

---

Barbara Weiden Boyd, Bowdoin College

*Latin for the 21st Century: From Concept to Classroom.* Edited by RICHARD A. LAFLEUR. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman-Addison Wesley 1998. Pp. xvi + 320.

This volume contains 24 chapters, each contributed by an author whose profession is at least in part devoted to Latin pedagogy. A collection of brief biographies of all the authors is helpful, though most of the names are already familiar to teachers of Latin. In addition to a usable index, the volume concludes with an extensive bibliography divided into three sub-sections: textbooks; works on Latin language, curriculum, and pedagogy; and general studies and reference works. This bibliography should prove valuable to readers interested in different approaches to the teaching of Latin.

The title of the book is itself, I think, something of a misnomer: what the book really offers is a series of snapshots of the status and conditions of Latin education today in the United States. That minor quibble aside, however, the subtitle "From Concept to Classroom" is in fact very accurate, since the book begins with a number of essays that take on some rather big philosophical questions for teachers of Latin, especially the utility argument (on which, see further below), but then quickly moves into a descriptive mode, with a practical, hands-on orientation.

It would be impossible given the limits imposed on this review to comment on each of the individual contributions; in any case, the volume is very readable and easy to find one's way around in, so teachers interested in a particular topic should be able to find what they want here very easily. The structure of the book with its 24 contributions divided up under seven separate subheadings (Changing Methods, Changing Standards; Latin and the Younger Learner; Approaches to High-School Latin; Articulation and Approaches to College Latin; Graduate Education and Teacher Training; Special Issues, Special Responses; and Cornucopia: Resources for Teaching Latin) even gives the book something of a plot for those who wish to read it cover-to-cover; the editor has done a wonderful job of establishing a logical sequence of topics, and has

occasionally offered a very useful juxtaposition of perspectives. In the remainder of this review, therefore, I want to comment on a number of the contributions, which, while representative of the collection as a whole, seemed to me particularly valuable or provocative, or both. They may well in turn lead interested readers to other essays in this volume.

Kenneth Kitchell's "The Great Latin Debate: The Futility of Utility?" offers a wonderful overview of 2000 years of Latin education. (My only complaint is that this chapter is too short!) Every teacher of the *Aeneid* should some day try out the ancient procedures for testing a student's knowledge of the grammar and syntax of *Aeneid* 1.1, as transmitted by Priscian (4); and the teaching methods of the British monk Aelfric (fl. 993) and his student of the same name, which put a premium on the development of an extensive vocabulary used in context, deserve to be better known (5-7). Most important, Kitchell shows that the argument for utility, one which all of us have resorted to on occasion either to convince students to stay with Latin, or to convince school boards not to cut a position in Latin, *vel sim.*, has really only a very limited validity (though that does not mean we should abandon these arguments entirely); rather, Kitchell's point is that the survival of Latin depends far more on how it is taught than on utility, however that may be defined. And this concern—how Latin is taught—sets the tone for the rest of the book. (The concluding chapter, also by Kitchell, is also valuable, though in a far different way—it is a rich resource of information on how to set up a Latin classroom, where to find maps, posters, and slides, what to include in a small reference library, and so on.)

Because of the sequential structure of the book, with articles on elementary and middle-school Latin, high-school Latin, undergraduate Latin programs, and graduate programs logically arranged, the issue faced by all Latin teachers at some, usually early, point in their careers—viz., what approach to use in teaching Latin—is addressed more than once. I found the four articles by Karen Lee Singh and David Perry (on grammar-translation and reading approaches, respectively, in high school) and by James May and John Gruber-Miller (on grammar-translation and reading approaches, respectively, in college) to be extremely informative, and they confirmed for me my own preference for the grammar-

translation approach. Singh describes the characteristics of and major differences among traditional high-school texts (the revised Jenney, *Our Latin Heritage, Latin for Americans*) and addresses all levels of high-school Latin, not just the first year or two. She also offers good, solid, and detailed advice on how to integrate cooperative learning into a traditional Latin class. Perry also looks at three textbooks (*Cambridge Latin Course, Oxford Latin Course, and Ecce Romani*), and offers a very sympathetic introduction to the reading approach. It helped me, on the one hand, to understand why *Ecce Romani* has been a good choice for my daughter, beginning Latin in sixth grade; unfortunately, it also helped me to understand why college freshmen with this Latin background alone who hope to enter an intermediate or advanced Latin course at Bowdoin inevitably struggle, and have a hard time moving beyond an intermediate level of competence. May's description of his use of Wheelock to teach introductory Latin is one of the high points of the book, and was certainly a surprise to me, since I have been rather dreading teaching Wheelock again this fall after a hiatus of several years. I intend to incorporate a number of his suggestions into my class. (I also want to comment on how cheering it was to read May's contribution immediately after the preceding chapter by Sheila Dickison, on high-school/college articulation. She identifies an issue that should be important to all of us; I worry, however, that by calling only those of us who teach high-school Latin "teachers," while those of us who teach in college are called "faculty," she helps to solidify the rift between the two groups. May, by contrast, demonstrates how much the two groups have in common.) Gruber-Miller's clear description of the reading method, using the *Oxford Latin Course*, is filled with suggestions for activities to make reading and grammar reinforce each other. I was struck again, however, by my own bias—what he proposes requires an inordinate amount of patience on the part of both teacher and students (certainly more than my students and I have!), seems to have as its goal not Latin literature and culture per se so much as the science and psychology of reading, regardless of the language being taught, and demands far more class time than many college teachers have nowadays—with three hours a week for first year Latin, I shall have approximately 78 hours of class time during the next academic year to cover all of Wheelock, its companion *38 Latin Stories*, and at least

some of the Longmans selections from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Again, any teacher considering a change of textbook and/or method will benefit greatly from these four chapters.

The other real treat in this volume besides May's article is Cynthia White's "*Docere Docentes: A Methods Course for Latin TAs*." "In this discipline-based methods course, Latin TAs read about Latin pedagogy in texts of ancient writers on education, especially Quintilian and Cicero" (209). The resulting course as described here truly combines first-rate research with a practical focus on teaching, and would be a welcome addition to almost any graduate program I can think of. Such a course could also go a long way toward tearing down the barrier recognized by Dickison in her chapter, since I can easily imagine that, in a mixed group of Ph.D. and M.A.T. students, the two constituencies would really see and benefit from each other's strengths and chosen paths. Frankly, I wish I could have taken this course myself, and I urge every reader who is considering a teaching career but who doesn't plan to be White's student at the University of Arizona to show this to a professor at your own institution and try to arrange at least a directed reading that would allow you to think about the material and issues raised in this course.

Finally, I want to note that several chapters in this volume are very handy resources for any of us, current or prospective teachers, who wish to evaluate the sometimes confusing variety of available teaching resources.

1. Judith Sebesta (Chapter 2) gives a good survey of first year Latin texts, for both high school and college, and briefly describes the philosophical and psychological underpinnings of these books (I did miss, however, my own favorite textbook, Moreland and Fleischer's *Latin: An Intensive Course*, mentioned only once and in passing elsewhere in this book);

2. Martha Abbott, Sally Davis, and Richard Gascoyne (Chapter 5) offer a good overview of the national Standards for Foreign Language Learning, and discuss how they have been adapted and can be implemented in the teaching of classical languages, especially Latin;

3. Margaret Brucia (Chapter 10) offers a good overview of the new AP Latin curricula, and gives practical advice on how to keep up AP enrollments;

4. Jane Hall (Chapter 11) collects information on how to participate in any or all of the various nation Latin exams, essay contests, organizations, and other enrichment activities for high-school Latin students;

5. and Rob Latousek (Chapter 23) offers a helpful and reader-friendly overview of educational and instructional software, databases, and tutorials for Latin, as well as classics on the world wide web.

All in all, this book accomplishes what it sets out to do, although some of the entries are far less stimulating than those I've mentioned above. I also finished the book thinking a little about what was missing, at least from my perspective. There are issues I face almost every day in my job that have very much to do with the survival of classics, especially Latin, into the 21st century, that are not addressed at all here. What, for example, of the demise or diminishment of the language requirement on many college campuses? My own institution has not had a language requirement for almost 30 years; while this mattered little when there were no other distribution requirements, the introduction and politicization of a non-Eurocentric requirement during the past decade or so have led to decreased language enrollments across the board (with classics actually surviving much better than many other programs, except of course for Spanish), and indeed a new marginalization of classical studies. Departments and disciplines once considered natural allies—History, English, and Romance Languages, for example—have for the most part abandoned the history of ideas in favor of contemporary texts and post-modern approaches to them (the term “presentism” may be familiar to some of you). I would like to see some of the energy expended on this volume turned now to a related but distinct issue: WHY Latin for the 21st Century? This question needs as much thought as the “How?” of this book.

BARBARA WEIDEN BOYD

Bowdoin College