The unifying goal for the HNRS 1391-2392 sequence of courses is to ground students solidly in Western culture, which forms the immediate context of their lives and the historical context of the origins and development of the Christian faith and which marks the point of departure for an informed engagement with other cultures.

More specifically, the goal of HNRS 1391 is to acquaint students with some of the most notable intellectual achievements of the ancient Greek and Hebrew cultures and with the ideals of the Parent, Prophet, King, Lawgiver, Hero/Heroine, Poet, Philosopher and Statesman. The implications of these ancient ideals for leading an exemplary life will be an overarching concern. The course is designed to provoke students to engage in a sustained critical reflection on these works and themes in order to acquire an insightful and nuanced understanding of the issues, questions, and alternatives they present. Over the course of the term, it is our intent to initiate students in this course into the liberal arts of speaking, listening, forming critical judgments and skillful writing: in short, to foster the intellectual virtues necessary to lead a free and worthwhile life.

**Course Requirements / Grading**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exam I</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam II</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper I</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper II</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance and Class Participation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grading Scale**

Numerical and letter grades in this course are correlated according to the following percentage scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>95-100</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-94</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-89</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-87</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-82</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-79</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-77</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-69</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-50</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** For the meaning of the letter grades given in this course, see the current Undergraduate Catalog. For example, a grade of “A” is understood to mean “Excellent — unusual and superior achievement,” and therefore the demands and expectations are considerably higher.
than for the award of a grade in the “B” range, which will be understood to mean “Good — above average, articulate achievement”; and so on for the grades of “C,” “D,” and “F.”

Policy on Papers
Due dates for papers are designated in the syllabus. Late papers will be accepted up to one class day past the original due date (with one-half letter grade deduction) or two class days past the original due date (with one full letter grade deduction). Because of pressures of time, late papers might not receive written comments. No compensatory work in lieu of the paper will be accepted. The professor must ask students not to request that he read and comment on rough drafts of papers in advance of their being turned in for a grade. The professor will be glad to consult with, and offer general advice and counsel to, students during office hours about the paper assignments. Papers must be hand-delivered to the professor. Students are responsible for keeping an electronic copy and for providing it upon request, until final grades for the course have been posted by the Registrar.

N.B. — For information on what is expected in the papers for this course, see the Guidelines for Papers, appended to the end of this Syllabus.

Policy on Make-up Exams
Dates for exams are listed in the Calendar of Assignments, below. Absent serious emergency, students are expected to be present to take exams on these dates. Make-up exams will be given only in the case of serious emergency. Requests for make-up privileges must be accompanied by appropriate documentation.

Academic Dishonesty
Academic dishonesty is a serious offense, inasmuch as it undermines the integrity of the educational mission of the university. Academic dishonesty includes but is not limited to:
1. Cheating on an examination or test; for example, by copying from another’s paper or using unauthorized materials during a test;
2. Plagiarism, which represents as one’s own the work of another, whether published or not, without acknowledging the precise source;
3. Knowing participation in the academic dishonesty of another student, even though one’s own work is not directly affected;
4. Any conduct which reasonable persons in similar circumstances would recognize as dishonest in an academic setting.
The penalty for an incident of academic dishonesty is, at the discretion of the professor, either a mark of zero for the work in question or a grade of “F” for the course. See also the Undergraduate Catalog 2012-2014, pp. 73-75.

Policy on Incompletes
At his discretion the professor may assign a grade of “I” to a student who has successfully completed (i.e., with at least a passing grade) a majority of the work of the class (i.e., at least half of the exams and papers) and who has a compelling reason why the remainder of the work cannot be completed on schedule. Upon the completion of the work within the next regular semester at the time prescribed by
the professor (no later than the end of the following regular semester), the faculty member will award
the student a letter grade, including the possibility of an “F.”

Attendance

Given the nature of the course as a discussion/seminar format, regular, consistent attendance is crucial,
both for the individual student and for the common good of the seminar; and obviously, attendance is a
necessary condition for active class participation. A record of attendance will be maintained and will
be a determinate of the participation grade.

Texts

The following are the required texts for the course. Reading assignments should be done prior to the
class for which they fall due. Students should always bring their texts to class.


Thucydides, On Justice, Power and Human Nature: Selections from The History of the Peloponnesian War.

Aeschylus, Aeschylus II: The Oresteia. Third Edition. Trans. David Grene, Richmond Lattimore, Mark


Calendar of Assignments:

1. Tues. 8/25 Introduction to Course: Syllabus / Procedures

   Part I: The Greeks and the City.

   The Family, the City and Justice.

2. Thurs. 8/27 Aeschylus, Agamemnon.

3. Tues 9/1 Aeschylus, Libation Bearers.

4. Thurs. 9/3 Aeschylus, Eumenides.

   Fate, Free Will, and Identity.

5. Tues. 9/8 Sophocles, Oedipus the King.

   Justice, the Common Good and Philosophy

6. Thurs. 9/10 Republic, Book I, 327a-341c

8. Thurs. 9/17 Republic, Book II (all).


11. Tues. 9/29 Republic, Book VI, 484a–509c7; 509c8–511e6; Book VII, 514a–521d.

12. Thur. 10/1 Republic, Book IX, 589c–592b.

13. Tues. 10/6 Exam I.

Justice, Power and the Human Good


Tues. 10/13 Fall Break: No Class.


The Warrior-Hero

16. Tues. 10/20 Homer, The Iliad, Book I, 1-611; Book II, 1-483; Book III, 1-461. (Note: Passages are cited first by Book number, then by line numbers within each respective Book.)


19 Thurs. 10/29 Homer, The Iliad, Book XVI, 1-123, 419-507, 684-867; Book XVIII, 1-64, 165-616; Book XIX, 1-153; Book XX, 1-74; Book XXI, 211-520; Book XXII, 1-505; Book XXIV, 1-804.

Interlude: Poetry and Philosophy

20. Tues. 11/3 Republic, Book X.

21. Thurs. 11/5 Exam II.

Part II: The Hebrew Tribe.

22. Tues. 11/10 Creation and Fall. Beginnings and Primitive History: Genesis 1-3.


    Thurs. 11/26 **Thanksgiving Break.** No Class.

27. Tues. 12/1 **Prophet.** Proverbs 1, 10. Isaiah: Isaiah 1–11, 40-66.


**Final Examination: TBA.**

---

**Guidelines for Papers — HNRS 1391**

**Dr. Hall**

Fall 2015

---

**Mechanics**

1. Papers should be 5-6 pages in length, using a 12-point Times Roman font, double-spaced and one-inch margins all around. You should not provide a separate title page, but you should include a title at the top of the first page of your paper. Put your name in the upper right- or left-hand corner of the first page. Pages of the text should be numbered throughout (either top center – except for first page of course – or top right or bottom center). *Failure to number pages is a discourtesy to your reader.* Don’t fail. It establishes you as a sloppy writer and an indifferent scholar.

2. Citations should be used where appropriate to avoid plagiarism. This includes all direct quotations from a text and also close paraphrases. Citations may be in the form of footnotes, endnotes or parenthetical citations in the body of the text, in the MLA style. Either the *MLA Style Sheet* or Kate Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations* (the latter based on *The Chicago Manual of Style*, which may be used instead) should be followed when making citations.
Follow one or the other of these citations styles. We hate sloppy or imprecise ways of citing sources. Note that titles of books are always italicized. Always. Do not fail to do this. If you fail to do this, we will shred your paper before your very eyes and leave you with the pieces. Or burn it on a funeral pyre – with no libations or hymns to the gods.

Substance of Paper
3. Your paper should be either “argumentative” or “clarifying” (i.e., an exercise in conceptual elucidation, see infra.)

An Argumentative Paper has a point, or set of points, it is concerned to argue. Such points should be “controversial,” not in the sense of being sensational but in the sense that what you say could be reasonably contested by another reader of the same text. Your task is to develop an interpretation of the material that you believe you can defend, for which there is evidence in the text or texts with which you are working and which is sufficiently “weighty” to be worth arguing. You should show that you are aware that one might look at the material in another way, that one can make different points than you are making, but that, even so, you believe your view is sound and worth considering. What you regard as good evidence for this should, of course, be the backbone of your paper.

Thus, your paper should have a well-developed and clearly formulated thesis statement in the first paragraph. The easiest way to do this is to introduce your thesis statement with a phrase like: “In this paper, I intend to argue that ______________________” or “In what follows, I intend to show that __________________.” Using the first person is perfectly fine, regardless of what others have taught you; first person is widely used in philosophy and many other of the humanities and with good reason: it makes things clear. Of course, you need not use the first person to introduce a thesis. You can, say, e.g., It will be seen that ______________ or “A careful reading of this section of the Republic shows us that______________.”

And yes, in this course you have permission to use the first person voice. This is standard in academic writing, notwithstanding what someone else might have told you.

Here is an example of the first paragraph of an argumentative paper. Note that what is being argued — i.e., the thesis statement — is identified by underlining.
In the *Apology*, Plato shows us Socrates defending himself before his fellow Athenians. That is, he shows us philosophy itself on trial, accused of being harmful to the city. Socrates' claim is that philosophy is not harmful to the city, but rather benefits it. He compares himself to a “gadfly” (just above 31a) and insists that the pain he causes his fellow citizens by his questioning is justified by the good it does them. I want to contest this view and argue, against Socrates, that his form of questioning leads to the sort of skepticism that undermines the city. In other words, I will try to show (1) that the examined life as Socrates practices it is incompatible with political association and that consequently (2) the Athenians were justified in getting rid of Socrates.

Note that you need not actually underline your thesis statement. We have done so in the example above (and the one immediately following, below,) in order to identify clearly where the thesis falls in the sample paragraph.

1. A Clarifying Paper is one in which you attempt to spell out the meaning of a central term or terms that one of our authors has used. E.g.:

Nietzsche, in *Beyond Good and Evil*, frequently makes use of the concept of the “will to power.” Notwithstanding his repeated invoking of this notion in order to say what he thinks must follow upon the experience of the “death of God,” it is not immediately clear precisely what the phrase “will to power” means. Does it mean that one can and should do just whatever one wants: rape, murder, pillage, tell the truth, lie, commit suicide? And if it does, is Nietzsche then saying anything significant and philosophically interesting? Wouldn’t he be saying simply that people are not only free to do whatever they want but are justified in doing it? In this paper, I intend to show that this is not what Nietzsche means by “the will to power,” that what he in fact means is connected to his belief that the will to power is the will to life. Thus, “will to power” for Nietzsche is all the life activities of an organism just expressing themselves in whatever way is appropriate for that kind of organism, including man. I then want to say what follows from this way of understanding “will to power.”

(In both examples, above, the underlined sentences are the thesis statement part of the opening paragraph.)

Note that a Clarifying Paper is itself a kind of argumentative exercise. After all, in it you must make a case for understanding a concept, or several concepts, in the way you think it must be understood – and that is tantamount to arguing your case.

4. Very Important: Try to guard against what I call merely “retelling the story,” in which you simply repeat what an author has said. If you find yourself writing several pages in which all you do is say, in effect, “first Plato says this, and then Plato says that, and then Plato says this other thing,” that is a warning flag that you are probably merely retelling the story. I want to know what you think Plato, e.g., means, where he is right or insightful and where he goes wrong, etc. You need to make space in the paper – a considerable amount of space – for you: for your interpretation, criticism, assessment, thoughts, observations. This is a critical and analytical paper, not a book report.
5. Since these papers are essentially exercises in textual analysis, you need not consult or reference secondary literature (outside sources). This is not to say that you are prohibited from using such sources. They can be helpful sometimes, particularly in stimulating your thinking, in getting you going in terms of developing what, exactly, it is you wish to say. If you do refer to these outside scholarly interpretations in your paper, you must give full credit in the form of a footnote or endnote. If you are unsure how to do this, consult the formats in either the MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers, ed. Joseph Gibaldi, 4th ed. (or later editions): e.g., look at sec. 4.2, p. 104 ff. “MLA Style”; or Kate L. Turabian, Student’s Guide for Writing College Papers.

6. Finally, if you wish to bring in points made during class discussion you may certainly do so. Your main focus, however, should be on the text. Keep in mind that these are university-level papers that are part of an academic course. They are not personal diaries. I might be interested in how you feel about an issue apart from the paper; but in the paper I am not interested in emotional responses, only what you think can be reasonably argued.
FOR FURTHER READING


2. For general background to Greek culture and civilization a number of histories are available. One Dr. Hall especially recommends – it is exceptionally well-written and accessible – is Sarah B. Pomeroy et al., *Ancient Greece: A Political, Social, and Cultural History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999). Perhaps the best short introduction is the classic book by H. D. F. Kitto, *The Greeks* (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1951), still in print and still compelling after more than a half century. A recent popular account that many find riveting is Thomas Cahill’s *Sailing the Wine-Dark Sea: Why the Greeks Matter* (New York: Doubleday, 2003). This is the fourth volume in a projected seven-volume series titled *The Hinges of History*. Earlier volumes in the series are *How the Irish Saved Civilization*, *The Gifts of the Jews* (on the Old Testament materials), and *Desire of the Everlasting Hills* (on Jesus and the rise of Christianity). A bit of an iconoclast and sometimes tendentious, Cahill is nevertheless an engaging writer with a knack for distilling what is essential from complex historical eras and episodes. His bibliographic essays at the back of each book should be quite useful to students who wish to locate resources for background, research and further reading. Since Athens figures so prominently in several of our readings and dominated the entire 5th century Greek world, mention should be made of *The World of Athens*, compiled by the Joint Association of Classical Teachers and published by Cambridge University Press (1984). The gold mine for all things pertaining to the classical world, Roman as well as Greek, is *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (often referred to simply as the OCD). First published in 1949, the most recent edition is the revised Fourth Edition (2012), edited by Simon Hornblower, Antony Spawforth and Esther Eidinow, published by the Oxford University Press.

The Perseus Digital Library at Tufts University is the most comprehensive online source for the ancient world. It is well worth getting to know. The URL is www.perseus.tufts.edu.

3. *Homer*

Students who would like to compare Lattimore with another translation should take a look at Robert Fagle’s rendering of the *Iliad* (New York: Penguin, 1990). The Fagles edition also contains a helpful introduction by Bernard Knox, the dean of American classicists. Malcolm M. Wilcock’s *A Companion to the Iliad* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976) is keyed to the Lattimore translation and contains much detailed information. Wilcock’s explanation of the many mythological allusions and Homeric conventions are in the form of notes to specific lines in Homer’s text. A classic essay on the *Iliad* – which argues that the focus of the poem is not the Homeric heroes (Achilles, Hector, Agamemnon) but force, violence itself – is Simon Weil’s *The Iliad or the Poem of Force*, reprinted in *Revisions: Changing Perspectives in Moral Philosophy*, ed. Stanley
Hauerwas and Alasdair MacIntyre (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983). Weil’s provocative essay should be read over against Jasper Griffin’s brilliant monograph Homer on Life and Death (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), which insists that not warfare, force or violence is the principal theme of the Iliad but rather the more fundamental notions of death and life. Especially accessible to the beginning student is Eva T. H. Brann, Homeric Moments: Clues to Delight in Reading the Odyssey and the Iliad (Paul Dry Books, 2002). Miss Brann is a long time, storied tutor at St. John’s College in Annapolis, Maryland, the premier “Great Books” college in the U.S., and a gifted reader of the classics. A recent work that is as insightful as it is disturbing is Jonathan Shay, Achilles in Vietnam: Combat Trauma and the Undoing of Character (New York: Scribner’s, 1995), which traces the parallels of psychological trauma between Homer’s heroes and the American soldiers who fought three centuries later in Vietnam. On another tack, one might reasonably raise the question, did the Trojan War really occur -- that is, was it an historical, as opposed to a merely mythological, event? Was there actually a physical city named Troy (or Ilium)? If so, what is the status of the archeological evidence? For a popular guide to the question of the historicity of the Trojan War, see Michael Wood’s 1985 documentary on PBS, In Search of the Trojan War, now available on DVD from Warner Home Video, and the companion book of the same title (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998).

4. Thucydides

5. Aeschylus
Hugh Lloyd-Jones’ translation of the *Oresteia* in the old Prentice-Hall Greek Drama Series has been reprinted (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993). The translation is good, but the special value of this volume are the extensive footnotes that shed light on Aeschylus’ language – particularly helpful to the reader who knows little or no Greek, but who appreciates the importance of the word choices – and thus on the meaning of the work as a whole. This edition also contains a short but illuminating historical appendix on the political situation in Athens and Argos around the time Aeschylus was writing. Of the many books on Aeschylus, two stand out as pertinent for our seminar: Richard Kuhns, *The House, the City, and the Judge: The Growth of Moral Awareness in the Oresteia* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1962) and *Aeschylus: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Marsh H. McCall, Jr. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972).

6. **Sophocles**
   On *Oedipus Tyrannus*, see Seth Benardete’s careful and nuanced reading in “Sophocles’ *Oedipus Tyrannus*” in *Ancients and Moderns: Essays on the Tradition of Political Philosophy in Honor of Leo Strauss*, ed. Joseph Cropsey (New York: Basic Books, 1964), reprinted in his *The Argument of the Action: Essays on Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, along with a longer treatment of Greek tragedy, including a substantial, new focus on the OT: chap. 7, “On Greek Tragedy.” An exacting but fruitful examination of the language of the OT is found in Barnard Knox’s now-classic *Oedipus at Thebes: Sophocles’ Tragic Hero and His Time* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957). Also useful, though a bit technical for the beginning student, is R. P. Winnington-Ingram’s *Sophocles: An Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980). Admirably accessible – as well as refreshingly energetic and opinionated – are the discussions of Sophocles, including extensive analysis of the OT, in Walter Kaufmann’s *Tragedy and Philosophy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968). For its superb running footnotes that shed powerful light on the meaning of Sophocles’ Greek – set up to be useful especially to the reader without knowledge of the language – Thomas Gould’s edition of the OT (translation and commentary; his title is the less accurate but more familiar *Oedipus the King*) is a singularly valuable aid to plumbing the subtle layers of meaning in the play. Long out of print, it was published (1970) as a part of the Prentice-Hall Greek Drama Series; it is well worth trying to track down.

Note: We are not reading Euripides this semester. He was on the reading list earlier and may return in the future.

7. **Euripides**

8. **Plato**