⁸⁹ Allen, 372.

⁹⁰ For more information on this transition, see Brent Shaw, "After Rome: Transformations of the Early Mediterranean World," *New Left Review* 51 (May 2008), 89-114.

As the curricula styles mixed, even so the cultural paradigms taught by the text were m elange of the Greek and Roman. This mixture is because the *Colloquia* were not only intended to introduce language through the curriculum, but also to demonstrate social structures of the target culture. In this last chapter I discussed the different curricula of the fourth-century and their manifestation within the text. In the next chapter I shall examine three of the socio-cultural traits which are conveyed through the *Colloquia*.

Chapter 3: Culture

This chapter examines the moral and social protocol which is taught implicitly within the *Colloquia*, a technique mentioned in the first chapter, and how the inclusion of those themes indicates the intermingling of Greek and Roman cultures in the fourth-century A.D. Mediterranean world. In particular, it will demonstrate how the cultural themes of *Romanitas*, hierarchy, and persona correlate to each of these cultures and how they are integrated into the *Colloquia*.

It is a fundamental tenet of socio-linguistics that the language of a culture which is composed of idioms, vocabulary, and grammatical structures is inextricably linked to the This fact is inescapable. A student cannot learn to categorize and comprehend the grammar of a second language without also contemplating the structures of their own native language. Often, as the student categorizes each language separately they will also understand them in comparison to one another – remembering features of the second language by paralleling or contrasting concepts. The way that Romans (Cicero, etc...) memorized speeches and other information is different from the way that we do today. The result of this implicit instruction leads to the satisfaction of the Greek proverb “know thyself” – the student will construct a stronger narrative of self and cultural identity through training in a second language. This achievement demonstrates a primary pedagogical objectives of implicit education, which is teaching students how to think effectually. The child must learn how to categorize values in order to make optimal decisions. Without the skills of discernment without a reconstructed framework dictating how societies function, it would be impossible for the child to succeed in their expected positions. For this reason the *Colloquia* lay out the infrastructure for this social framework and encourages the

students' deductive reasoning through implicit instruction.⁹¹ This activity of creating a mental framework is the creation of *habitus*, or the “set of skills and expectations regulating social performance.”⁹² When the student is confronted with a new traditions and unique societies they meditate on and compare it to their own and augment their understanding of the world.⁹³

Romanitas

This section is entitled *Romanitas*, the Latin term which identify the characteristics which separated a civilized man from a barbarian. These specific qualities were the cultural paradigm, the kind of traits that befitted a person who, according the prevailing culture, was an ideal man. In Rome these traits were referred to as *Romanitas* as this sections heading suggests, but in Greek it was referred to it as *Hellenikon*. While the characteristic referred to by each of these terms varies, both cultures expected their ideal qualities to be embodied by rhetoricians, politician, and the aristocracy.⁹⁴ Each of these cultural paradigms were essential to a man's public success because they socially separated a citizen from the barbarian hordes— although adherence to the cultural paradigm resulted in no legal ramification.⁹⁵ *Romanitas* and *Hellenikon*, both included qualities such as honor, moral integrity, courage, and statuses well as dominance, the concepts of control, and applied authority. “Being perceived as masculine, or at least not as

⁹¹ D' Angelo, *Composition*, cited in Gibson, 9-10.

⁹² Sean Alexander Gurd, *Isocrates, Plato, and Quintilian: Revision, Pedagogy, and the Formation of Selves*. Oxford University Press (2011), 1.

⁹³ James P. Lantolf, *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*, Oxford University Press, 2000.

⁹⁴ Craig A. Gibson, 4.

⁹⁵ Martin Bloomer, “Schooling in Persona,” 72.

effeminate, is a necessary condition for the man who aspires to honor and authority in Greco-Roman antiquity.⁹⁶

Both Greeks and Romans imagined this man as displaying “the cardinal pagan virtues of fortitude, justice, prudence, and temperance... good citizenship was taught, not as a vague ideal, but as a moral duty.”⁹⁷ Also both Roman and Greek curricula show that a primary goal of education is the creation of this superior man. However, these cultures not only used slightly different methods to create that ideal man, they also differed on the precise definition of a man superior.⁹⁸ *Romanitas* – the term I am using to define these characteristics – is a term from the Latin language, the concept of superior characteristics which sequesters one echelon of society from another was also heavily present in the Greek system. The superior characteristics are displayed by the protagonists of Greek literature. Take, for example, Odysseus’ display of wit, the oath-loyalty of Greek city-states in the Trojan War, and the physical prowess of Achilles. In comparison, the Roman narrative emphasized characteristics which indicated the cultural superiority of their own citizens over other peoples of the empire resulting in a heavy emphasis on education, rhetoricians, and the wealthy elite. When defining the characteristics of *Romanitas*

⁹⁶ There is an increasing body of scholarly literature on Greco-Roman masculinity including: Lin Foxhall and John Salmon, eds., *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition* (Leicester-Nottingham Studies in Ancient Society 7; London: Routledge, 1998); Craig A. Williams, *Roman Homosexuality: Ideology of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); Lin Foxhall and John Salmon, eds., *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power, and Identity in Classical Antiquity* (Leicester-Nottingham Studies in Ancient Society 8; London: Routledge, 1998); Maud W. Gleason, *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995); R. M. Rosen and I. Sluiter, eds., *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

⁹⁷ Although these stereotypes need not have been true, they were widely believed, Gibson, 5.

⁹⁸ Nela Filimon, and Mario Campana, “The Role of Greco-Christianity In Preserving Ancient Aristocratic Cultural Values,” *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences* 140 (2014), 517.

it is impossible to understand the term without understanding authority and control. Foremost this meant control over one's self – harkening to the stoic tradition rampant in Rome – but that control also extended to his ability to maintain his household and family as the *paterfamilias* of an estate.⁹⁹ His ability to exert authority extended even to his relationships with other men as patron or friend, and in turn expected him to submit to the authority of the state.¹⁰⁰ A man's failure to exercise his authority effectively suggested effeminacy to the Roman culture and had significant social repercussions for the man.¹⁰¹ One scholar notes that *Romanitas* was “negatively defined as the opposite of effeminacy.”¹⁰² This means that the proper qualities of *Romanitas* were most frequently emphasized by situations demonstrating their inappropriate absence. In such situations, the absence of proper behavior was characterized as “soft – *mollis* in latin, *malakos* in Greek” and reflected poorly on the man.¹⁰³ Like the Greeks, these social distinctions for Roman men are evident in the stories that Romans wrote and studied. Their cultural heroes epitomized these traits. Likewise, the stories of the *Colloquia* implicitly define social distinctions between Romans and non-Romans in the Empire. A Roman man – especially an elite or government official – was expected to embody these characteristics of *Romanitas*. The definitions slowly shifted from the Greeks who placed great stock on birth and nationality, to Roman who also valued birth highly, yet mitigated it with reputation, wealth, and skill. After all,

⁹⁹ Fredrick Ivarsson, “Christian Identity as True Masculinity,” *Exploring Early Christian Identity* ed., Mohr Siebeck and Bengt Holmberg (Chicago, Illinois: Hans-Josef Klauck, 2008) 159-160.

¹⁰⁰ Kathy Warnes, “Education in Ancient Greece,” *Salem Press Encyclopedia* (January 2014).

¹⁰¹ Fredrick Ivarsson, 159-160.

¹⁰² Arthur K. Steinberg. “Crusading Armies of the West,” *Salem Press Encyclopedia*, January 2015.

¹⁰³ Fredrick Ivarsson, 160.

the ethos of each man demonstrated the validity of his birthright, regardless of his current occupation. Whereas the Greek characteristic of the superior man was always associated with the government, the *Romanitas* slowly separated from the political entity of Rome as the idea of being Roman was romanticized.¹⁰⁴

The two definitions which apparently affected the *Colloquia* were that of Greek (*Hellenikon*) and Roman civilizations. *Hellenikon* relocated the attributes of an ideal man to a good citizen while Romans attributed it to an accomplished orator. Since the type of person that was worthy of the term *Romanitas* differed from one to the other, the character attributes which comprised *Romanitas* were also different. The distinction between each culture's concept is laid out rather well by the systems that each society developed – as discussed earlier. Greek education was formatted to cultivate the skills and personality that was necessary in a citizen who benefitted his polis. Roman education employed exercises to develop the ideal orator. Although both Greek and Roman *Romanitas* are present at times, the concept of *Romanitas* which is prevalent in the *Colloquia* belongs firmly to the Roman conceptualization.

Explicit Instruction

There are different ways that the *Colloquia* promote these two definitions of *Hellenikon* and *Romanitas*. One of these ways is through explicit instruction that take the form of maxims and appear sporadically and infrequently within these texts – which comes as no surprise considering the fundamental reliance on implicit grammar instruction throughout the text. Some of these

¹⁰⁴ *Romanitas*, even during the height of the Roman Empire, was characterized as a frame of mind that could be corrupted by the intrusion of *ignavi*, see Poliheimer, 428; *Romanitas* was the civilized characteristic that separated the citizens of the Roman Empire from the barbarians according to Salvian of Marseilles in *De Gubernatione Dei* in the fifth century.

maxims include, “It befits a good boy to be clean,”¹⁰⁵ and “it is not fitting for a master to engage in a boisterous argument.”¹⁰⁶ In some of these examples the character appears to be defined according to *Hellenikon*, describing the good character of the man in terms of the community: “It is a wise man who accepts an injury to the community as an injury to himself.”¹⁰⁷ This axiom displays the quintessential Greek thought that the best man was the citizen who was loyal to his city more than his own career or reputation. However, existence of *Hellenikon* is particularly fitting in this situation as it is part of the retelling of the siege of Troy. Throughout the majority of the explicit instruction of character paradigms which fits the notions of both cultures and which leans more heavily on the Roman conception. However, far more energy is devoted to the implicit instruction of both types of character paradigm than explicit instruction, as the next sections demonstrate.

Implicit Instruction

In this text it becomes far more difficult to prove that the cultivation of the character paradigms is intentional because all language inevitably conveys the values of the culture to one degree or another. This is because, the system of “Greco-Roman education and rhetoric, as works (including narrative) that were written under their influence, emphasize models, paradigms, or exempla for imitation by pupils or readers.”¹⁰⁸ The most obvious way that the

¹⁰⁵ “Sic enim decet puerum ingenuum,” *Stephani*, 6b.

¹⁰⁶ “Rixam et controversiam facere non est bonum libero homini et patrifamilias,” *Harleianum*, 23i.

¹⁰⁷ “Prudentes...qui iniuriam unius civis sui omnium communem iudicantes, uno animo” *Stephani*, 27a-b.

¹⁰⁸ For more on this, see Benjamin Fiore, *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles* (AnBib 105; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986), especially his chap. 3, “Example in Rhetorical Theory, Education, and Literature,” 26-44, as well as the bibliography; William Kurz, 171.

Colloquia convey implicit ideals concerning character traits is through storytelling. The most obvious instance of storytelling is apparent in the retelling of the sack of Troy. Like the epic original version, the heroes exemplify the characteristics of *Hellenikon* which the audience should value and emulate.¹⁰⁹ Within this simplified retelling of the Homeric tale, the author highlights *Hellenikon* by praising characters who display it. Within the short narrative men are praised for wisdom and bravery¹¹⁰ for valor in battle¹¹¹ for piety¹¹² and for hospitality.¹¹³ *Romanitas* is also reinforced by criticizing the character who fails to demonstrate the proper characteristics. In the same narrative account, the author refuses to even name Paris. Instead he calls him the “foolish man and barbarian” for refusing to follow the rules of social engagement when he stole Helen away from his host.¹¹⁴ Outside the story of Troy the author displays the characteristic of *Romanitas* in the same manner by exhibiting them through the boy-man protagonist of the *Colloquia*. In some instances the exhibition seems quite mundane such as the display of decency when the man keeps his left hand hidden.¹¹⁵ In another example the

¹⁰⁹ *Stephani*, 27-36.

¹¹⁰ “Ducibus...quorum et virtutes miramur et sapientiam laudamus...” *Leidense-Stephani*, 31a-b; “Multi et eminentes virtute et genere in bello ceciderunt,” *Leidense-Stephani*, 36a; “Vir fortis,” *Montepessulanum*, 7a.

¹¹¹ “Que multa et dina memoria peregerunt, annis novem pugnantes,” *Leidense-Stephani* 32a.

¹¹² “Adoravimus,” *Celtis*, 14a.

¹¹³ *Monacensia-Einsidlensia*, 11.

¹¹⁴ “Oblitus benefactorum et hospitalitatis et omnes humanitatis, taquam barbarous et imprudens...” *Leidense-Stephani* 28b-c.

¹¹⁵ “Protuli manum dextram, sinistram perpressi,” *Stephani*, 12b.

protagonist earns the praise of “worthy student” because of his dedication to his study of the classics.¹¹⁶

There are other ways that the *Colloquia* promote the character paradigms besides storytelling. The vocabulary chosen by the author frequently intimates which character traits the audience is expected to focus on and emulate. For example the protagonist claims to be trustworthy¹¹⁷ and a friend praises him as deserving of every good thing.¹¹⁸ A fuller projection of *Romanitas* is conveyed this way, through the criticisms of those who fail to meet expectations. The terms chosen to denigrate the recipient reveal the attributes that the culture values. In *Harleianum*, among lists of idiomatic insults, the terms used to attack an opponent in an argument indicate the qualities that the culture values by contrast.¹¹⁹

Through explicit and implicit instruction, the *Colloquia* demonstrates character paradigms to its audience in a way that encourages student emulation. Many of the attributes in this text are traits which both Greek and Roman culture valued. Where the values diverge, the *Hellenikon* are found in the retelling of classical Greek stories and *Romanitas* attributes appear in the mundane activities.

¹¹⁶ “Filius sit eorum,” *Stephani*, 26a.

¹¹⁷ “Non periurus,” *Leidense-Stephani*, 10a.

¹¹⁸ “Omnium enim bonorum dingus es,” *Harleianum*, 12f.

¹¹⁹ “Impostor... odiose... maligne... expudorate... nequissime homo... desperate... malum caput... male facis et nesci... tunequam servus... impostor... servus... non es dingus... dominum tuum... maximam infamiam... intemperantia,” *Celtis*, 67b; “Malum caput,” *Harleianum*, 18a; “Desperate,” *Harleianum*, 17c; “Non es dingus,” *Harleianum*, 18g.

Hierarchy

The *Colloquia* help its audience to construct a framework of categories to classify the world around them by demonstrating the proper role of a boy or man belonging to the upper echelon of society. The texts construct this demonstration through examples which show the correct behavior for such a boy-man as he interacts within various power structures regarding his superiors, inferiors, and colleagues.

Contemporary pedagogues readily admitted that one of the primary outcomes of the trivium and a liberal arts education was the creation of a man who demonstrated the high morals of *Romanitas* or *Hellenikon* as discussed in the previous sections on education and character paradigms.¹²⁰ However, Bloomer argues that while school texts created a moral citizen, the curriculum demonstrates a more powerful determination to foster a particular perspective based on the social hierarchy in order to prepare school boys for their inevitable role as dominus (master of an estate).¹²¹ That is, education trained young men to think in terms of social hierarchy and to think of themselves as masters. Utilizing Bloomer's conclusions, it becomes clear that the author of the *Colloquia* intended to teach the power structures of Roman society – particularly superior-inferior roles – along with the appropriate actions, responsibilities, and struggles. The *Colloquia* teach this social hierarchy implicitly by placing the protagonist of the story into the hierarchical rank which correlated with the position of the primary student-audience, allowing the education to be geared towards the specific needs of the elite. This highly specialized training is exemplified by the format of speech training offered in the *Colloquia*

¹²⁰ See Protagoras, *Dialogues*.

¹²¹ Bloomer, "Schooling in Persona," 72.

directly correlate to the exercises that they would utilize later in the trivium curriculum which in turn replicated responsibilities that they would assume in their vocational roles as orators. An instance of this format is in one of the law scenes, the critique of a robber, which could easily transfer into the older boy's *ethopoeia* exercises. Training in these very specific demonstrates the intentionality of rank-based instruction within the *Colloquia* text. This intentionality in producing an orator-elite can be seen in the hierarchy that structures that the *Colloquia* presents. In the stories the protagonist is always in a position of authority, subject only to older members of the educated elite. Displaying these hierarchies to the students does more than identify the social relationships of the characters. The interplay of "social bonds, affinities, and the assertion of identity, both individual and collective" is ingrained in the mind of the child.¹²² The status quo is projected as a phenomenon which naturally and inevitable occurs. Of course, logistically the gap between the educated elite and laymen was dependent on financial disparity, but the *Colloquia* suggest that it was more than birth or money that set the educated elite apart.

Isolating the Elite

One of the ways that education bestowed this privilege on elite men is by sequestering them from the lower rabble with a distinct dialect which could only be cultivated through diligent education, literary Latin, which was only accessible through written text. While high culture usually is separated from the mundane, literary Latin began a particularly isolated path in the first century A.D. when sophists and politicians increased their incorporation of rhetoric into daily speech patterns. By the fourth-century, vulgar and literary Latin had already sufficiently

¹²² Kendra Eshleman, *Social World of Intellectuals in the Roman Empire: Sophists, Philosophers, and Christianity* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 18.

diverged to be considered distinct dialects although they remained mutually intelligible like modern and Shakespearian English. The languages were distinct enough that the author Plautus, who wrote in the third century A.D., contrasts vulgar and literary Latin for comedic effect.”¹²³ The literary language which daily became more isolated and distinct from the vernacular dialects was able to become a supra-regional standard so that not only Romans, but any educated elite could communicate through this language.¹²⁴ The material contained in the *Colloquia* distinctly inclines towards literary Latin because its students would likely come from among the social elite.

The Romans believed that an unadulterated Latin culture was to alien cultures, although much of Roman culture was an alteration of foreign traditions. They valued their linguistic purity so highly that the corruption of Latin considered to be a moral vice.¹²⁵ One historian remarks that, according to Romans, Latin was “the difference between humans and all the other forms of life – including slaves.”¹²⁶ Their dialect was an identity badge and a socio-political tool. Latin speaking elites believed that the incursion of barbarian words into their own language somehow adulterated it.¹²⁷ Literary language was viewed as *purus*: free from barbarisms, and as a result

¹²³ Leonhardt, 55.

¹²⁴ “It is notable that Latin-learning materials from the earlier centuries of the empire are almost all transliterated, and that transliteration then became much less common, ceasing to be the rule in the third century and almost ceasing to appear at all after the fourth-century. This shift is no doubt linked to the fact that the literary texts do not appear among the language-learning materials until the fourth-century AD: the focus of Latin learning in Egypt evidently changed from oral proficiency to literacy,” Dickey, vol. 1, 10.

¹²⁵ Roderich Kirchner, “*Elocutio*: Latin Prose Style,” *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*, ed. William Dominik and Jon Hall (Malden: Blackwell P, 2010), 291.

¹²⁶ Brian Ray, 196.

¹²⁷ *Idem.*, 196.

uncorrupted language became a defense against barbarism.¹²⁸ Julius Caesar himself reputedly stated that the purity of literary language can instruct by analogy and thereby correct corrupted language.¹²⁹ Quintilian, who is famous for his treaty regarding an elite child's education, clearly decries the incursion of foreign words.¹³⁰ One of the reasons that "pure" literary Latin was so highly valued was that it was so hard to achieve. The irony is that Roman affinity for linguistic purity is a characteristic originally from Greek culture which the Romans adopted and adapted in order to call it their own. By the time that the *Colloquia* were in use, the "final arbiters of correctness [for literary Latin] no longer resided among living speakers but among the dead, and so the only way to acquire this dialect was through an expensive education."¹³¹

Literary Latin separated the elite class, in their own opinion, as a legitimately superior stratum. Several features of high literature which separated it from common writings and which made it valuable to the educated elite.¹³² The elite class distinguished themselves by the content of their conversation through the grammatical structures they used and the words they chose. Also in the aesthetics of their words, as a speech made in literary style was well planned with a calculated rhythm and vowel distribution.¹³³ For examples of this aesthetic, see the speeches of

¹²⁸ Rolando Ferri and Philomen Probert, "Roman Authors on *Colloquia* Language," in and Anna Chahoud, *Colloquial and Literary Latin* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2010) 14.

¹²⁹ "Rationem adhibens consuetudinem vitosam et corruptam pura et incorrupta consuetudine emendat," *Brut.* 261 as cited in Andreas Willi, "Campaigning for Utilitas: Style, Grammar, and Philosophy in C. Iulius Caesar, 236.

¹³⁰ Quintilian, *Institutio Oratio*, 8.3.33.

¹³¹ Leonhardt, 102-103.

¹³² "Roman rhetoricians inherited from their Greek predecessors the notion that there were three stylistic levels in rhetoric – a grand, medium, and simple style." Leonhardt, *Latin*, 111; The author of the "the aesthetic quality of this literature is an important characteristic. The nuances of word choices and sound, the rounded phrasings and prosody in prose and rhythms in poetry – these were obviously the objects of intense authorial effort," Leonhardt, *Latin*, 112; "although the Greek of this colloquium is not very elegant it is rarely...ungainly," Dickey, *Stephani*, 37a, note.

¹³³ "The use of such cadences was drilled into all students as part of their lessons in rhetoric," Leonhardt, *Latin*, 69.

Cicero or the poetry of Horace.¹³⁴ Also literary Latin by the fourth-century had developed a unique accent. In the classroom scenes of the *Colloquia* the protagonist remarks on learning a new accent to pronounce his classroom practices.¹³⁵ Since only a student from an elite family could afford a complete education, only a man from such wealth would speak with the artificial accent acquired by studying Greek and Latin in the forms that by this time were antiquated.¹³⁶ The student had to work hard to cultivate technically proper pronunciation since it was no longer vernacular anywhere in the empire.

An interesting quality of the *Colloquia* is that they do not seem to be limited to literary Latin as might be expected from text so clearly intended for an elite audience. Instead, phrases and vocabulary from impure, vulgar Latin occur. Here are some examples of situations in which the grammar and vocabulary of the text bears signs of vulgar Latin which are not shared by the literary language. The *Monacensia-Einsidlensia* shows a particular preference for Vulgar Latin. As the author suggests, “concerning everyday speech/stories, speech, conversation, everyday usage, ought to be given to all boys, [both] younger and older, since they are necessary.”¹³⁷ He then proceeds, as promised, to provide very utilitarian phrases and scenarios that his young students would inevitable confront: getting dressed, greeting his family, going to court,

¹³⁴ For modern scholars regarding this concept see Yanique M. Edmond, Suzanne M. Randolph, and Guylaine L. Richard, “The Lakou System: a Cultural, Ecological analysis of mothering in rural Hati,” *Journal of Pan African Studies* 2 no. 1 (November 2007) on soliolinguistics.

¹³⁵ “Coepi reddere...Cum aspiratione ubi oportebat,” *Stephani*, 13a-d.

¹³⁶ *Stephani*, 13d-14b.

¹³⁷ “De fabulis cottidianis... sermo, conversation, usus cottidianus debet dari omnibus pueris, minoribus et maioribus, quoniam necessaria sunt.” *Monacensia-Einsidlensia*, 3a-b.

exchanging money, visiting friends, bathing and table etiquette. This categorized array of useful information for mundane life (much like a modern traveler's phrase book discussed in chapter one) is demonstrated by the separation of events by theme as well as the lists of "useful idioms or phrases."¹³⁸ This combination of literary and vernacular dialects could be a reflection of the unique needs of young students. Interspersing antiquated diction with familiar words would expose the student to these higher literary forms without overwhelming the child as he learns to read. It is more likely a reflection of the Roman expectation that an orator be familiar with all three dialects. As contemporary pedagogues explained, it was important for an orator to be capable of switching among these three registers in order to convey different ethos.¹³⁹

Interacting with Other Strata

While literary language was one distinction which allowed the elite class to distinguish themselves as the highest stratum of society, the *Colloquia* include other themes and characteristics to distinguish between other factions of the general public. One of these themes is the division between freedman and slave. In the *Colloquia* this theme is brought up time and again due to the centrality of this topic to the economic infrastructure Roman Empire.¹⁴⁰ In the *Colloquia* "the vocative serves to clarify for the reader that an order is being given to a

¹³⁸ *Harleianum*, 14-22. For more on this, see the discussion on audience in chapter one.

¹³⁹ *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 4.16; Cicero, *Oratorio*, 99-111; Quintilian, *Institutio*, 12.10.69-72; Not everyone agreed with this methodology – Atticists fought Cicero on this point in Cicero, *Brut.* 284 and *Oratorio* 23, 28.

¹⁴⁰ In a list of insults, the speaker references reminds someone of their subservient position by mentioning "dominus tuus" their opponent's master in *Harleianum*, 16g; Also "How? I am the best of men, but you are a worthless slave. "Qua re? Quoniam ego ingenuus homo sum, tu autem nequam servus" in *Harleianum*, 18c; There is even a foreboding threat that "I want to teach you the difference between a man and a slave." Volo discere utrum servus es aut libertus" *Harleianum*, 18f; Later a sarcastic "And you will flog me? I am afraid. Your status is high." "Et caedis me? Timeo. Magna tua dignitas" *Harleianum*, 17e.

servant.”¹⁴¹ It is interesting, then, that the vocative is scarcely used throughout the *Colloquia* and never in reference to the protagonist since the social position of the student would be equivalent to a slave as long as he is a child even though his an aristocrat. The dynamics of slavery in Roman culture was not a simple superior-inferior organization. Instead, a spectrum of powers with temporary or conditional positions of authority were dependent upon the situation. For example, in the classroom the student’s personal slaves (pedagogues) were allowed to provide discipline, including physical punishment, yet outside of the classroom they were at the boy’s command.¹⁴² This interconnection of webs which is the reason why the young child needed to learn Roman hierarchical structures. The infrequent use of vocative in general is probably not due to a desire to avoid hierarchy as much as an avoidance of real, contemporary names. It seems that the author was trying to create generic characterization which will be addressed more in the section regarding persona.¹⁴³ To maintain general charaters and avoid names, the author avoided employing frequent vocatives, but commands and hierarchy still seem important to the author. The degree importance of grammar to distinguish social hierarchies is evidenced by the sheer quantity of imperatives directed either at the protagonist from his superiors or issued by the protagonist to his slaves.

Not only did distinct levels exist in society, but even the classrooms were comprised of unequal boys. These divisions went beyond age and included extracurricular features such as the

¹⁴¹ Idem.

¹⁴² W.Martin Bloomer, *The School of Rome*, 12-13.

¹⁴³ Dickey, *Latin Forms of Address: From Plautus to Apuleius*, (New York, New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 64.

student's charisma, motivation, and natural skill.¹⁴⁴ Instead lieu a set hierarchy, the classroom consisted of boys who needed to establish their own place in the malleable structure. The way that these boys interact display arguments waged among boys to attain power. Therefore the hierarchy which appears among the boys in the *Colloquia* may either display a distinction by age or ability in the classroom or merely the hierarchy which naturally forms as a result of the skirmishes of young men.¹⁴⁵ That is why the protagonist's attempts to assert authority, whether successfully or otherwise, is an aspects of the *Colloquia* which is consistently and repeatedly articulated through all six *Colloquia*.¹⁴⁶ For example, upon entering the classroom the protagonist of the *Colloquia* says to a classmate, "Hello fellow students... show me my seat...scoot over." To this statement the seated boy replies, "go over there: this is my spot, I was here first."¹⁴⁷ This scene demonstrates a familiar scene of conflict between students. To some degree this scene is a subject of humor because of the familiar, childish behavior. However, there is more value to this story than a chuckle. The colloquium presents this act of rejection in order to display a situation that the audience could learn from, yet it surprisingly ignores protagonist's response to the rejection. At least, it presents only an ambiguous response: the conjugation of the

¹⁴⁴ "Pusilli...maioribus" *Monacensia-Einsidlensia*, 2m; "Naturae variae studentium" *Stephani*, 19. "If the text is sound, the meaning seems to be that the pupils at different stages of training in writing recite verses at different levels of difficulty" Dickey, *Stephani*, 20b, 242.

¹⁴⁵ *Monacensia-Einsidlensia*, 2m; *Stephani*, 21a.

¹⁴⁶: "meus locus" *Leidense-Stephani*, 4a; "tu mihi" *Leidense-Stephani*, 6e; "et tu, inquit, dicta mihi. Dixi ei: redde primo. Et dixit mihi: non vidisti, cum redderem prior te? Et dixi: mentiris, non reddidisti. Non mentior. Si verum dicis, dicto" *Monacensia-Einsidlensia*, 2K-L.

¹⁴⁷ "Avete, condiscipuli...locum mihi date meum...Densa te. Illuc accedite: meus locus est, ego occupavi.," *Leidense-Stephani*, 3c-d.

verbs *sit*, *learn*, and *study*.¹⁴⁸ Other instances of student confrontation also occur without a direct responses from the fellow student.¹⁴⁹ A possible explanation for this absence is that the *Colloquia* do not pretend to offer the perfect solution for these confrontations so much as providing an opportunity for the audience to work through the scenario in their minds to determine a solution for themselves. It is teaching the tenets of hierarchy and displaying examples of how to maneuver through said structure.

At other times, the author not only displays the hierarchies but forces his audience to participate in those hierarchies. The author wrote a narrative voice in an authoritative position over the audience and which assumes the right to issue effectual commands just like the audience's superiors might do in real life. In one such situation, the narrative voice adopts the tone of a loving father, writing a letter to his son. Because Roman culture was a patriarchal society his instructions and advice bears more weight and are therefore more likely to be remembered by the student who reads the passage. At the same time the idea that the father is writing advice and commands reinforces the social roles of father and son in the mind of the child as he experiences the role.¹⁵⁰ The exchange between father and son in *Harleianum* the father giving a series of imperatives in a proverb-like structure. In response the son honors the father with submission, "most honored father... I have heard everything and stored it up in my

¹⁴⁸ "Sedere, ediscere and discere," *Leidense-Stephani*, 3e.

¹⁴⁹ "Praeducere nescio: tu mihi praeduc, quomodo scis." *Leidense-Stephani*, 6b-c.

¹⁵⁰ *Harleianum* 1.

memory. I acknowledge the greatest gratitude...”¹⁵¹ As the child participates in a receiving role as the son-audience, the roles of father and son are reinforced in his mind.

The frequent utilization of particular grammar in the passage mentioned above and throughout the text reinforces the structured hierarchy of the classroom and the schoolboy’s daily life.¹⁵² Imperative commands are given by teachers to students, fathers to sons, and boys to slaves.¹⁵³ Third person verbs action upon the protagonist only when the actor holds a superior social position. In *Leidense-Stephani* third person verbs are reserved for the teacher who greets the boy and dismisses him for lunch.¹⁵⁴ All other verbs within this *Colloquium* are first person (singular or plural), deponent, or imperatives given by the boy.¹⁵⁵ This selective use of verbs appears to be an intentional use of implicit instruction. It seems more logical pedagogically to familiarize the pupil with them via examples as is done more in the other five *Colloquia*. Instead, this grammar suggests the characters within textbooks taught a student how to act according to social norms, that it taught them the social guidelines which were most important to roman culture.¹⁵⁶ The repetition of the material also reinforced the student’s concept of self,

¹⁵¹ “Pater carissime...audivi omnia et in momoriam condidi. Gratias Confiteor maximas...” *Harleianum* 2a-c.

¹⁵² In *Leidense-Stephani* manuscript there are 9 imperatives of a 216 word text.

¹⁵³ “Occasionally elder classmate to younger student. But morphologically and socially, they taught the imperative... The recognized the frequency and importance of commands to slaves in these texts. In exclusively formal terms, the student rehearsed thematic and athematic imperatives, presents and aorists. ...Significantly, the only imperatives the boy receives all have to do with reading and writing” Dionisotti, 93.

¹⁵⁴ *Leidense-Stephani*, 3c, 7b, 10e.

¹⁵⁵ There is one exception when it is ambiguous whether the speaker is in fact the teacher or merely an older pupil, but in either case the speaker has authority over the central character, *Leidense-Stephani*, 5b.

¹⁵⁶ Andreas Willi, “The Italian Tradition in John Lyly's Court Dramas: With Emphasis on His Characterizations and His Ideas of Love,” *Michigan State* 18 (1958), 241.

empowering them to assume their correct role in society, both is their current role as a child and in their later role as an aristocrat ad orator.

The hierarchy displayed by the *Colloquia* texts focus on distinguishing different strata from one another. Using grammar and dialect to emphasizes distinctions and draws lines between people groups while explaining how to interact with these different strata. Whereas a purpose of Greeks education was the creation of good citizens who had universal equality, the *Colloquia* privilege the Roman hierarchy which utilized education to give special privileges to only an elite few.

Persona

A persona is somewhat like a character in a play. The character of the persona is usually a stereotypical role which is assumed by a speaker as a rhetorical tool. The idea of persona is used by the *Colloquia* to create a framework in the students' minds and to train them to think categorically about people. For the students studying rhetoric they would later participate in *ethopoeia*, a related declamatory exercise in which the boy evaluated the attributes and tendencies of a character in a given situation in order to affects them as a persona in a speech or debate.

“Declamatory plotting was more than a projection of patriarchal anxiety or filial fantasy; it explored social and familial relations quite frequently by imagining and animating the situation, sentiments, and even words of the victimized. Speaking on behalf of the prostitute who applied to be a priestess or the rape victim who hesitated between choosing death of the rapist or marriage with him was not an exercise in situational ethics nor did it necessarily impart any enlightened state. It did naturalize the speaking rights of the freeborn male elite.”¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁷ Bloomer, “Scholing in Persona,” 57-58.

Creating the infrastructure for this categorization process was paramount for the child's future success both in the realm of the elite and as an orator since the students' knowledge of these roles would be important both in their future vocations and in their present navigation of society. For the student orator, learning to affect these personae was a fundamental skill for their future. Speeches and lawsuits at the time were dependent on the speaker's ability to relegate the character of a defendant into an existing stereotype to bolster or undermine their reliability. A future orator needed this skill. For this reason, the trivium trained students how to understand and manipulate these stereotypes, "how to imagine and how to picture other people's life and character in an understanding and persuasive way."¹⁵⁸ This skill was not explicitly taught until the child matured beyond the *Colloquia* curriculum. The recorded speeches of orators provide several examples of such affected personae. For example, a great warrior and emperor, Theodosius, uses an affected persona to advise Augustus Honorius on how to become a great emperor and later to attack Gildo.¹⁵⁹ One notable practice of this skill occurred in the *ethopoeia* exercises in which boys were required to produce speeches in character and prepare lawsuits based on those characters. Unlike the *ethopoeia* and its explicit instruction, the *Colloquia* utilize implicit instruction in personae, subliminally laying a firm foundation for a necessary skill and preparing the elite student for his future career by reinforcing "a set of culturally accepted values through the criteria used for praise and blame, persuasion and dissuasion, and introduced the student to the notion and practice of censure in itself."¹⁶⁰ The development of student

¹⁵⁸ Anders Sigrell, "Progymnasmata – an answer for today's rhetorical pedagogy?" *Academic Exchange* (2003) 113.

¹⁵⁹ *IV Cons Hon.* 213f; *Bell. Gild.* 215f.

¹⁶⁰ Gibson, 6.

stereotyping was not only critical for their oratory future, however. The child's development of character types ultimately affects their perspective and the way that they interact with the world around them. This means that the *Colloquia*'s enthusiastic promotion of stereotyping was helpful to more than just the children belonging to the upper echelon of society who were destined to be public speakers. A firm grasp of status quo and public personalities would also help the student who could only afford this basic education or even for the adult student who used the *Colloquia* as a travel phrasebook. This skillset was fundamentally necessary for every member of the student audience and so, justifiable, heavily embedded throughout the *Colloquia*. There are several ways in which he implicitly teaches these characters including through the genre, through the presentation of a variety of character types, and through role-play.

Cast of Characters

Next, I shall examine the variety of character types that the narrator presents. The *Colloquia* train the students by introducing various characters, using the actions and outcomes of episodic stories to associate particular character traits with specific social roles. The portrayal of these roles helped to create a framework of stock stereotypes in the mind of the child. The *Colloquia* lay a firm, social foundation by exposing the child to a plethora of different stereotypes which display appropriate behaviors in context. Despite the brevity of the *Colloquia* passages under examination (which range from 216 to just over 1,000 words) they demonstrate an astounding number of personae. The complete list of characters includes sixty-six roles as follows: school boy (older, younger, and protagonist), teacher and teacher's assistant, perjurer, bather, servants (including table server, concierge, male nurse, female nurse, pedagogue, slave boy, doorman, cook, litter bearers, curator, herald), father, mother, grandfather, grandmother,

uncle, aunt, sister, brother, and other members of the *familias* (eunuch, steward, concierge, acquaintances (both as children and adults), warriors (including soldiers, centurions and militia men), kings, queens, sick friends, legal advocates (at least eight distinct roles), legal witness, peasant boy, bathing attendants, bath keeper, landowners and their wives, orators, gods, mule drivers, shop keepers, money lenders, jailors, animal fighters, government officials (with at least six varieties), and a robber. Although each of the *Colloquia* may not include all of these characters, even the shortest of the *Colloquia* contains a high ratio of characters to words.¹⁶¹

The format of the *Colloquia* makes it possible to present so many different stereotypes. As the boy-man travels throughout the story to sundry settings he interacts with the characters located there. These interactions between the characters and the protagonist correlates occupations and personalities with specific levels of the social hierarchy, but more may be learnt from these interactions than merely superior-inferior relationships. Although most of the positions are superficially superior-inferior relationships such as master and slave, teacher with student, or even older student to younger student, the actions of the protagonist within these relationships demonstrate the malleability of roles. For example, the teacher poses a question and the protagonist responds with a lie, which the instructor immediately spots. For a few lines the two playfully banter, aware of the breach in protocol but unwilling to confront it. In the end the teacher chooses to turn a blind eye to the boy's insolence and the story progresses.¹⁶² This episode indicates that teaching social hierarchy, although important, was not as important to the author as teaching the student how to maneuver throughout the different levels of the hierarchy.

¹⁶¹ The shortest, *Leidense-Stephani* contains eight characters in the short 216 word passage.

¹⁶² *Harleianum*, 8.

The student learned this social maneuverability by comparing the information given implicitly within the *Colloquia* to relationships with which he was already familiar. After reconciling the two the student had a better understanding of the bigger picture. Some *Colloquia* include other characters with which the audience was familiar such as: bath house attendant, steward, friend, and pedagogue. However, other passages present personae which were wholly unfamiliar to the young student such as banker and legal defendant. Although the student would be inexperienced with the actual person, through the personae they would begin to categorize the stereotypes of those roles. As the student established their understanding of social strata, they could apply it to the society around them.

Genre

The genre which the author chose for the *Colloquia*, comedy, is ideal for implicitly conveying stereotypes. Comedy is a classical genre and one of its primary characteristics is the demonstration of truths about society, people, and the status quo through illustrations without the complication of trying to relay true events. Potter describes this genre as stories which “made use of argumentum, which was false, but like the truth” to convey an idea that is truth.¹⁶³ Because of its genre, the *Colloquia* are illustrative texts, meaning that the text is “primarily concerned with ideas and habits, not intended to reflect specific contemporary events. An illustrative text tends to be a work that is written for the education and/or amusement of the reading public.”¹⁶⁴ The illustrative nature of this text had two layers. The first layer was strictly related to teaching

¹⁶³ Potter, 14.

¹⁶⁴ Potter, 22.

language. However, on the second level it needed to teach the idioms and expected behaviors of that culture which was clearly the primary focus for the author of the *Colloquia*, as evidenced by its format, and word choice, grammar integration, and topic selection. The author chose to depict scenes and characters which would best project the target worldview, using “well-figured, well-scripted voices of freedmen, slaves, women, and children that one meets in the school exercises of imperial Rome.”¹⁶⁵ Although each character may not be an obvious projection of opinions, they help to present a cohesive picture of life in the Roman world which the author hoped to instill in its students.

Affecting Personae

Finally, there is the role play aspect of the *Colloquia* where either the audience or narrative voice affect a persona. This training format moves beyond the formation of stereotypes in the mind of the child as it forces the audience to participate and assume a role merely by reading the text. For example, the *Harleianum* manuscript begins with a salutation, like a letter, and proceeds with language which indicates that this passage is emulating a letter that a father writes to his son. It includes idiomatic phrases which indicate that the audience (son) is of a lower hierarchy than the narrative voice (father).¹⁶⁶ As the student reads through this *Colloquium*, therefore, he is forced to assume the role and persona of a son listening to his father. Another example occurs during each of the school scenes when the narrative voice likewise affects the persona of school teacher, another role with which the audience was familiar.

¹⁶⁵ Bloomer, “Schooling in Persona,” 60.

¹⁶⁶ *Harleianum*, 2.

The *Colloquia*'s curriculum did more than teach boys how to affect various personae, it also forcibly drilled the patterns of thought and behavior into the heads of young boys.¹⁶⁷ Since the *Colloquia* are first person accounts of a boy's daily life, by reading the *Colloquia* the reader experiences the demands on a similar a boy who obeyed the protocols of society. An example of this exercise is the schoolroom setting contained in each of the six *Colloquia* where a pupil interacts with his teacher.¹⁶⁸ Although each passage contains variations on this conversation, they all are based the student-protagonists' response to the teacher's commands or to the instructor's questions. The audience becomes better acquainted with those protocols and is more likely to obey them in his own life. The fact that these accounts are in first person means that the audience who was using the *Colloquia* to study would speak truths about his own situation when he read aloud the statements of the story-boy. For example, a boy may be asked to read "While I repeat back [the story that the teacher spoke], I am corrected by the instructor so that my way of speaking will become more like [the teacher's or the standard]."¹⁶⁹ Although the role of student was already one with which the audience was eminently familiar, the way that the teacher and boy interact within the *Colloquia* continue to reinforce the roles of teacher and student in the mind of the reader as well as the characters of each role. Besides living vicariously through the

¹⁶⁷ For example, in one classroom scene of the *Colloquium Celtis*, the boy list sixteen action "I read, I mark, I reason" followed by twenty items to study "versus, versus, nomen, nomina, notarius, notae, nota..." followed by seventeen demands from his instructor. See *Celtis*, 24-26.

¹⁶⁸ *Stephani*, 10-22; *Leidense-Stephani*, 3-8; *Monicensia-Einsidlensia*, 2g-u; *Harleianum*, 2-10; *Montepessulanum*, 2; *Celtis*, 18-46.

¹⁶⁹ "Dum redo emendates sum a praeceptore, ut et vocem praeparem propiorem" *Stephani*, 14a-b.

role, the first person narrative also allowed the audience of the *Colloquia* to understand the scenario presented as well as a student's perspective of that scenario.

By presenting idealized personae, the author offers the student the ability to connect particular traits with their respective societal roles.¹⁷⁰ Using examples or false-truths, the *Colloquia* provide a framework for categorizing the world and interacting with people, providing exempla so that the student could apply the tool to real situation in their lives. These tools were necessary skills for the maturing student who was destined for a career as a politician, lawyer, orator, or merely a citizen of Rome.

¹⁷⁰ Bloomer, "Schooling in Persona," 67.

Chapter 4: Conclusion

Summary

This examination of the *Colloquia* reveals that the fourth-century elementary classrooms used a mixture of tools from both Greek and Roman curricula in order to convey cultural elements from both cultures. Although Christianity was present in the fourth-century world, elements of Christian morality and pedagogy are not apparent in the *Colloquia* texts. Regarding both curriculum and social protocol, the text is more heavily weighted with Roman elements than Greek attributes due to the contemporary power of the Roman Empire, but the sentiments of Greek culture are still clearly present in the mixture. Although uneven, the presence of both the Greek and Roman elements reflects the intermingling of the two cultural spheres within the fourth-century Mediterranean world. This overlap of cultural spheres may not have been unique to the centuries when the *Colloquia* were first composed, but the intensity of their interaction was exceptionally prevalent during this period. Without that pervasiveness the *Colloquia* would not contain the various contents that it does, and, in fact, would probably not exist as a text since the necessity of a bilingual textbook would not exist without both Latin and Greek preeminence.

References

- Adams, J.N. *Social Variation and the Latin Language*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Allen, Pauline. "Some Aspects of Hellenism in the Early Greek Church Historians." *Traditio* 43 (1987), 368-281.
- Archee, Ray. "Aemulatio, Imitation and Mimesis in Tertiary Education." *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences* 174 (2015): 2418-2424.
- Basozw, Tutku. "Through the Eyes of Prospective Teachers of English: Explicit or Implicit Grammar Instruction?" *Pseudo-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 158 (2014): 377-382.
- Bitros, George C. "Character, Knowledge and Skills in Ancient Greek Paideia: Some Lessons for Today's Policy Makers." *Journal of Economic Asymmetries* 6 (2010), 193-204.
- Bloomer, W. Martin. *The School of Rome: Latin Studies and the Origins of Liberal Education*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2011.
- "Schooling in Persona: Imagination and Subordination in Roman Education." *Classical Antiquity* 16, no. 1 (April 1997): 57-78. Accessed January 22, 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25011054>.
- Bonner, Stanley F. "Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny." *History of Education Quarterly* 20, no. 3 (Autumn, 1980). Accessed February 2, 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/367903>.
- Buck, Carl Darling. *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1933.
- Cameron, Averil. *The Later Roman Empire*. New York: Harvard University Press: 2009.
- Cribiore, R. *Gymnastics of the Mind, Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton, Oxford: 2001.
- DeVaney, Thomas A., Nan B. Adams, and Cynthia B. Elliott. "Assessment of Online Learning Environments: Using OCLES (20) with Graduate Level Online Classes." *Journal of Interactive Online Learning* 7 no. 3 (Winter 2008), 165-174.

- Dickey, Eleanor. *Latin Forms of Address: From Plautus to Apuleius*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- , and Anna Chahoud. *Colloquial and Literary Latin*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- , *The Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana: Colloquia Monacensia-Einsidlensia, Leidense-Stephany- and Stephani*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Dionisotti, A. C. "From Ausonius' Schooldays? A Schoolbook and Its Relatives." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 72 (1982): 83-125. Accessed February 2, 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/299118>.
- Edmond, Yanique M., Suzanne M. Randolph, and Guylaine L. Richard. "The Lakou System: a Cultural, Ecological analysis of mothering in rural Hati." *Journal of Pan African Studies* 2 no. 1 (November 2007) 19-33.
- Ellis, R. "Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: an SLA perspective." *TESOL Quarterly*, 40 no. 1, (2006): 84.
- Eshleman, Kendra. *Social World of Intellectuals in the Roman Empire: Sophists, Philosophers, and Christianity*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Fantham, Elaine. *Roman Literary Culture: from Cicero to Apuleius*. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Filimon, Nela and Mario Campana. "The Role of Greco-Christianity In Preserving Ancient Aristocratic Cultural Values." *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences* 140 (2014) 517-521.
- Fiore, Benjamin. *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles*. (AnBib 105) Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986.
- Fleming, J. David. "The Very Idea of a Progymnasmata." *Rhetoric Review* 22, no. 3 (2003): 105-120. Accessed January 22, 2015.
- Foster, Francis. "Reconstructing Virgil in the Classroom in Late Antiquity." *History of Education: Journal of the History of Education Society* 43, no. 3 (2014): 285-303. Accessed January 22, 2015. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0046760x.2014.887791>.

- Foxhall, Lin and John Salmon, eds. *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition*. Leicester-Nottingham Studies in Ancient Society 7. London: Routledge, 1998.
- *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power, and Identity in Classical Antiquity*. Leicester-Nottingham Studies in Ancient Society 8. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. "Toward a Theology of Acts: Reading and Rereading." *Interpretation* 42 (April 1988).
- Gibson, Craig A. "Better Living Through Prose Composition? Moral and Compositional Pedagogy in Ancient Greek and Roman Progymnasmata." *Rhetorica: a Journal of the History of Rhetoric*. University of California Press, 32 no. 1 (Winter 2014): 1-30.
- Gleason, Maud W. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Goetz, G. *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*. Leipzig, Germany: 1892.
- Gurd, Sean Alexander. *Isocrates, Plato, and Quintilian: Revision, Pedagogy, and the Formation of Selves*. Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Hopkins, Keith. "Everyday Life for the Roman Schoolboy." *History Today* 43 no. 10 (October 1993).
- Ivarsson, Fredrick. "Christian Identity as True Masculinity." *Exploring Early Christian Identity*. ed. Mohr Siebeck and Bengt Holmberg. Chicago, Illinois: Hans-Josef Klauck, 2008.
- Joyal, Mark, Iain McDougall, and J.C. Yardley. "3." In *Greek and Roman Education: A Sourcebook*. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Kaimio, Jorma "Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum." *The Romans and the Greek Language* by Societas Scientiarum Fennica 64 (1979).
- Kirchner, Roderich. "Elocutio: Latin Prose Style." *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*. Ed. William Dominik and Jon Hall. Malden: Blackwell Press, 2010: 181-94.
- Kurz William. "Narrative Models for Imitation in Luke-Acts." in *Greeks, Romans, and Christianity: Essays in Honor of Abraham*, ed. David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne A. Meeks (1990).
- Lantolf, James P. *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*. Oxford University Press, 2000.

- Leonhardt, Jurgen. *Latin: Story of a World Language*. London, England: Harvard University Press, 2013.
- Lopes-Frias, Francisco Javier, Emanuele Isodori, and Clea Hadjustephanou Papaellina. "Greek Mythology and Education: From Theory to Practice." *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences* 197 (2015) 595-599.
- Millar, Fergus. *A Greek Roman Empire: Power and Belief under Theodosius II 405-450*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2006.
- Morgan, Teresa. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and roman Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Pearson, Roberta and William Uricchio. *The Formative and Impressionable Age: Discursive Constructions of the Nickelodesn's Child Audience*. London, England; British Film Institute; 1999. Film.
- Penner, T. "Reconfiguring the Rhetorical Study of Acts." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 35 (1996), 1-517.
- Potter, David S. *Literary Texts and the Roman Historian*. London, England: Routledge, 1999.
- Raine, Paul. A Discussion of the Notional-Functional Syllabus. Dissertation, University of Birmingham, UK, March 2010. <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/cels/essays/sylabusandmaterials/rainenotfunc.pdf>
- Ray, Brian. "A *Progymnasmata* for Our Time: Adapting Classical Exercises to Teach Translingual Style." *Rhetoric Review* 32, no. 2 (2013): 191-209. Accessed February 2, 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/86060374>.
- Rosen, R. M. and I. Sluiter, eds. *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Sarff, Krystina. *Cultivating Strong Citizens through Public Educatio: Greek and Roman Methodology as a Pedagogical Approach in Public Education*, Orlando Florida: University of Central Florida Online, 2009.
- Shaw, Brent. "After Rome: Transformations of the Early Mediterranean World." *New Left Review* 51 (May 2008): 89-114.
- Sigrell, Anders. "Progymnasmata – an answer for today's rhetorical pedagogy?" *Academic Exchange* (2003): 112-117.

Taplin, Oliver. *Literature in the Roman World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Thorsteinsson, Runar M. "Roman Christianity and Roman Stoicism: A Comparative Study of Ancient Morality." *Oxford Scholarship Online* (September 2010).

Williams, Craig A. *Roman Homosexuality: Ideology of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Wilson, N.G. *Saint Basil and the Value of Greek Literature*. London: 1975.

Willi, Andreas. "The Italian Tradition in John Lyly's Court Dramas: With Emphasis on His Characterizations and His Ideas of Love." *Michigan State* 18 (1958): 1041.