IDS 2935: Ancients and Moderns

Quest 1: The Examined Life

I. General Information

Class Meetings

- Spring 2025
- Required 100% In-Person, no GTAs, 35 residential students
- MWF Period 4 (10:40am–11:30am)
- MAT 117
- 3 Credits

Instructor

- Dr. Thomas Matthew Vozar
- CSE E456
- Office hours: Mondays 1:00–3:00pm
- thomasvozar@ufl.edu

If you need to schedule an appointment outside of office hours, please email the course instructor.

Course Description

Are we better than the Ancient Greeks and Romans? What do we owe them, and how have we surpassed their achievements? What does it mean to define ourselves as "modern" in contrast to classical antiquity? These and related questions are the focus of this course, which explores the ancient–modern dynamic in Western culture from the Renaissance through the Enlightenment. Readings will include selections from such writers and thinkers as Homer, Aristotle, Vergil, Petrarch, Erasmus, Bacon, Hobbes, Milton, Swift, and the American Founding Fathers. As the political philosopher Leo Strauss insisted: "Only in the light of the quarrel between the ancients and the moderns can modernity be understood."

Quest and General Education Credit

- Quest 1
- Humanities
- Writing Requirement (WR) 2000 words

This course accomplishes the Quest and General Education objectives of the subject areas listed above. A minimum grade of C is required for Quest and General Education credit. Courses intended to satisfy Quest and General Education requirements cannot be taken S–U.

The Writing Requirement (WR) ensures students both maintain their fluency in writing and use writing as a tool to facilitate learning.

Course grades have two components. To receive writing requirement credit, a student must receive a grade of C or higher and a satisfactory completion of the writing component of the course.

Required Readings and Works

1. William Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, ed. S. P. Cerasano (New York: Norton, 2012).
2. John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, ed. Stephen B. Dobranski (New York: Norton, 2022).
3. Writing Manual: *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 18th edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2024)
4. All other required readings will be made available as PDFs on Canvas.
5. Materials and Supplies Fees: N/A

Course Objectives

- Identify, describe, and explain the methodologies used across humanities disciplines to examine essential ideas about the relationship between antiquity and modernity.
- Identify, describe, and explain key questions and problems with respect to the relationship between antiquity and modernity.
- Analyze how different course authors have thought about the dynamic between antiquity and modernity.
- Analyze and evaluate specific ideas regarding the relationship between antiquity and modernity, using close reading, critical analysis, class discussion, and personal reflection.
- Develop and present clear and effective written and oral work that demonstrates critical engagement with course texts.
- Communicate well–supported ideas and arguments effectively within class discussion and debates.
- Connect course content with students' intellectual, personal, and professional lives at UF and beyond.
- Reflect on students' own and others' experience with thinking about what it means to be modern.

II. Graded Work

Description of Graded Work

1. **Active Participation and Attendance: 20%**
    a. **Participation: 10%**
        i. An exemplar participant shows evidence of having done the assigned reading before each class, consistently offers thoughtful points and questions for discussion, and listens considerately to other discussants. See participation rubric below. (R)
    b. **Class Attendance: 10%**
        i. On-time class attendance is required for this component of the course grade. Class attendance will be recorded daily. You may have two unexcused absences without any penalty, but starting with the third class missed your grade will be affected. Starting with the third unexcused absence, each unexcused absence reduces your attendance grade by 2/3: an A– becomes a B, and so on.
        ii. Except for absence because of religious holiday observance, documentation is required for excused absences, per university policy. Excessive unexcused absences (10 or more) will result in failure of the course. If you miss 10 or more classes (excused or not), you will miss material essential for successful completion of the course.

2. **Experiential Learning Component (Campus Talk): 10%**
    Students will attend one of several campus talks (options to be announced) that relates to the course topic and will subsequently prepare and submit a review of the event.

3. **In-class Reading Quizzes: 20%**
    a. Reading quizzes will be administered at the start of class on Monday, five times throughout the semester. They will test the student's knowledge of the week's readings, and may contain short-answer, true/false, and/or multiple-choice questions. Professor will provide written feedback on short-answer questions. See examination rubric below. (R)
    b. Quiz dates: Weeks 3, 5, 9, 12, 14.

4. **Midterm Examination: 25%**
    a. In Week 7, a midterm examination will be administered in class. The examination will be an in-class, 50-minute exam including essay, short-answer, true-false, and/or multiple-choice questions. Professor will provide written feedback on essay and/or short-answer questions. See examination rubric below. (R)

5. **Final Analytical Paper: 25%**
    a. During Week 13, you will submit a 2,000 word (minimum) analytical essay addressing a prompt provided to you by Week 5. You will develop an analytic argument based on your own thesis responding to the prompt. Your paper must incorporate at least four course

readings. See Canvas for more details. Professor will provide written feedback. See writing rubric below. (R)

b. Professor will evaluate and provide written feedback, on all the student's written assignments with respect to grammar, punctuation, clarity, coherence, and organization.
c. You may want to access the university's Writing Studio.
d. An additional writing guide website can be found at OWL.

III. Annotated Weekly Schedule

WEEK 1: CONVERSING WITH THE ANCIENTS: PETRARCH AND BOCCACCIO

The concept of the Renaissance—a word signifying "rebirth"—carries with it the notion of a "revival" of the culture of classical antiquity. At the same time the Renaissance, originating in fourteenth–century Italy, is also the period to which we often look back as the beginning of modernity. How do we make sense of this apparent paradox? How did the ancients help us become modern?

Renaissance scholars or "humanists"—those devoted to the *studia humanitatis* (humanities)—explored the worm–eaten collections of monastic libraries and discovered forgotten manuscripts of neglected Roman authors. Increasingly, they learned Ancient Greek, a language that was rarely studied in Western Europe in the Middle Ages (hence the phrase "it's Greek to me"), often through the aid of émigrés from the Byzantine East. They sought to restore the texts of ancient writings that had been corrupted in transmission over the centuries. They modeled their Latin and vernacular writings on ancient exemplars. And they tackled the difficult task of assimilating pagan thought to a Christian worldview, a longstanding problem in Western culture.

This week we will read the writings of two early Italian humanists, Petrarch (1304–1374) and Boccaccio (1313–1375), and will consider the ways in which they approached the reading of ancient authors. We will supplement this primary focus with some attention to the visual arts and the Renaissance art historian Giorgio Vasari (1511–1574).

Readings (73 pages)**:**

1. Petrarch, *Petrarch's Letters to Classical Authors*, trans. Mario Emilio Cosenza (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1910), pp. 1–4 (to Cicero), 21–28 (to Cicero), 100–103 (to Livy), 136–140 (to Vergil), and 148–171 (to Homer).
2. Giovanni Boccaccio, *Boccaccio on Poetry: Being the Preface and the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Books of Boccaccio's Genealogia Deorum Gentilium in an English Version with Introductory Essay and Commentary*, trans. Charles G. Osgood (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1930), pp. 80–87 and 121–129.
3. Giorgio Vasari, *The Lives of the Artists*, trans. Julia Conway Bondanella and Peter Bondanella (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 3–6 and 277–283.

Schedule:

January 13	Introduction
January 15	Petrarch
January 17	Boccaccio and Vasari

WEEK 2: MACHIAVELLI ON LIVY AND THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

Renaissance thinkers also looked to the ancients in formulating their conceptions of politics. One of the most innovative, influential, and controversial of these was Niccolò Machiavelli (1469–1527), whose name became a byword for immorality and self–interest due to the devious advice that he offered political leaders in his best–known piece of writing, *The Prince*. Machiavelli engaged directly with ancient history and political thought in another important work called the *Discourses on Livy*, a series of reflections on the early history of Rome as recorded by the ancient author Livy.

This week we will read a snippet from the very beginning of Livy's history as well as a set of more extensive excerpts from Machiavelli's *Discourses*, and we will consider how Machiavelli used the material of early Roman history to examine the nature of a republic.

Readings (Livy + 58 pages):

1. Livy, *Livy in Fourteen Volumes I: Books I and II*, trans. B. O. Foster (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919), pp. 2–9 and 63–73 (dual language; English text only on odd pages).
2. Niccolò Machiavelli, *Discourses on Livy*, trans. Harvey C. Mansfield and Nathan Tarcov (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), pp. 5–39, 123–138, and 209–215.

Schedule:

January 22	Livy and the preface to the first book of Machiavelli's *Discourses* (pp. 5–6)
January 24	Machiavelli's *Discourses*

Week 3: The Christian Humanism of Erasmus

Erasmus of Rotterdam (1466–1536) went from a cloistered life as an Augustinian monk in the Netherlands to being the most famous humanist in Europe. He first made his reputation with the *Adages*, a collection of Greek and Latin proverbs first published in 1500 that he worked on and expanded throughout his life. He was also the author of the satire *The Praise of Folly*. But his most ambitious undertaking was a novel bilingual Latin-Greek edition of the Old and New Testaments, which replaced the old Vulgate Latin translation of the Bible that had been used by the Catholic Church for over a millennium. Erasmus's work inspired early leaders of the Reformation like Martin Luther, who used Erasmus's edition as the basis for his German translation of the Bible, even though Erasmus himself opposed the Reformers as too extreme.

This week we will read two of the most substantial essays from Erasmus's *Adages* as well as the "Paraclesis" prefacing his 1516 edition of the Bible, with a focus on how Erasmus treats ancient writings and how he justifies his controversial editorial project.

Readings (82 pages)**:**

1. Erasmus, "Sileni Alcibiadis / The Sileni of Alcibiades," in *Collected Works of Erasmus: Adages II vii 1 to III iii 100* (= *CWE* 34), trans. R. A. B. Mynors (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1992), 262–282.
2. Erasmus, "Dulce bellum inexpertis / War is a treat for those who have not tried it," in *Collected Works of Erasmus: Adages III iv 1 to IV ii 100* (= *CWE* 35), trans. Denis L. Drysdall (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2005), 399–440.
3. Erasmus, "The Paraclesis of Erasmus of Rotterdam to the Pious Reader," trans. Ann Dalzell, in *Collected Works of Erasmus: The New Testament Scholarship of Erasmus* (= *CWE* 41), ed. Robert D. Sider (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2019), 393–422 (text at pp. 404–422).

Assignment: Reading Quiz #1

Schedule:

January 27	Erasmus's "The Sileni of Alcibiades"
January 29	Erasmus's "Dulce bellum inexpertis"
January 31	Erasmus's "Paracelsis"

WEEK 4: PLUTARCH AND SHAKESPEARE'S ROME I

William Shakespeare (1564–1616) was said by his contemporary Ben Jonson to have had "small Latin and less Greek." But although he never went to university, Shakespeare received a comprehensive grounding in the Classics through his grammar school education, which made him a capable reader of Latin and gave him some familiarity with a variety of ancient authors—there is even a plausible biographical tradition that before his acting and playwriting career in London the Bard "had been in his younger years a schoolmaster in the country," in which role he would have taught Latin and classical literature to his pupils.

Roman history offered a plethora of dramatic episodes for Renaissance playwrights, and Shakespeare wrote several plays on such themes. In addition to *Titus Andronicus*, a gory revenge tragedy from the early 1590s set in an indeterminate historical period, and *Cymbeline*, a late romance set in Britain just before the Roman conquest of the island, Shakespeare wrote three plays in which he drew from a collection of biographies written by the Roman-era Greek writer Plutarch, which had been translated into English by Thomas North in 1580: *Julius Caesar*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, and *Coriolanus*.

This week we will read the first half of *Julius Caesar*, which culminates with the titular character's assassination on the Ides of March, together with Plutarch's life of the historical Caesar, and will consider how Plutarch's material was appropriated and transformed by Shakespeare.

Readings (57 pages)**:**

1. Plutarch, "The Life of Julius Caesar" (excerpts), in William Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, ed. S. P. Cerasano (New York: Norton, 2012), pp. 85–100.
2. William Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, ed. S. P. Cerasano (New York: Norton, 2012), pp. 3–47 (i.e. scenes 1.1–3.1).

Schedule:

February 3	Plutarch on Julius Caesar
February 5	Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* Act 1
February 7	Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* 2.1–3.1

Week 5: Plutarch and Shakespeare's Rome II

Continuing the theme of the previous week, we will read the final two acts of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, which treats the aftermath of the assassination, the Battle of Philippi, and the suicides of the chief conspirators, Cassius and Brutus. Alongside this we will read Plutarch's life of Brutus and explore the connections between the two texts.

Readings (55 pages):

1. Plutarch, "The Life of Marcus Brutus" (excerpts), in William Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, ed. S. P. Cerasano (New York: Norton, 2012), 101–114.
2. William Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, ed. S. P. Cerasano (New York: Norton, 2012), 47–81 (i.e. scenes 3.2–5.5).

Assignment: Reading Quiz #2

Schedule:

February 10	Plutarch on Brutus and Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* 3.2–3.3
February 12	Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* Act 4
February 14	Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* Act 5

Week 6: Aristotle and Bacon on Knowledge

In medieval Europe and the Islamic world Aristotle was by far the most influential philosopher among the ancients, and many of his Greek writings were translated into Latin and Arabic. In the West, Aristotelian thought became the foundation of "scholasticism," the prevailing philosophy of the schools and universities, and was incorporated into virtually every branch of knowledge, from logic to theology to natural philosophy (or what we would think of as the natural sciences). For the Catholic theologian Thomas Aquinas, Aristotle was simply "the Philosopher." In the early modern period, however, the Aristotelian foundations of philosophy were increasingly challenged and questioned by exponents of "the new science," among the most influential of which was the philosopher Francis Bacon (1561–1626). Bacon was a prominent statesman under King James I, and his *Essays* are regarded as the first great example of the genre in English. But his most influential writings were on natural philosophy and scientific method, for which he is remembered as a major figure in the Scientific Revolution.

This week we will read excerpts from Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*, an important component of Aristotle's *Organon* ("instrument"), which deals with logical analysis and the demonstration of knowledge, together with parts of Bacon's *New Organon*, which sought to outline a new method of producing knowledge that deviated from Aristotle's.

Readings (66 pages):

1. Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics* (excerpts), trans. J. Barnes, in *A New Aristotle Reader*, ed. J. L. Ackrill (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 39–59.
2. Francis Bacon, *Novum Organum*, trans. Peter Urbach and John Gibson (Chicago: Open Court, 1994), pp. 37–41 (preface), 43–77 (§§1–67), 92–93 (§84), 99–101 (§89).

Schedule:

February 17	Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*
February 19	Bacon's *Novum Organum*
February 21	Midterm review

WEEK 7: ARISTOTLE AND HOBBES ON POLITICS

Aristotelian thought was also highly influential in the realm of political philosophy, but here too early modern thinkers began to challenge the dominance of Aristotle. Among the most controversial was Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679), the author of *Leviathan*. Hobbes developed his political philosophy amidst a period of political crisis, the English Civil Wars, which culminated in the trial and execution of King Charles I in 1649 and the transformation of the British monarchy into a republic until the Restoration in 1660.

This week we will read excerpts of Aristotle's *Politics* and Hobbes's *Leviathan*, exploring how these two philosopher's differing anthropologies, or perspectives on the nature of humankind, led to disparate conceptions of the foundations of political order, sovereignty, and liberty.

Readings (70 pages):

1. Aristotle, *Politics* (excerpts), trans. T. A. Sinclair and T. J. Saunders, in *A New Aristotle Reader*, ed. J. L. Ackrill (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 507–539.
2. Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. David Johnston (New York: Norton, 2021), 99–104, 166–176, 527–546.

Assignment: Midterm Examination

Schedule:

February 24	Midterm
February 26	Aristotle's *Politics*
February 28	Hobbes's *Leviathan*

WEEK 8: ORATORY AND POLITICAL CRISIS: ISOCRATES AND MILTON

In ancient Athens, oratory was regarded as a public and political art that could sway a court or legislature and, in doing so, could affect the lives of individuals as well as the course of nations. Oratory could play a similar role in the early modern period, even when performed on the printed page—or so thought John Milton (1608–1674), who addressed his pamphlet *Areopagitica* to the English Parliament as if it were a piece of oratory. Milton, better known as the author of the epic poem *Paradise Lost* (portions of which we will read in the coming weeks), wrote *Areopagitica* in an attempt to convince Parliament to revoke the Licensing Order of 1643, which mandated pre–publication censorship of the press. He failed in this immediate goal, but the tract went on to become a key text in the history of free speech, which the legal scholar Vincent Blasi has called "the foundational essay of the First Amendment tradition." Emphasizing the pamphlet's status as a work of oratory, Milton named it after a speech by the Greek rhetorician Isocrates called *Areopagiticus*, which recommended reinstituting the authority of the Areopagus Court in Athens.

This week we will read these two orations, the one originally oral and the other printed, by Isocrates and Milton. We will consider not only why Milton named his tract after its ancient predecessor but also, more importantly, how the two authors used rhetoric to respond to two quite different moments of political crisis.

Readings **(64 pages):**

1. Isocrates, "Areopagiticus," trans. Yun Lee Too, in *Isocrates I*, trans. David C. Mirhady and Yun Lee Too (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2000), pp. 182–200.
2. John Milton, *Areopagitica*, in John Milton, *Areopagitica and Other Writings*, ed. William Poole (London: Penguin, 2014), pp. 98–142.

Schedule:

March 3	Isocrates' "Areopagiticus"
March 5	Milton's *Areopagitica*
March 7	Milton's *Areopagitica*

Week 9: *Paradise Lost* and Classical Epic I

Milton was a devout, if theologically idiosyncratic, Christian, and at the same time a studious reader of pagan Greco-Roman authors. His talents as a classical scholar are attested by the fact that the marginal annotations that he happened to leave in his personal copy of the tragedies of Euripides were published after his death in an edition of that author by a Cambridge professor of Greek. In devising his own ideal curriculum, Milton, who worked for many years as a private schoolmaster, filled his tract *Of Education* with recommended classical authors, but he also specified that there was a higher goal behind attention to such texts: "the end [...] of learning is to repair the ruins of our first parents." The "ruins of our first parents"—the Fall, the original sin of Eve and Adam—became the theme of *Paradise Lost*, the greatest epic poem in the English language, and perhaps the greatest poem altogether.

The eighteenth–century writer Samuel Johnson judged *Paradise Lost* "a poem which, considered with respect to design, may claim the first place, and with respect to performance the second, among the productions of the human mind"—second, that is, only to Homer, the name to which the great Archaic Greek epics, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, are attributed. For Milton was writing within a long tradition of the classical epic as a genre which traced itself back to Homer and his Roman successor Vergil.

Over the next few weeks we will read six of the twelve books of *Paradise Lost*, or half of the entire epic (Johnson also once commented: "None ever wished it longer than it is"), together with excerpts from the Homeric epics and from Vergil's *Aeneid*. This week we will focus on proems or invocations of the Muse, epic similes, epic catalogues, and Satan as an Odysseus–figure.

Readings (64 pages)**:**

1. Homer, *The Iliad*, trans. Richmond Lattimore (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), pp. 75 and 104–113.
2. Homer, *The Odyssey*, trans. Richmond Lattimore (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), p. 27.
3. Vergil, *The Aeneid*, trans. Sarah Ruden (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2021), pp. 3–4.
4. John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, ed. Stephen B. Dobranski (New York: Norton, 2022), pp. 7–58.

Assignment: Reading Quiz #3

Schedule:

March 10	*Iliad* 1.1–21, *Odyssey* 1.1–10, *Aeneid* 1.1–33, and *Paradise Lost* 1.1–26
March 12	*Paradise Lost* 1.27–798 and *Iliad* 2.441–785
March 14	*Paradise Lost* Book 2

Week 10: *Paradise Lost* and Classical Epic II

After the break we continue our discussion of *Paradise Lost* and the classical epic tradition, concentrating in particular on depictions of theomachy or divine combat in the *Iliad* and *Paradise Lost*, Milton's Satan as a classical orator, and what distinguishes a Christian epic from its classical pagan precursors.

Readings (83 pages):

1. Homer, *The Iliad*, trans. Richmond Lattimore (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), pp. 146–170.
2. John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, ed. Stephen B. Dobranski (New York: Norton, 2022), pp. 134–158 and 195–227.

Schedule:

March 24	*Iliad* Book 5
March 26	*Paradise Lost* Book 6
March 28	*Paradise Lost* Book 9

WEEK 11: *PARADISE LOST* AND CLASSICAL EPIC III

This week concludes our discussion of *Paradise Lost* and the classical epic tradition. We will consider the end of Milton's epic, which deals with the immediate aftermath of the Fall, in relation to several episodes from the *Aeneid*, attending in particular to Milton's Eve as compared to Vergil's Dido (the queen of Carthage who kills herself after being abandoned by Aeneas) and the archangel Michael's revelation of the salvation history of mankind to Adam as compared with Vergilian visions of the future of Rome.

Readings (71 pages):

1. Vergil, *The Aeneid*, trans. Sarah Ruden (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2021), pp. 105–109, 163–172, and 343–348.
2. John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, ed. Stephen B. Dobranski (New York: Norton, 2022), pp. 228–258, and 284–302.

Schedule:

March 31	*Aeneid* 4.584–705 and *Paradise Lost* Book 10
April 2	*Aeneid* 6.679–901 and 12.791–952
April 4	*Paradise Lost* Book 12

WEEK 12: THE BATTLE OF THE BOOKS: ANCIENTS VERSUS MODERNS

In the late seventeenth century a dispute erupted at the Académie Française in Paris and spread throughout European learned circles over whether or to what extent modern culture had surpassed that of the Ancient Greeks and Romans. It became known as the "Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns" or, after the satirist Jonathan Swift's intervention in the controversy, the "Battle of the Books." This week we will read a variety of French and English documents participating in the "Quarrel," including salvos from the "Moderns" Bernard Le Bovier de Fontenelle (1657–1757) and Richard Bentley (1662–1742), ripostes by the "Ancients" Swift (1667–1745) and Alexander Pope (1688–1744), and finally a brief, later reflection on the dispute by Voltaire (1694–1778).

Readings **(57 pages):**

1. Bernard Le Bovier de Fontenelle, "A Digression on the Ancients and the Moderns," trans. Donald Schier, in *The Continental Model: Selected French Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century in English Translation*, eds. Scot Elledge and Donald Schier (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1960), 358–370.
2. Richard Bentley, *A Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris, Themistocles, Socrates, Euripides, and Others; and the Fables of Aesop* (London: J. Leake for Peter Buck, 1697), 3–15, 66–68.
3. Jonathan Swift, "The Battle of the Books," in *The Essential Writings*, ed. Claude Rawson and Ian Higgins (New York: Norton, 2010), pp. 95–111.
4. Alexander Pope, *The Dunciad* (excerpt from Book 4) in *Selected Poetry and Prose*, ed. Robin Sowerby (London: Routledge, 1988), 205–211.
5. Voltaire, "Ancients and Moderns," in *Voltaire's Philosophical Dictionary*, trans. H. I. Woolf (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1923), pp. 17–20.

Assignment: Reading Quiz #4

Schedule:

April 7	Fontenelle's "Digression"
April 9	Bentley and Swift
April 11	Pope and Voltaire

WEEK 13: ENLIGHTENMENT HELLENISM: VICO AND WINCKELMANN

The Enlightenment brought about a renewed regard for Greek antiquity; in this week we will explore two prominent examples from eighteenth–century cultural history. Our first author is Giambattista Vico (1668–1744), a professor of rhetoric at the University of Naples whose principal work, *The New Science*, presented a universal theory of the historical development. Our reading comes from the third book of Vico's treatise, on the "Discovery of the True Homer," which proposes an understanding of Homeric poetry and Archaic Greek culture that has proved highly influential among scholars down to the present.

Our second author this week is Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717–1768), a German art historian and archaeologist whose writings on Ancient Greek art inspired such figures as Goethe and Nietzsche. Winckelmann wrote reports about the early excavations of Herculaneum, an ancient Roman town that like nearby Pompeii was destroyed in the first–century eruption of Mount Vesuvius and composed an extensive and widely read *History of the Art of Antiquity*. For our reading this week we will focus on an early and influential essay of his "On the Imitation of the Painting and Sculpture of the Greeks."

Readings (65 pages):

1. Giambattista Vico, *The New Science*, trans. Jason Taylor and Robert C. Miner (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2020), pp. 331–361.
2. Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *Reflections on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and Sculpture*, trans. Elfriede Heyer and Roger C. Norton (La Salle: Open Court, 1987), 3–69 (dual language; English text only on odd pages).

Assignment: Analytical Paper Due

Schedule:

April 14	Vico
April 16	Winckelmann
April 18	Winckelmann + analytical paper due

Week 14: Classical Antiquity and the American Founding

With few exceptions the Founding Fathers of the United States of America, like many of their compatriots, were steeped in ancient learning. Colonial institutions modeled after English grammar schools and universities taught a classical curriculum that included Latin and Greek language instruction as well as lessons in ancient literature, history, and philosophy. The writings of the Founders are, accordingly, loaded with quotations of and references to classical texts. The Classics were an important part of their intellectual world, such that their thoughts and actions were colored by their reading of Greek and Roman authors.

This week, to conclude the course, we will examine a few different contexts from this period in which the influence of classical antiquity in one form or another can be detected. We will read several of the *Federalist Papers*, a series of essays advocating for the ratification of the Constitution of the United States composed by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay under the collective pseudonym "Publius" (itself a classical reference), and will consider the role that ancient history and classical political thought played in the authors' arguments. We will also read two brief excerpts from Thomas Jefferson's *Notes on the State of Virginia* and several of his letters alongside a poem by the African-American poet Phillis Wheatley, who is mentioned in passing by Jefferson; this will allow us to explore the various ways in which the classical legacy was appropriated around the time of the American Founding.

Readings (62 pages)**:**

1. Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay, *The Federalist Papers*, ed. Ian Shapiro (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), pp. 26–31 (no. 6), 42–46 (no. 9), 88–93 (no. 18), 185–192 (no. 38), 354–360 (no. 70).
2. Phillis Wheatley, "To Maecenas," in Phillis Wheatley, *Collected Works*, ed. John Shields (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), pp. 9–12.
3. Thomas Jefferson, "Notes on the State of Virginia," in Thomas Jefferson, *Selected Writings*, ed. Wayne Franklin (New York: Norton, 2010), pp. 66–67 and 118–126.
4. Thomas Jefferson, *Selected Writings*, ed. Wayne Franklin (New York: Norton, 2010), pp. 227–230, 243–244, 247–248, 283–284, and 342–346.

Assignment: Reading Quiz #5

Schedule:

April 21	*Federalist Papers*
April 23	Jefferson and Wheatley

IV. Grading Scale and Rubrics

Grading Scale

For information on UF's grading policies for assigning grade points, see here.

A	94 – 100%		C	74 – 76%
A–	90 – 93%		C–	70 – 73%
B+	87 – 89%		D+	67 – 69%
B	84 – 86%		D	64 – 66%
B–	80 – 83%		D–	60 – 63%
C+	77 – 79%		E	<60

Grading Rubrics

Participation Rubric

Grade	Description
A (90–100%)	Typically comes to class with pre–prepared questions about the readings. Engages others about ideas, respects the opinions of others and consistently elevates the level of discussion.
B (80–89%)	Does not always come to class with pre–prepared questions about the reading. Waits passively for others to raise interesting issues. Some in this category, while courteous and articulate, do not adequately listen to other participants or relate their comments to the direction of the conversation.
C (70–79%)	Attends regularly but typically is an infrequent or unwilling participant in discussion. Is only adequately prepared for discussion.
D (60–69%)	Fails to attend class regularly and is inadequately prepared for discussion. Is an unwilling participant in discussion.
E (<60%)	Attends class infrequently and is wholly unprepared for discussion. Refuses to participate in discussion.

Examination Rubric: Essays and Short Answers

	Completeness	Analysis	Evidence	Writing
A (90–100%)	Shows a thorough understanding of the question. Addresses all aspects of the question completely.	Analyses, evaluates, compares and/or contrasts issues and events with depth.	Incorporates pertinent and detailed information from both class discussions and assigned readings.	Presents all information clearly and concisely, in an organized manner.
B (80–89%)	Presents a general understanding of the question. Completely addresses most aspects of the question or address all aspects incompletely.	Analyses or evaluates issues and events, but not in any depth.	Includes relevant facts, examples and details but does not support all aspects of the task evenly.	Presents information fairly and evenly and may have minor organization problems.
C (70–79%)	Shows a limited understanding of the question. Does not address most aspects of the question.	Lacks analysis or evaluation of the issues and events beyond stating accurate, relevant facts.	Includes relevant facts, examples and details, but omits concrete examples, includes inaccurate information and/or does not support all aspects of the task.	Lacks focus, somewhat interfering with comprehension.
D (60–69%)	Fails fully to answer the specific central question.	Lacks analysis or evaluation of the issues and events beyond stating vague, irrelevant, and/or inaccurate facts.	Does not incorporate information from pertinent class discussion and/or assigned readings.	Organizational problems prevent comprehension.
E (<60%)	Does not answer the specific central question.	Lacks analysis or evaluation of the issues and events.	Does not adduce any evidence.	Incomprehensible organization and prose.

Writing Rubric

	Thesis and Argumentation	Use of Sources	Organization	Grammar, mechanics and style
A (90–100%)	Thesis is clear, specific, and presents a thoughtful, critical, engaging, and creative interpretation. Argument fully supports the thesis both logically and thoroughly.	Primary (and secondary texts, if required) are well incorporated, utilized, and contextualized throughout.	Clear organization. Introduction provides adequate background information and ends with a thesis. Details are in logical order. Conclusion is strong and states the point of the paper.	No errors.
B (80–89%)	Thesis is clear and specific, but not as critical or original. Shows insight and attention to the text under consideration. May have gaps in argument's logic.	Primary (and secondary texts, if required) are incorporated but not contextualized significantly.	Clear organization. Introduction clearly states thesis, but does not provide as much background information. Details are in logical order, but may be more difficult to follow. Conclusion is recognizable and ties up almost all loose ends.	A few errors.
C (70–79%)	Thesis is present but not clear or specific, demonstrating a lack of critical engagement to the text. Argument is weak, missing important details or making logical leaps with little support.	Primary (and secondary texts, if required) are mostly incorporated but are not properly contextualized.	Significant lapses in organization. Introduction states thesis but does not adequately provide background information. Some details not in logical or expected order that results in a distracting read. Conclusion is recognizable but does not tie up all loose ends.	Some errors.
D (60–69%)	Thesis is vague and/or confused. Demonstrates a failure to understand the text. Argument lacks any logical flow and does not utilize any source material.	Primary and/or secondary texts are almost wholly absent.	Poor, hard-to-follow organization. There is no clear introduction of the main topic or thesis. There is no clear conclusion, and the paper just ends. Little or no employment of logical body paragraphs.	Many errors.
E (<60%)	There is neither a thesis nor any argument.	Primary and/or secondary texts are wholly absent.	The paper is wholly disorganized, lacking an introduction, conclusion or any logical coherence.	Scores of errors.

V. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

At the end of this course, students will be expected to have achieved the Quest the General Education student learning outcomes for Humanities (H).

Humanities (H) Humanities courses must afford students the ability to think critically through the mastering of subjects concerned with human culture, especially literature, history, art, music, and philosophy, and must include selections from the Western canon.

Humanities courses provide instruction in the history, key themes, principles, terminology, and theory or methodologies used within a humanities discipline or the humanities in general. Students will learn to identify and to analyze the key elements, biases and influences that shape thought. These courses emphasize clear and effective analysis and approach issues and problems from multiple perspectives.

Content: *Students demonstrate competence in the terminology, concepts, theories and methodologies used within the discipline(s).*

- Identify, describe, and explain the methodologies used across humanities disciplines to examine essential ideas about the relationship between antiquity and modernity (Quest 1, H). **Assessment**: midterm exam, analytical essay, in–class reading quizzes.
- Identify, describe, and explain key questions and problems with respect to the relationship between antiquity and modernity (Quest 1, H). **Assessment**: midterm exam, analytical essay, in–class reading quizzes.

Critical Thinking: *Students carefully and logically analyze information from multiple perspectives and develop reasoned solutions to problems within the discipline(s).*

- Analyze how different course authors have thought about the dynamic between antiquity and modernity (Quest 1, H). **Assessment**: analytical essay, midterm exam.
- Analyze and evaluate specific ideas regarding the relationship between antiquity and modernity, using close reading, critical analysis, class discussion, and personal reflection. (Quest 1, H). **Assessment**: analytical essay, midterm exam.

Communication: *Students communicate knowledge, ideas and reasoning clearly and effectively in written and oral forms appropriate to the discipline(s).*

- Develop and present clear and effective written and oral work that demonstrates critical engagement with course texts (Quest 1, H). **Assessment:** active class participation, analytical essay, midterm exam.
- Communicate well–supported ideas and arguments effectively within class discussion and debates (Quest 1, H). **Assessment:** active class participation.

Connection: *Students connect course content with meaningful critical reflection on their intellectual, personal, and professional development at UF and beyond.*

- Connect course content with students' intellectual, personal, and professional lives at UF and beyond. (Quest 1). **Assessment:** active class participation, analytical paper.
- Reflect on students' own and others' experience with thinking about what it means to be modern (Quest 1). **Assessment:** active class participation, analytical paper.

VI. Quest Learning Experiences

1. Details of Experiential Learning Component

Students will attend one of several campus talks (options to be announced) that relates to the course topic and will subsequently prepare and submit a review of the event.

2. Details of Self-Reflection Component

Self–reflection is built into many of the assignments, primarily through class discussion and the analytical paper assignment. In these opportunities for self-reflection offered by specific activities throughout the course, students will reflect on the broader implications of the themes of the course, considering the impact to themselves and/or to a wider community.

VII. Required Policies

Attendance Policy

Requirements for class attendance and make–up exams, assignments and other work in this course are consistent with university policies that can be found here.

Students Requiring Accommodation

Students with disabilities who experience learning barriers and would like to request academic accommodations should connect with the Disability Resource Center. It is important for students to share their accommodation letter with their instructor and discuss their access needs, as early as possible in the semester.

UF Evaluations Process

Students are expected to provide professional and respectful feedback on the quality of instruction in this course by completing course evaluations online via GatorEvals. Guidance on how to give feedback in a professional and respectful manner is available here. Students will be notified when the evaluation period opens and can complete evaluations through the email they receive from GatorEvals, in their Canvas course menu under GatorEvals, or via this link. Summaries of course evaluation results are available to students at GatorEvals Public Data.