

## Teaching Martial's Epigrams from Manuscript to Critical Edition: Editorial Method and Palaeography in the Intermediate Latin Classroom

Recent volumes of *Classical Journal* have been host to a discussion of the future of the critical edition in the digital age. What these contributions have in common is a focus on the form of the finished product, with the production-process and end-users left more or less unexamined. Keeline (2017) playfully suggests that, pedagogy aside, the digital form itself will inspire engagement among readers (“if you build it, they will come”, 360). Olson (2019) draws attention to this gap in Keeline’s argument (p. 337-338) but the nutshell cost-benefit analysis he draws up leaves the pedagogical question out. Similarly, Huskey and Cayless (2022) focus on the digital form of the future apparatus without considering the *formation* of future readers and editors.

In this presentation, I would like to suggest that this focus on the finished form of the edition (digital or print? crowd-sourced or single-authored?) misses key pedagogical benefits that may be derived from teaching the editorial process itself. I present a lesson plan and reflections from a field-test for a semester-long Intermediate Latin (“201”) project in which students collate digitized manuscripts, build an apparatus, and edit and comment on an epigram of Martial. I will provide learning outcomes focused on language-acquisition benefits as well as ideas for how projects like this help classicists fit into the larger pedagogical and disciplinary landscape of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### Works Cited

Huskey, S. and H. Cayless. 2022. “The Digital Critical Apparatus: Thoughts from the Field”.

*Classical Journal*, vol. 117, pp. 337-355.

Keeline, T. "The Apparatus Criticus in the Digital Age." *Classical Journal*, vol. 112, pp. 342-363.

Olson, S. D. 2019. "Further Notes on the Apparatus Criticus." *Classical Journal*, 114, pp. 330-344.