A team-taught course on Greek civilization was designed to reach a broad audience of majors and non-majors at the University of New Mexico and has changed in response to faculty and student responses. The first version of the course covered Greek and Roman culture and presented a variety of guest lecturers, but student comments indicated that too much material was covered. The course was cut in half and transformed into an interdisciplinary Greek civilization course taught by two professors. The course was advertised through a widespread cross-listing to appeal to as many students as possible. Distributing flyers was effective in recruiting 140 to 170 students each time the course was offered every spring for 4 years. The current version of the course is divided into Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greece, with a heavy emphasis on the first two. The instructors rely mainly on primary sources to accompany the lectures every week. The instructors have tried a variety of strategies to provide small groups of students with access to instructors, since the department does not have enough money to hire discussion section leaders. The exams follow the tried-and-true essay format. Students unanimously agree on the effectiveness of using slides to accompany lectures. The success of the course has led to the petitioning of the university to add a new interdisciplinary major and minor in Classical Civilization. (The syllabus is attached.) (RS)
Introduction

I'd like to tell you a little bit about our Classics program at the University of New Mexico, and how it is currently being transformed by the infusion of "Civilization" (or, to be more current, "Cultural Studies") courses taught in English to reach a broader audience of majors and non-majors alike. I want to talk specifically about our very successful team-taught interdisciplinary Greek Civilization course, a class which in its four-year history has drawn an enrollment of between 140 and 170 students every Spring it has been offered. Let me share with you first the trials and tribulations we experienced in shaping the course to its present (and I think optimal) form, and then talk a bit about some strategies that we've found effective in making the course work both for the students and for the program as a whole.

Background

I arrived at the University of New Mexico five years ago, straight from graduate school. My new faculty position was initially funded by an NEH grant, and the explicit charge was that I was to develop a new slate of Classical Civilization courses in translation: our program so far had only included Greek and Latin language courses, with the only possible major being in languages. The grant also offered a little seed money for start-up projects, such as advertising, printing flyers, workshops, and honoraria for visiting lecturers. My senior colleague in Classics had already requested a couple of new course numbers the previous year - at our school, it takes an act of God and Congress and almost two years of paperwork to get a new course number! - so I was all set to go. My first new course that first Fall was a multi-media extravaganza, a 100-level Greek Mythology course. No problem there, as I was the sole mistress of ceremonies: it was easy to satisfy only one ego, especially since it was my own.

But then I decided to design a team-taught interdisciplinary course, along the lines of a course I had taken as a freshman in college, which was called "Western Civilization" but known to the students as "Plato to NATO." Picture it: Berkeley, 1980. Reagan had just been elected, and it was still acceptable to name a course "Western Civilization" without appending some disclaimer about the evil white male imperialists. Part I of this course, on the ancient Greek and Roman world, changed my life. This course yanked me out of a major in Journalism and set me squarely down in Greek and Latin classes... forever, as it turned out! It was taught by
two professors who alternated their lectures on various topics in ancient history, art and literature, and the eighteen-year-old me was transfixed, hooked: just add water, an instant Classics major. So now, as a Classics professor, I wanted to have something of the same effect on my students at the University of New Mexico: I was confident that I could reach out there and touch a few Pharmacy majors the way I had been touched. And what's more, I wanted to give my UNM faculty colleagues interested in the study of antiquity a chance to participate in such a unique and exciting adventure. I had no idea what trouble this would cause, how much ego-massaging it would entail: well, I was young, idealistic and rather naive.

That first spring, then, I offered a course called "Classics 204: Greece and Rome" (*staged* would be a more appropriate verb: this quickly turned into a comedy of errors!) The cast was as follows. My senior colleague, a Latinist, and I (a Hellenist) decided to share the literature lectures; I invited a colleague from Philosophy to do a few lectures, who had to be convinced that the enrollment would not be too large, as he was used to small, reading-type classes; I also invited a colleague from Art History who specializes in Renaissance art (we have no one who does ancient art exclusively), who finally agreed to do a few slide lectures; finally, with some trepidation but out of a strong programmatic necessity, I invited UNM's only ancient historian, to join us: my nervousness arose from the fact that he is our most notorious campus celebrity, a real 60's type who rails against all forms of oppression, from the University Administration to the Dallas Cowboys, in a weekly and widely-read column in the *Lobo*, our school newspaper, among other places. But his classes are packed, standing room only, sold out weeks in advance of registration, and his talent as a teacher was legendary. To my delight, he gave me an enthusiastic "yes."

After what was not surprisingly a pretty rocky semester, I had to take stock of the situation: should this class ever be offered again? and if so, in what form? The results of this first experiment in team-teaching were variously reported in the student evaluation forms. First of all, it was just too much material: the students' heads were spinning from such a broad and superficial sweep of two massive ancient cultures, Greek and Roman. Second, instead of being excited by the number of different professors, the students seemed frustrated by the constant change in style and attitude of the faculty involved: the course was "like a manic-depressive personality," one of them wrote, sometimes wildly creative, sometimes deadly dull. Let me share with you one of the student comments from that first semester, which is still one of the worst I've ever seen: "I'd rather drink Drano than listen to Professor X lecture." It was clear, especially to the students, that some of the faculty did not want to, or merely could not, participate in this kind of pedagogical adventure. There were some positive comments, too: as I expected, the students loved the historian's lectures (especially those dramatic moments when his eyes would well up with tears, like when he describes the Spartans at Thermopylae or the
death of Alexander the Great); they also enjoyed the reading from primary sources, getting into the actual ancient works.

So before the next spring rolled around, I initiated cuts drastic enough to make me an honorary Republican member of Congress. First, I cut the existing course in half: the class would now be on "Greek Civilization" only (eventually, I planned to create a "Roman Civilization" companion course, if this one were successful). Then, I "downsized" the staff: I fired everyone except the historian. This was easily accomplished, since my senior colleague in Classics went on sabbatical, the philosopher was happy to escape back to his small seminars, and the art historian did not want to participate again. So, what you see in the syllabus before you (in the handout) is the result of this early and absolutely necessary retooling of the course, into something more along the lines of what I originally intended: an interdisciplinary civilization course taught by two professors who alternate their lectures on various topics in ancient history and literature, with a little philosophy and art thrown in for good measure. Oh, yes, and taught by two professors who really want to be there, who are comfortable with the large lecture-class format (that is, they have a bit of the ham in them), who genuinely enjoy the material and can get that enthusiasm across to the students, and who are committed to the project with all its many goals. You might then ask, how do we do what we do?

Advertising

The most significant challenge we face as teachers of Classics is drumming up interest among the "MTV generation" for our subject: how do we get their pierced little bodies into class? Do we trick them? Bribe them? Bully them? Lure them? Well, in my experience, a combination of approaches seems to work best. First of all, we have to make it worth their while, especially if they are not Classics majors. Obviously, we require the course for Classics majors (that's the bullying part!), but how do we get the non-major into the course? We can't just tell them that the study of this great civilization will form the basis for all their other studies at the University as well as help them with Life, because that, as you know, isn't seductive enough: we need to make the course PAY OFF in some short term way. This course would have to satisfy some requirement, it would have to fit somewhere into the dreaded "distribution requirement worksheet" that the students must fill out for graduation. So, I came up with the marketing idea of widespread cross-listing to appeal to as many students as possible: you will note on the syllabus that the course is officially designated as Classics 204, however, students may also enroll under the headings History, Philosophy, or Art History 204 (AOA means "Also Offered As"). This allows the student to choose the designation which best fits into his or her own curriculum, or progression towards degree: for example, a History major can take the course
under History to fulfill the total major hours required. Or a science student may enroll under Classics or Philosophy to satisfy a Humanities breadth requirement. Over the four years, I've found that most students, about half, sign up under History; the other three designations split the remaining eighty or so students among them. Of course, every semester we try to cover enough interdisciplinary ground to merit this privilege of cross-listing, since it has proved to be by far the greatest inducement for the students to sign up for the course.

As far as other advertising efforts go, we also distribute a mountain of flyers announcing the course: a recent example is on the first page of your hand-out. Good places to recruit students, as we've discovered, include the Western Civilization 101 classes, English 100 classes, beginning language classes, and my own 100-level Mythology class: we just ask the instructors to announce the course and leave stacks of flyers on the desk. We have also placed ads in the school paper, but that can be terribly expensive, and the flyers seem to work just as well. My colleague's weekly anti-establishment column in the student paper also serves us as free advertising: the students feel "cool" to be taking a course from the campus gadfly. The first year I organized the course, we still had enough money in the grant to send out a mass-mailing in fall about the course to all UNM freshman, which was a good way to target a susceptible audience. But since then, we have benefitted a great deal from word of mouth recommendations, which, as you know, is really the most effective type of advertising: we'll be counting on this established popularity when we launch the "Roman Civilization" course next Spring.

Course Content

As you look at the syllabus, you see that the course is divided, like Gaul and any part of the Hegelian universe, into three parts: Archaic, Classical and Hellenisitic Greece, with a heavy emphasis on the first two. We do experience a bit of a crunch when we get to the end of the course, but we've made our peace with it in order to get through what we consider the most important and interesting part of Greek culture: let me remind you, this was the part of the course originally reserved for Rome! So we think we've made an improvement on that score. As you look at the different reading assignments, you can see that we rely mainly on primary sources to accompany the lectures every week. Both of us incorporate the readings into our weekly remarks: we attend each other's lectures and end up referring to each other quite often (sometimes with great dramatic flourish)! We have over the years ordered more actual texts as books, as the copyright laws have allowed us to reproduce fewer materials in the xerox packet: for example, we used to just include xeroxed portions of Thucydides' history in the packet, but now we order the entire Penguin volume. According to our University policy, we still
try to keep total costs down. I won’t comment on each text in detail, but let me share with you a few observations on what I’ve found notable/interesting/problematic in the course content:

1) You have to do both the Iliad and the Odyssey. The first year we just did the Odyssey, and kept referring to the Iliad; the second year we just did the Iliad, and kept referring to the Odyssey. Hence, the students (and the professors) got confused. Moreover, both poems are indispensable to the study of tragedy and comedy later in the course. You just have to do both. We do leave a bit more time for the Iliad, as you can see.

2) We somewhat sophistically include the Oresteia at the end of the Archaic period in order to talk about the transition between old and new forms of justice, and to set the stage (as it were) for the phenomenon of the Attic theatre.

3) I’ve tried doing Oedipus Rex before Antigone, because it follows "myth time" and so doesn’t confuse the class, but my Western linear mind won’t allow me to subvert the actual chronology (so far as we know) of the plays. Also, Antigone is such a simpler play, it makes sense to do it before Oedipus, which is much more difficult and so benefits from the later reading.

4) I’ve chosen these two comedies, Acharnians and Lysistrata, because they relate well to our discussion of the Peloponnesian War. Well, okay, I chose the Lysistrata because it’s sexy and easily accessible to the crowd. I did try the Clouds once, in connection with the Socrates lecture, but the students didn’t get it: let’s just say, if they had been on his jury, they would have voted for conviction!

5) Medea works well because of the later tie-in with Apollonius’ Argonautica. the students feel like they are getting the “inside scoop” of Medea and Jason’s early life together: they know the golden honeymoon was destined not to last forever.

6) The students love the primary literary sources, but they also clamored for an additional “textbook with all the history.” The little Hollister text Roots of the Western Tradition was ordered this year in response to this request: it has the advantage of outlining both Greek and Roman history, so the returning student can use it next year (another marketing tool!). So far it seems to be doing the job: I am awaiting the students’ comments. The Pollitt book Art and Experience has served us well, especially when we have fewer art lectures.

7) The xerox packet (samples are available for perusal) contains lots of various items: outlines, more notes on authors, and the lyric and Hellenistic poetry selections that form part of the assigned reading.

Every time the course has been offered, the reading assignments and lecture format have varied somewhat: as you’ve probably guessed, we are not afraid to learn from the previous year’s experience! "If it doesn’t grow corn, plow it under."
Reviews/Examinations

Most university courses of this size offer weekly discussion sections where smaller groups of students meet with teaching assistants to go over the lectures and readings, and to refine what they've already learned. My department still does not have enough money to hire actual section leaders for this class. In the absence of such sections, we have tried a number of strategies. The first year we offered an "optional" review session with both professors before the exams: and even though we held these right after class, only a handful of students ever showed up. The next year, I tried writing the pre-exam review sessions right into the syllabus, giving us the obvious advantage of having a captive audience: but the sessions were for the most part brief affairs, with silent students and garrulous profs holding forth on such non-relevant (but nevertheless fascinating) topics as petting on the first date or the NFL draft. Finally, last year, we hit on what I think is the best recipe: I passed out lists of "study questions" for the exams, examples of which are in your hand-out. Now, the review sessions are very viable discussion meetings, with students eager to ask questions to fill in the gaps in what they know they are expected to know. It is also amusing to watch them try to "psych us out" as to which questions we'll put on the test. We still endeavor to make the reviews fun and interesting, with a sort of "he said, she said" agonistic tone to our presentation, which the students seem to enjoy.

Last year, we showed up to one of the reviews in 18th century costume, and we answered all the students' questions from the rather un-p.c. perspective of a couple from the British Enlightenment. This year, my colleague suggested we come as nomos ("culture") and physis ("nature"), but we couldn't agree on who would get to be "nature"!

As for the exams themselves, they basically follow the tried-and-true essay format. From the list of study questions for the first two exams, we choose two for the actual exams: we try to pick one question which will appeal to the history-types in the class, and one which is more literature-based. There are three exams: one following the Archaic period section of the course, with very particular questions looking for very specific answers; another following the Classical period, where the questions allow the students to think a bit more deeply about the texts and the Athenian experience they may represent; and the final exam, where we ask the students to tackle one great-big "what-does-Greece-mean-to-me" type question, including what they've learned in the (admittedly) brief excursus into the Hellenistic world, and to synthesize as many aspects of Greek culture as they can into their eloquent and insightful answers. Since the time elapsed between the second and third tests is very short, we allow them to choose one question in advance and prepare only that one.
Guest Lectures & Other Accessories

When I "right-sized" the teaching personnel for this class, I was left with the not-inconsiderable problem that some areas of study would remain under-represented in the course syllabus, namely philosophy and art history. This would have the potential to damage the inter-disciplinary integrity of the course I had designed. My colleague and I addressed this problem to some extent by splitting the two orphan disciplines between us: he took over the topics in philosophy, as you can see on the syllabus, and I decided to incorporate the visual arts into my literature lectures (more about the use of slides in just a bit). But we also thought it was important to try to include the presentations of some intermittent "experts." Our success in adding these "guest lectures" to the syllabus has varied considerably from term to term, based on the availability and philanthropy of our colleagues, since our seed money for honoraria and thus our ability to compensate these guests pretty much dried up after the first year. So now we just beg, borrow, steal or even hustle whomever we can: for example, one year we "stole" a visitor to the Theater Department, a specialist in the presentation of Classical drama, who illustrated for our class his recent production of *Oedipus*; another year we "borrowed" a candidate for a job in the History Department, an historian of science, who spoke to us, as part of his on-campus interview, about the Milesian philosopher-scientists; last year, our architectural historian took the class on a slide-accompanied journey from the city gates of Athens along the Sacred Way up to the Acropolis, just like the chorus of the *Eumenides*. This year, we begged him for another art lecture, which he gave last week; we have also secured the contribution of a retired colleague in Classics whose specialty is the Hellenistic Anthology. It is my belief that such "guest lectures" add variety without disturbing the students' sense of continuity; however, from reading the evaluations, the students on the whole seem rather less impressed. I'm not quite sure why: the guest lecturers seem nervous, perhaps? not in with the flow of the class? Whatever it may be, this is one area where I don't feel bound by slavish adherence to popular demand.

One thing the students unanimously agree on is the effectiveness of using slides. Of course, any guest art historian will use slides to accompany his or her lecture. But I have also become hooked on tapping into the visual aesthetic to get my literature points across. So what started as something of a necessity, in order to incorporate Greek art and archaeology back into our course, has now become powerful tool for making even the literary material delightfully accessible. At first, I must confess, I was rather dubious: can they take proper notes in the dark? (yes) and, don't some of them fall asleep? (also yes) It is true that while the students' eyes are transfixed on the screen, they seem to write down a lot less than they would without the pictures: however, I'm told that lots of studies prove that what the students SEE will make a
much deeper impression upon them than what they merely read: "a picture's worth a thousand
words" and all that. Some examples of how I use slides in literature lectures: in one of the Iliad
lectures, I show them the ancient site of Troy and talk about how archaeological methods have
changed; in the Oresteia lecture, I show them the ancient theaters at Epidauros and what's left
of the Theater of Dionysus at Athens and talk about the external features of Attic drama; and
during the Bacchae lecture, I do a survey of Attic vase-painting, focusing on the ubiquitous
drinking-cup figures of maenads and satyrs. We have offered viewings of films outside of class,
but again, we've had trouble attracting a sizable audience when the screening is "optional": I
think for the Rome class next year, we will incorporate the films right into the class schedule.
Another good idea: I always include a brief skit during my lecture on Aristophanes, often with
student volunteers as actors: the scene in the Lysistrata between the horny Kin-sias and his
teasing wife Myrhinne is always a big hit. This year, my colleague showed up to model his
costume from a local summer production of Lysistrata, complete with huge leather phallos,
which he raised and lowered on its string throughout my lecture, causing shrieks of laughter
and general pandemonium in the class. Now, it was all in the interest of fun, of course, but I
think the class also learned something about the nature of Aristophanic humor!

Recruitment

Finally, a word about how this kind of course can help your Classics program.
Obviously, big enrollments are the stuff of dreams for deans and department chairs: they'll
smile at you in the hallway and slap you on the back at meetings and show your enrollment
stats, like baby pictures, to all your envious colleagues. So you can use this newfound clout to
build on for other requests to help your program: money for slides, visiting lecturers, teaching
software, books, a wet-bar in your office, whatever you want! Another benefit we earned by
having courses such as this was that we were able to petition the College successfully for the
addition of a whole new interdisciplinary major and minor in Classical Civilization, to add to
the existing major in Classical Languages and the minors in Greek and Latin. But perhaps most
important of all, these classes serve as the fertile ground where we plant the seeds of interest in
the study of the ancient languages themselves: each year after this course and others like it, we
draw an increasing number of students into beginning Greek and Latin, some of whom even
become majors in our program! And, as I know from my own personal experience, a class like this
might even be where a Classics professor is born.
This course will meet TT 12:30-1:45 pm in Mitchell Hall 101.

This is an introductory survey of classical Greek history, literature, art and philosophy designed to give students a familiarity with ancient Greek culture by using an interdisciplinary approach of interpretation. The emphasis will be on Greek culture as it manifests itself in the primary literary sources: epic, lyric and dramatic poetry, as well as historical and philosophical texts.

This course will consist of lectures: there will also be three opportunities for in-class review and discussion panels. This is a team-taught course: as noted in the schedule of lectures, each professor will lecture on different days. Students will be expected to prepare as homework the entire reading assignment for each scheduled class as specified on the syllabi is. Reading from optional texts is noted in square brackets.

The are no prerequisites for this course. Requirements for a grade in the course are two hour exams (30% each) and one comprehensive final exam (40%).

Required Texts:

Homer, Iliad: trans. R. Lattimore (Chicago)
   Odyssey: trans. R. Fitzgerald (Doubleday)
Aeschylus I: Oresteia: ed. Grene and Lattimore (Chicago)
Sophocles I: Three Tragedies: ed. Grene and Lattimore (Chicago)
Euripides I: Four Tragedies: ed. Grene and Lattimore (Chicago)
   V: Three Tragedies: ed. Grene and Lattimore (Chicago)
Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War: trans. R. Warner (Penguin)
Aristophanes, Lysistrata, Acharnians, Clouds: trans. A. Sommerstein (Penguin)
Apollonius of Rhodes, The Voyage of Argo: trans. E.V. Rieu (Penguin)
**Xerox Packet: available at the SUB Copy Center

Optional Texts:

Pollitt, J.J. Art and Experience in Classical Greece (Cambridge)
Hollister, C.W. Roots of the Western Tradition (Mc-Graw Hill)
THE DARK AGE & THE ARCHAIC PERIOD, ca. 1184 - 480 BCE

Wk 1 17 Jan.  Club Hellas Presents: The Greeks (Cyrino/Berthold)
19 Jan.  Blind Homer and the Dark Age Blues (Berthold)

Reading:  begin Homer, Iliad [Hollister, pp. 67-79]

Wk 2 24 Jan.  Introduction to the Iliad: Agon and Ecstasy (Cyrino)
26 Jan.  In the Line of Fire: the Iliad at Close Range (Cyrino)

Reading:  finish Homer, Iliad

Wk 3 31 Jan.  The Hoplites Hop In: the Archaic Age (Berthold)
2 Feb.  The Hero Who Loved Me: the Wanderings of Odysseus (Cyrino)

Reading:  Homer, Odyssey [Hollister, pp. 80-95]

Wk 4 7 Feb.  Gods, who needs em? Rationalism and Humanism (Berthold)
9 Feb.  Archilochos, Sappho and Lyric Pop Stardom (Cyrino)

Reading:  lyric poetry selections (xerox packet)
 [Pollitt, pp. 3-14; Hollister pp. 108-112]

Wk 5 14 Feb.  Orestes' Excellent Adventure: the Development of Justice
16 Feb.  Ancient Theater and the Argosville Horror (Cyrino)

Reading:  Aeschylus, Agamemnon, Libation Bearers, Eumenides

Wk 6 21 Feb.  Review and Discussion (Cyrino/Berthold)
23 Feb.  1ST HOUR EXAM (30%)

THE CLASSICAL PERIOD, 480 - 323 BCE

Wk 7 28 Feb.  Morality for Sale or Rent: Sophism (Berthold)
2 Mar.  Family Values and the Single Woman: Antigone (Cyrino)

Reading:  Sophocles, Antigone [Pollitt, pp. 15-63; Hollister, pp. 113-115]

Wk 8 7 Mar.  One Adult Male, One Vote: Athenian Democracy (Berthold)
9 Mar.  Oedipus and the Limits of Knowledge, or Do You Know Who Your Parents Are? (Cyrino)

Reading:  Thucydides, I.89-117, II.34-46; Sophocles, Oedipus Rex [Hollister, pp. 96-107]
Wk 9 21 Mar. Athens in Vietnam: the Failure of the Democracy (Berthold)
23 Mar. Fatal Attraction: the Revenge of Medea (Cyrino)

Reading: Thucydides, I.56-117, II.47-65, III.36-50, V.13-24, 84-116, VI.8-32; Euripides, Medea [Hollister, pp. 121-135]

Wk 10 28 Mar. Heavy Heads: Socrates, Plato and Aristotle (Berthold)
30 Mar. LIVE, from Athens, it's Aristophanes! (Cyrino)

Reading: Plato, Apology; Aristophanes, Acharnians & Lysistrata [Hollister, pp. 115-120]

Wk 11 4 Apr. The Limits of Civilization, or Why Ask Why? the Bacchae and Nature (Cyrino)
6 Apr. All Power to the Phallos: Sex and Society (Berthold)

Reading: Euripides, Bacchae

Wk 12 11 Apr. Beauty and the Best: Classical Greek Art (*guest lecture* by Dr. Christopher Mead)
13 Apr. Review and Discussion (Cyrino/Berthold)

[Reading: Pollitt, pp. 64-135]

Wk 13 18 Apr. 2ND HOUR EXAM (30%)

THE HELLENISTIC PERIOD, ca. 323 - 30 BCE

20 Apr. He's Fast, He's Cool, He's Alexander the Great: The Rise of Macedon (Berthold)

[Reading: Pollitt, pp. 135-194; Hollister, pp. 136-151]

Wk 14 25 Apr. Waiting for the Romans: the Hellenistic World (Berthold)
27 Apr. The Garden of Eros: the Hellenistic Anthology (*guest lecture* by Dr. Peter Mellon)

Reading: selections from the Anthology (xerox packet)

Wk 15 2 May Magical Mystery Tour: Jason and the Argonauts (Cyrino)
4 May Oh Those Greeks! Summaries, Review and Discussion (Cyrino/Berthold)

Reading: Apollonius of Rhodes, The Voyage of the Argo

6 May FINAL EXAM (40 %)
Kale Tyche! (Good Luck!)