

Backward Mapping and the New Standards for Classical Language Learning

Peter Anderson
Grand Valley State University

ABSTRACT

The purpose of standards within education is to provide direction for our taught curriculum (content and skills) by identifying desired outcomes. Assessment, the means by which we determine whether or not we have met the standards, ends up being an afterthought in many curriculum discussions; it is a very rare thing indeed that people discuss assessment as a strategy to promote learning and the achievement of desired outcomes in the first stages of curriculum design. Nevertheless, a design approach for curriculum such as Backward Mapping, which begins with the *Standards for Classical Language Learning* and addresses assessment needs early on, can be very beneficial. Properly done, Backward Mapping is never a case of the “tail wagging the dog,” but rather a holistic approach to design that focuses attention through the Standards towards both the taught curriculum and assessment. In what follows, this article sketches out some basic history and observations about Backward Mapping, describes its basic principles, and discusses some potentials and pitfalls of the process. The central concern of this article, however, is to present two working models of Backward Mapping with the new Standards in order to illustrate this assessment-focused approach to curriculum design.

KEYWORDS

assessment, Standards, curriculum design, learning outcomes

INTRODUCTION

Many of us in the teaching professions have heard of “backward mapping” and “understanding by design” in the context of assessment initiatives. I suspect most of us did not choose teaching in order to perform assessment. Within my different professional contexts, it is often the case that eyes (my own included sometimes) roll when assessment comes into the conversation. Assessment ends up being an afterthought in many curricular discussions and it is a very rare thing indeed that people discuss assessment as a strategy at the early stages of curriculum design to

promote learning. Regardless of our feelings about assessment and how it relates to curriculum, all of us should come to understand the purpose and value of an assessment-focused design approach for our curriculum. In what follows, I sketch out some basic history and observations about Backward Mapping, describe its basic principles, and discuss what I see as some potentials and pitfalls. The central concern of this article, however, is to present two working models of Backward Mapping with the new Standards in order to illustrate this assessment-focused approach to curriculum design.

THE 4 PS OF BACKWARD MAPPING: PRINCIPLES, PRACTICE, POTENTIALS, AND PITFALLS

Backward Mapping as a dominant principle in education policy - and subsequently in curriculum design - appears at the end of the 1970s with a short article by Richard Elmore. In it he discusses the importance of taking implementation into account when planning policies: by anticipating issues around implementation at the policy building stage, he argued, any foreseeable problems with implementation that would dilute the effect of the policy can be mitigated. By 1989, under the leadership of President George H.W. Bush, with then Governor Bill Clinton (AR) and Governor Carroll Campbell (SC) leading the critical taskforce, the push for assessment standards in education had taken on an intractable momentum. President Clinton, and after him President George W. Bush, continued this push for such standards; the notions of backward and forward mapping in policy decisions moved, logically, into curriculum and content design. It is there, I think, that most of us have encountered the idea of backward mapping, even if it is not precisely the original application: how we build a curriculum that can lead to the knowledge outcomes we want for our students.

The next major shift in the application of this concept in education policy and design was led by Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe in the late 1990s. Their *Understanding by Design*® system focused on skills development within the curriculum planning process. Understanding something, rather than simply knowing something (e.g., a set of facts), allows - in the *UbD*™ model - for transfer of knowledge and skills to new domains. For this reason, planning from “what knowledge to know” is less appropriate for curriculum design than planning from “what to do with knowledge.” Content (what to know) should always be, of course, an important concern for curriculum design: deciding what to put before our students is, frankly, one

of the more exciting things about teaching. I suspect that many of us have encountered the idea of Backward Mapping in connection with content only (e.g., “what do we want students to know at the end of the course/program?”). But as I have noted, Backward Mapping as a planning strategy in education was connected initially to *assessment* design, not content. One of the major contributions Wiggins & McTighe made was to reassert the essential quality of Backward Mapping as a design tool that begins from the Standards and then moves to the assessment through which we measure our achievement of a Standard. All of this seems a fine point to be making - perhaps too fine - but, because most of us are inheritors of content-based instruction (think “the canon” here), or possibly content-based instruction that has been subjected to standards alignment, it seems an important point to make: Backward Mapping promotes effective curriculum by moving us from understanding the Standards, to designing assessments that *determine* how we have met the Standards, to designing a curriculum that develops the skills and knowledge we need to assess. Ten years ago, Rita Oleksack called for a wide-spread attempt to develop assessment literacy among World Language teachers in North America, arguing that “assessment is the bridge that links our curriculum and drives our instruction.” As classical languages educators grapple with the New Standards, it seems a good time to reassert the value of Standards-focused practices such as Backward Mapping.

In principle, then, Backward Mapping requires that we begin planning from the Standards, moving backward from there through assessment strategies and learning strategies, and then finally to the taught curriculum which includes content and implementation. On a practical level for World Language teachers working with the new Standards, this means that from the initial planning stages through to the learning strategies, it *does not matter what language we are teaching*. In contrast, most traditional methods of curriculum design move from the topic (or perhaps sphere of knowledge), to the teaching strategies, and then to assessment. To make this a stark distinction: imagine what it would do for your planning if a major examining board did not prescribe what Latin should be read for a course but only provided a list of required skills and an example of the kind of exam students would sit at the end of the course. How would you as a good teacher put all this into practice? Our new Standards are essentially the list of required skills in this analogy.

The best practices of Backward Mapping, I think, are those of all good teaching. First, know your purpose. Strong educational design is purpose driven above all and in our case to have a clear purpose we must understand the Standards.

Second, understand as best as possible with what skills and knowledge students enter the planned period of study that will be assessed. Third, very clearly identify, define, disseminate, and develop the skill sets and skill levels for all involved. Fourth, scaffold or link learning strategies and outcomes in a progressive way with standards-based assessments in mind. In my conversations with teachers and educational professionals in North America and the UK, it has always seemed that efforts to make assessment central to curriculum design (or even to our jobs as teachers) is a betrayal of the passion for literature in Latin or Greek that led us to teach in the first place. As I noted above, few of us got into the profession in order to design excellent and focused assessments. Perhaps it is the case that good teaching and our love for the craft of teaching exist in our professional identities separate from the craft designing good assessments.

I pondered all these points, intellectual and emotional, while preparing a version of this article for a talk at CAMWS 2017 and I observed myself having a series of “knee-jerk” reactions. In my content-based heart, I felt the essential practices and implications of Backward Mapping were too radical: is our content not one of our unique characteristics - perhaps even our unique identity? On the other hand, because I am involved in assessment planning and assessment informed curriculum design, I have a hale and hearty mistrust of the assessment cart leading the curriculum horse. Where does that leave me as a (hopefully good) teacher? But I would argue that standards-based design approaches, such as Backward Mapping, are *not* the same as assessment-driven design; the latter is a perversion of the former. Practices such as Backward Mapping help us propose an assessment framework that is determined by the Standards; this assessment framework is a skeleton, if you like, onto which we can graft the sinews and muscles of the taught curriculum. The taught curriculum (content and method) seems to move the body but it is the skeleton that actually provides the internal leverage and structure for the muscles to work upon. Just as these mechanisms and structures working together in the human body produce kinetic potential, I argue that there are pedagogic potentials that result from the interaction of our standards-based assessment skeleton and our content sinews and muscles.

The most significant potential embedded within our new Standards is their deliberate inclusion of the widest variety of pedagogies and programs that make up our quilt of classical language instruction. On all sides of the often heated discussion about instruction methods, we owe it to ourselves to admit openly, honestly,

and proudly that there are many viable methods and areas of content under the tent of classical languages. By using the Standards as a starting point through practices like Backward Mapping, we can build on the following potentials in an attempt to find common ground for our discipline in what looks to be a challenging future.

Potential #1: specific content (e.g., “the canon”), never irrelevant, is nevertheless untethered as an essential component of curriculum design, allowing for the broadest range of representation from Latin and Greek authors of all periods;

Potential #2: generating a set of common purposes among differing teaching methods that often seem themselves in conflict;

Potential #3: common, wide-spread adoption of standards-based design may create many opportunities for pedagogical research in implementation, design, and assessment among teaching methods;

Potential #4: standards-based design, such as Backward Mapping, offers more advantages in effective design without sacrificing the content, while content-focused frameworks often get very poorly retrofitted to Standards;

Potential #5: professional development efforts in teaching at every level, but perhaps especially at a national level, could be more coherent and inclusive if focused mainly around the Standards.

For the sake of balance, it seems fair to align five pitfalls with these potentials.

Pitfall #1: To quote Seneca noster, *quid mihi prodest Backward Mapping si textbook rector est?* We are often bound in content adoption by whatever the schools can afford (or say they can afford) to give us.

Pitfall #2: Our teaching-method conflicts and antagonisms are as much a product of our *viscera* as they are of our intellects.

Pitfall #3: We might fall into design for the sake of design, never quite getting to effective implementation and assessment, because of which it would be very hard to develop and foster collaborative research projects.

Pitfall #4: We might have to relinquish some long-held assumptions about what students should be reading when we are confronted formally, in the planning process, with the frequent mismatch between student skill sets and the content we want them to engage with by the end of a course of study. That is, what can I really expect in assessment of students on how well they read and understand Vergil after a four-year high-school course?

Pitfall #5: Adoption of new practices and/or of new Standards needs a comprehensive and coordinated initiative for professional development. Interesting work outlined in Cobb and Jackson suggests that teachers need much more than the lure of CEUs to adopt, sustain, and spread educational innovation and reform.

Our disciplinary quirks - or perhaps I mean independence - and the *ubertas* of the traditions and texts we are so lucky to work with is our greatest strength, however, not a pitfall. I do not find it likely that we will argue amongst ourselves about whether or not students should acquire the ability to use and to understand Latin and Roman cultures or Greek and Greek cultures (or indeed, both). Fortunately, our new *Standards for Classical Language Learning* do not deal explicitly with content, curriculum, or pedagogies: as written they are brilliantly focused, as Standards should be, only on the acquisition of skills and knowledge in language and culture (i.e., the C's). One of the greatest virtues of the new Standards, in my opinion, is that they blow wide open the tent of classical languages, hopefully creating a more inclusive community of teachers and then, as a result, a reinvigorated community of learners. Standards-based design strategies such as Backward Mapping (or *UbD*TM), whatever their potentials and pitfalls, stand to build the kind of bridges that can link our curricula and drive our instruction. If we can show that this practice can work, perhaps we can convince more teachers to adopt a similar approach. More important, because we are all working from the same Standards, perhaps we can then develop and reinforce the learning curve between different levels of instruction, create genuine and broadly applicable professional development, and generate the kinds of data (quantitative and qualitative) that we need to argue for the importance of classical languages.

In the two following examples, although I have included a content framework as well, I am focused on demonstrating how to plan an assessment strategy under the new Standards using the basic approach of Backward Mapping. The first example is built from the Standards to be assessed first - a fully Backward Mapping approach. The second is a retrofit of an existing course. Our new Standards may not identify a specific set of texts or content - what to know - but they certainly identify specific skills and practices our students should acquire so that they can do something with whatever they come to know. What more could a good teacher hope for?

BACKWARD MAPPING STANDARDS EXAMPLE 1: LEARNING SCENARIO

Standards to assess with target level:

- Standard 1.1, Communication: Interpretive
intermediate low (“*Intermediate Low Learners can understand the main idea of short and simple Latin or Greek texts when the topic is familiar.*”)
- Standard 1.2, Communication: Interpersonal
intermediate low (“*Intermediate Low Learners can communicate and exchange information about familiar topics in simple Latin or Greek sentences, using phrases and sentences that are supported by words and phrases in the reading at hand, and engage in conversation to satisfy basic needs.*”)
- Standard 1.3, Communication: Presentational
intermediate low (“*Intermediate Low learners can write briefly about most familiar topics and present information using a series of properly phrased simple sentences.*”)
- Standard 2.2, Relating Cultural Practices to Perspectives
intermediate low (“*Learners use Latin or Ancient Greek to investigate, explain, and reflect on the relationship between the practices and perspectives of the cultures studied.*”)

Planned Assessment Goals

Students will be able to *identify* and *use* Greek or Latin to *discuss* key elements of identity; and *use* Greek or Latin to *articulate* elements of their own identity; *demonstrate understanding of* and *synthesize* key texts in Greek or Latin. Students will be able to *discuss* diverse cultural understandings of individual development. *Note: In the assessment descriptions below I do not include the content source text because it is not yet relevant.*

Informal assessment (written or oral readiness quizzes):

- (Standard 1.1) Students read and demonstrate understanding of a source text.

- (Standard 1.2) Students read and use materials in the target language developed by other students as they practice question & response exercises.

Formal assessment (written or oral production):

- (Standard 1.1, 2.2) Students identify four key individuals who have influenced their lives and identify the personal qualities they learned or inherited or modelled from those individuals; students seek the best Greek or Latin word to articulate each personal quality identified (e.g., ambition, courage, frank speech, cleanliness).
- (Standard 1.2, 1.3) For each of these qualities, students prepare a brief definition in the target language.
- (Standard 1.2, 1.3) Students develop a question & response framework using their definitions.
- (Standard 2.2) Students compare and contrast the culturally specific qualities they and a source text identified; analyze, from the key text and from their own context, the qualities learned from people of different social status, gender, and type of relationships (family members, public figures, fictional characters, personal heroines, etc.); examine cultural triangles between Greek and Roman qualities and those of their own heritage(s); and discuss the challenges in finding appropriate Greek or Latin terms to express modern qualities.

Student Activities

Note: I have not chosen a source text yet, although I might have several in mind. [] indicates some content to be added later in the design process.

1. Students read [a suitable source] in order to demonstrate comprehension (see *Planned Assessments Informal 1*).

2. Students in groups identify [some number of] key individuals and/or key personal qualities associated with individuals in the source text; students develop a definition in [the target language] of each quality using appropriate resources (see *Planned Assessment Informal 2*; supports *Planned Assessment Formal 1 and 2*).

E.g.,

Quality:

- “*Ā frātre meō amōrem familiārium.* (From my brother, love for my intimate friends.)”
- “*Ā mātre meā industriam.* (From my mother, conscientiousness.)”

Definition:

- *Familiārēs sunt quī vel in amīcitiā pervenīrent vel ex intimīs essent.* (Intimate friends are those who either enter into friendship with me or are among my closest relationships.)
- *Industria est dīligentia cum studiō.* (Conscientiousness is diligent work combined with eagerness.)

3. Students develop and practice a question & response framework for the identified individual(s) and qualities (see *Planned Assessment Informal 2*; supports *Planned Assessment Formal 1 and 2*).

E.g.,

Question:

- “παρὰ τίνος τὸ δι’ αὐτὸν γινῶναι Θρασεάν καὶ Κατῶνα;”
- “From whom personal knowledge of Thrasea and Cato?”

Response:

- “παρὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ἐκείνου, Σεουρήνου.”
- “From his brother, Severus.”

4. Students identify four qualities for themselves and seek the best translation into the target language; they may use the source texts exclusively, but should also be encouraged to seek other connections to the ethical systems and terms of the ancient world through relevant ancient texts and dictionaries (see *Planned Assessments Formal 1 and 2*). Students reflect on the challenges of relating ethical systems and culturally specific terms (see *Planned Assessment Formal 4*)

5. Students use Greek and Latin to develop and practice a question-response framework for their own individuals and qualities, including definitions (see *Planned Assessment Informal 2*; supports *Planned Assessment Formal 1 – 4*).

E.g.,

Question: “*Ā quō industriam?*”

Response: “*Ā mātre meā industriam.*”

Question: “*Quid ā mātre?*”

Response: “*Ā mātre meā industriam.*”

Question: “*Quae est industria?*”

Response: “*Industria est diligentia cum studio.*”

Selected Content

Note: Now I can select suitable content, and incorporate a source text (although I might already have had several options in mind). In this case, I will use a selection from Marcus Aurelius Meditations Book 1 in Greek or Xylander’s Latin translation of the Meditations, or an adapted/edited copy of the initial sentences from Book 1.1-14. To this point, any teacher using any methodology could be using this learning scenario.

Required Resources

- Text of Marcus Aurelius *Meditations* 1.1-14 (provided in Appendix A)
- access to printed or digital dictionaries (L1 to L2 and L2 to L1)

BACKWARD MAPPING STANDARDS EXAMPLE 2: DIALOGUE PROJECT

Intended Level and Standards Equivalents

In retro-fitting our upper college level prose composition course to the new Standards I had to take into account the goals of the course within the context of our degree program. This course is the mandatory content area course (i.e., pre-College of Education) for Latin Secondary Education candidates, although most other Latin students take the course. Secondary Education candidates go on to take an integrated methods course in the College of Education with other students seeking certification in more-commonly-taught languages (usually French and German). The skills goals, from the point of view of the Standards, are equivalent to Advanced-Mid level. The *Dialogue Project* outlined below focuses on Presentational writing and speaking skills, and on Relating Cultural Practices to Perspectives, rather than teaching methodologies, etc. (those are addressed elsewhere in the course). But the *Dialogue Project* has always served within the course as a *locus* for interrogating how a single, multi-step project might be adapted into quite different methodologies. Only the learning goals and associated assessments needed to be shifted and even then very little. Please note that one could easily adapt the assessment focus from written to spoken. The original form of the three elements below (*Prospectus Colloquii*,

Vocabularium Colloquii, Grammatical Palette) is attached in Appendix B. None of these elements are required by the Standards, but I use them to focus student attention on certain elements necessary to complete the *Dialogue Project*.

Prospectus Colloquii

Standards to Assess with target level

- Standard 1.3 Communication: Presentational: (written) advanced low (“*Advanced-Mid Learners can make organized presentations in Latin or Greek using properly phrased connected sentences and paragraphs in various time frames and moods on researched academic, social, and cultural topics.*”)
- Standard 2.2: Relating Cultural Practices to Perspectives

Planned Assessment Goals

Students will be able *to research* a social, historical, and/or cultural topic or event using relevant online or print resources; students will be able *to write* in Latin in dialogue form using a variety of verb tenses, moods, and other advanced grammatical structures in their writing; students will be able *to analyze and employ* in dialogue form culturally-appropriate patterns of behavior and interactions typical of Roman culture, supported with evidence from authentic materials; students will prepare a dialogue in a written presentation with attention to various patterns of behavior or interactions typical of Roman culture, within a specific historical event or historically accurate fictitious event.

Informal assessment (trust and verify):

- Informal evaluation of the project will be closely linked to adherence to the procedure guidelines and the completion of goals for the *Project* by the assigned dates (these are goals/dates set by me within the course to facilitate completion of the project in the stages I want students to move through).
- Basic “script” or “panel” framework for the narrative constructed.
- Draft submitted for comment.

Formal assessment (written production for Standards A and B):

- 3-4 page written summary of research on the characters’ biographical information, cultural contexts; with an identification and

description of a context, time, place, and/or event; and the primary sources relevant for the dramatic context of the *colloquium*.

- Key vocabulary identified (see *Vocabularium Colloquii*).
- Basic grammatical stylesheet for the narrative and critical vocabulary (see *Grammar Style Sheet*) which demonstrates which syntax and vocabulary will be used and how.
- Final version of the *Dialogue*.

Student Activities

- Choose a relevant historical figure, historical/political event, social situation or monument from Roman antiquity (best to choose one that is somehow described in extant Latin prose);
- Research the chosen subject (e.g., biographical information, cultural contexts, and primary sources, images, etc.);
- Identify a context, time, place, and/or event that will underpin your dialogue composition [*first due date*];
- Identify key vocabulary (in conjunction with *Vocabularium Colloquii*), [*second due date*];
- Construct a basic “script” or “panel layout” (if, e.g., the dialogue will be recorded on video) for your dialogue [*third due date*];
- Construct a basic *Grammatical Palette* for your narrative and identify critical syntactic structures (in conjunction with *Grammar Style Sheet* [*fourth due date*]);
- Begin writing, revise, revise, revise. Submit a Draft [*fifth due date*].
- Submit final draft [*final due date*]

Required Resources

- Access to printed or digital resources for cultural and historical information (e.g., a university library)
- Access to printed or digital dictionaries (L1 to L2 and L2 to L1)

CONCLUSION

Wiggins and McTighe (2005) prefer to call standards-based design “results-driven” in contrast to “content-driven,” but I think this is unnecessarily combative. What teachers can teach without content? For me at least, it has been a challenge to shift my habitual and inherited mindset for planning, in which I used to start with

textbooks, authors, materials, fun lessons, traditional methods – what I would *use* to teach Latin or Greek and their cultures. Instead, I need to push myself to start with asking what students need to learn *how to do*, abstracted from specific content. What I value about this approach most of all is that it is fundamentally inclusive of approaches to teaching and learning, materials for instruction, and assessment methods.

WORKS CITED

- American Classical League and Society for Classical Studies Joint Task Force on Standards for Classical Language Learning. [*Standards for Classical Language Learning*](#). Rev. ed. Draft. Hamilton, OH: American Classical League, 2017.
- Childre, A., J. R. Sands, and S. T. Pope. “Backward design.” *Teaching Exceptional Children* 41.5 (2009): 6-14.
- Cobb, P. and K. Jackson. “Supporting teachers’ use of research-based instructional sequences.” *ZDM Mathematics Education* 47 (2015): 1027-1038.
- Elmore, R. F. “Backward mapping: Implementation research and policy decisions.” *Political Science Quarterly* 94 (1979-1980): 601-616.
- Ladwig, J. “Working backwards toward curriculum: On the curricular implications of Quality Teaching.” *Curriculum Journal* 20.3 (2009): 271-286.
- Oleksak, R. “Building a Framework for National Assessment Literacy.” *Foreign Language Annals* 40.4 (2007): 565.
- Sykes, G. and S. Wilson. “How Teachers Teach: Mapping the Terrain of Practice.” *Understanding by Design®*, edited by ETS, G. Wiggins, and J. McTighe, 2nd ed., Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2005.

APPENDIX A

MARCUS AURELIUS *MEDITATIONS* 1.1-14

Greek text: Marcus Aurelius. *M. Antonius Imperator Ad Se Ipsum*. Jan Hendrik Leopold. in aedibus B. G. Teubneri. Leipzig. 1908.

Latin text: *M. Antonini Imperatoris Romani, Et Philosophi De seipso seu vita sua Liber XII*. trans. W. Xylander. Lugduni (Lyon). 1559. [transcribed and normalized by P. Anderson]

1.1 Παρὰ τοῦ πάππου Οὐήρου τὸ καλόηθες καὶ ἀόρητον.	<i>Ab avo meo Vero didici placidis esse moribus et irae abstinens.</i>
1.2 Παρὰ τῆς δόξης καὶ μνήμης τῆς περὶ τοῦ γεννήσαντος τὸ αἰδήμιον καὶ ἀρρενικόν.	<i>Existimatione parentis mei eiusque recordatio ad verecundiam et viro dignos mores usus sum.</i>
1.3 Παρὰ τῆς μητρὸς τὸ θεοσεβῆς καὶ μεταδοτικὸν καὶ ἀφεκτικὸν οὐ μόνον τοῦ κακοποιεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ ἐννοίας γίνεσθαι τοιαύτης: ἔτι δὲ τὸ λιτὸν κατὰ τὴν δίαιταν καὶ πόρρω τῆς πλουσιακῆς διαγωγῆς.	<i>Matrem in studio pietatis erga deos liberalitateque imitatus; praeterea in abstinendo a non perpetrando modo sed et cogitandis flagitiis; tum in frugalitate victus ab opulentiam comitante luxu remotissima.</i>
1.4 Παρὰ τοῦ προπάππου τὸ μὴ εἰς δημοσίᾳς διατριβὰς φοιτῆσαι καὶ τὸ ἀγαθοῖς διδασκάλοις κατ' οἶκον χρῆσασθαι καὶ τὸ γινῶναι ὅτι εἰς τὰ τοιαῦτα δεῖ ἐκτενῶς ἀναλίσκειν.	<i>A proavo id habui ut ne in publicos ludos commearem sed bonis praeceptoribus domi meae uterer intellegeremque nullis hac in re parcendum sumptibus.</i>
1.5 Παρὰ τοῦ τροφῆως τὸ μήτε Πρασιανὸς μήτε Βενετιανὸς μήτε Παλμουλάριος ἢ Σκουτάριος γενέσθαι: καὶ τὸ φερέπονον καὶ ὀλιγοδεές: καὶ τὸ αὐτουργικὸν καὶ ἀπολύπραγμον: καὶ τὸ δυσπρόσδεκτον διαβολῆς.	<i>Ab educatore, ne auriga prasinus aut venetus neve palmularius aut scutarius fierent ab eodem; tolerare labores, esse contentus parvo, operari, non immiscere me multis negotiis, haud facile calumniam admittere didici.</i>

<p>1.6 Παρὰ Διογνήτου τὸ ἀκενόσπουδον: καὶ τὸ ἀπιστητικὸν τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν τερατευομένων καὶ γοήτων περὶ ἐπιδῶν καὶ περὶ δαιμόνων ἀποπομπῆς καὶ τῶν τοιούτων λεγομένοις: καὶ τὸ μὴ ὀρτυγοτροφεῖν μηδὲ περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐπτοῆσθαι: καὶ τὸ ἀνέχεσθαι παρρησίας: καὶ τὸ οἰκειωθῆναι φιλοσοφίᾳ καὶ τὸ ἀκοῦσαι πρῶτον μὲν Βακχείου, εἶτα Τανδάσιδος καὶ Μαρκιανοῦ: καὶ τὸ γράψαι διαλόγους ἐν παιδί: καὶ τὸ σκίμποδος καὶ δορᾶς ἐπιθυμῆσαι καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἀγωγῆς ἐχόμενα.</p>	<p><i>A Diogneto, studium in res inanes non conferre; fidem abrogare iis quae de incantationibus demonumque profligationibus ac id genus aliis rebus praestigiatore et impostores referunt; neque animi causa coturnices alere aut similitium rerum studio et cupiditate teneri; item libere dicta ferre aequo animo, philosophiae me addicere, audire primo Bacchium, deinde Tandasidem ac Marcianum, scribere dialogos puerili aetate; grabatum, pellem, aliaque ad Graecam disciplinam pertinentia requirere.</i></p>
<p>1.7 Παρὰ Ῥουστίκου τὸ λαβεῖν φαντασίαν τοῦ χρῆζειν διορθώσεως καὶ θεραπείας τοῦ ἥθους: καὶ τὸ μὴ ἐκτραπῆναι εἰς ζῆλον σοφιστικόν, μηδὲ τὸ συγγράφειν περὶ τῶν θεωρημάτων, ἢ προτρεπτικὰ λογάρια διαλέγεσθαι, ἢ φαντασιοπλήκτως τὸν ἀσκητικὸν ἢ τὸν ἐνεργητικὸν ἄνδρα ἐπιδείκνυσθαι: [2] καὶ τὸ ἀποστῆναι ῥητορικῆς καὶ ποιητικῆς καὶ ἀστειολογίας: καὶ τὸ μὴ ἐν στολῇ κατ' οἶκον περιπατεῖν μηδὲ τὰ τοιαῦτα ποιεῖν: καὶ τὸ τὰ ἐπιστόλια ἀφελῶς γράφειν, οἷον τὸ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τούτου ἀπὸ Σινοέσης τῇ μητρί μου γραφέν: [3] καὶ τὸ πρὸς τοὺς χαλεπήναντας καὶ πλημμελήσαντας εὐανακλήτως καὶ εὐδιαλλάκτως, ἐπειδὴν τάχιστα αὐτοὶ ἐπανελθεῖν ἐθελήσωσι, διακεῖσθαι: καὶ τὸ ἀκριβῶς ἀναγινώσκειν καὶ μὴ ἀρκεῖσθαι περινοοῦντα ὀλοσχερῶς μηδὲ τοῖς περιλαλοῦσι ταχέως συγκατατίθεσθαι: καὶ τὸ ἐντυχεῖν τοῖς Ἐπικτητείοις ὑπομνήμασιν, ὧν οἶκοθεν μετέδωκεν.</p>	<p><i>Rustici monitu, in eam deveni cognitionem mores meos correctione ac cultu opus habere; non esse imitandos Sophistas, non esse institutendas de contemplationibus descriptiones neque orationum adhortatorias declamandum; neque speciem viri exercitiis dediti ac laboriosi ostendam. ad haec rhetorica, poesi, et astrologia abstinendum; domi neque vestitu neque aliis huius modi rebus utendum; epistolas scribendas simpliciter, quo modo ipsius ad matrem meam est epistola Sinuessā missa. insuper, placabilitatem esse, et in alloquio facilitatem, exhibendam iis qui stomachum nobis moverint aut aliquid deliquerint simulantque ii redire ad officium velint; diligenter etiam legendum neque omnino considerationem summarium satis putandum; neque celeriter adsentendum alios traducentibus; commentarios Epicteti legendos, quorum et e domo sua mihi copiam fecit.</i></p>

<p>1.8 Παρὰ Απολλωνίου τὸ ἐλεύθερον καὶ ἀναμφιβόλως ἀκύβευτον καὶ πρὸς μηδὲν ἄλλο ἀποβλέπειν μηδὲ ἐπὶ ὀλίγον ἢ πρὸς τὸν λόγον: καὶ τὸ ἀεὶ ὅμοιον, ἐν ἀλγηδόσιν ὀξείαις, ἐν ἀποβολῇ τέκνου, ἐν μακραῖς νόσοις: καὶ τὸ ἐπὶ παραδείγματος ζῶντος ἰδεῖν ἐναργῶς ὅτι δύναται ὁ αὐτὸς σφοδρότατος εἶναι καὶ ἀνειμένος: [2] καὶ τὸ ἐν ταῖς ἐξηγήσεσι μὴ δυσχεραντικόν: καὶ τὸ ἰδεῖν ἄνθρωπον σαφῶς ἐλάχιστον τῶν ἑαυτοῦ καλῶν ἡγούμενον τὴν ἐμπειρίαν καὶ τὴν ἐντρέχειαν τὴν περὶ τὸ παραδιδόναι τὰ θεωρήματα: καὶ τὸ μαθεῖν πῶς δεῖ λαμβάνειν τὰς δοκούσας χάριτας παρὰ φίλων, μῆτε ἐξηττώμενον διὰ ταῦτα μῆτε ἀναισθητῶς παραπέμποντα.</p>	<p><i>Apollonius me docuit ut libertatem sectarer certamque constantiam neque alio unquam ne minimum quidem quam ad rectam rationem respicerem. ac semper mei similis essem in gravibus doloribus, amissione prolis morbisque diuturnis; utque in vivo exemplo evidenter contemplarer posse eundem et durissimum esse et remissum quam maxime. tum etiam, ut in percipienda doctrina me non morosum praescriberem sed circumspicerem de homine, qui palam experientiam et in tradendis scientiis facultatem minimum suorum bonorum putaret. praeterea modum beneficia (ut iis videntur) ab amicis accipiendi ne vel accepta ea nos viliores redderent vel stupide negligerentur atque praetermitterentur.</i></p>
<p>1.9 Παρὰ Σέξτου τὸ εὐμενές: καὶ τὸ παράδειγμα τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρονομουμένου: καὶ τὴν ἔννοιαν τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν ζῆν: καὶ τὸ σεμνὸν ἀπλάστως: καὶ τὸ στοχαστικὸν τῶν φίλων κηδεμονικῶς: καὶ τὸ ἀνεκτικὸν τῶν ἰδιωτῶν καὶ τὸ ἀθεώρητον οἰομένων: [2] καὶ τὸ πρὸς πάντας εὐάρμοστον, ὥστε κολακείας μὲν πάσης προσηνεστέραν εἶναι τὴν ὁμιλίαν αὐτοῦ, αἰδεσιμώτατον δὲ αὐτοῖς ἐκείνοις παρ' αὐτὸν ἐκείνον τὸν καιρὸν εἶναι: καὶ τὸ καταληπτικῶς καὶ ὁδῶ ἐξευρετικόν τε καὶ τακτικὸν τῶν εἰς βίον ἀναγκαίων δογμάτων: [3] καὶ τὸ μηδὲ ἔμφασίν ποτε ὀργῆς ἢ ἄλλου τινὸς πάθους παρασχεῖν, ἀλλὰ ἅμα μὲν ἀπαθέστατον εἶναι, ἅμα δὲ φιλοστοργότατον: καὶ τὸ εὐφημον ἀσοφητὶ καὶ τὸ πολυμαθὲς ἀνεπιφάντως.</p>	<p><i>In Sexto, depraehendi comitatem et exemplum domus ad arbitrium patrisfamilialis institutae, vivendi secundum naturam, gravitatem non simulatam inque consulendo amicorum commodis sagacitatem, facilitatem erga privatos moresque omnibus accomodatos. quo fiebat ut eius consuetudo omni adulatione suavior ipseque eodem tempore in summa apud eos, quibuscum agebat, veneratione esset. porro autem expeditam viam ac rationem inveniendi et disponendi praecepta ad usum vitae necessaria. item quod neque irae neque ali[us]cuiusquam animi commotionis ullum indicium dabat sed simul et quam maxime affectibus vacuus et humanissimi erat ingenii. in eodem, honestam famam sine iactatione multarumque rerum scientiam citra ostentationem.</i></p>

<p>1.10 Παρὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ γραμματικοῦ τὸ ἀνεπίληκτον καὶ τὸ μὴ ὄνειδιστικῶς ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι τῶν βάρβαρον ἢ σόλοικόν τι ἢ ἀπηχῆς προενεγκαμένων, ἀλλ' ἐπιδεξίως αὐτὸ μόνον ἐκεῖνο ὃ ἔδει εἰρησθαι προφέρεσθαι ἐν τρόπῳ ἀποκρίσεως ἢ συνεπιμαρτυρήσεως ἢ συνδιαλήψεως περὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πράγματος, οὐχὶ περὶ τοῦ ῥήματος, ἢ δι' ἑτέρας τινὸς τοιαύτης ἐμμελοῦς παρυπομνήσεως.</p>	<p><i>Alexandrum Grammaticum observabam ab increpationibus sibi temperare, neque ignominiose castigare si quis barbarum, soloecum, aut absonum quippiam protulisset, sed civiliter id modo, quod dicendum fuerat, pronunciare. Perinde ac si respondens vel suam sententiam interponeret, aut rationem re ipsa, non verbo, cum altero conferret. Aut omnino alia quadam solerti et occulta correctione idem efficiebat.</i></p>
<p>1.11 Παρὰ Φρόντωνος τὸ ἐπιστῆσαι οἷα ἢ τυραννικὴ βασκανία καὶ ποικιλία καὶ ὑπόκρισις, καὶ ὅτι ὡς ἐπίπαν οἱ καλούμενοι οὗτοι παρ' ἡμῖν εὐπατρίδαι ἀστοργότεροί πως εἰσί.</p>	<p><i>A Frontone didici ut scirem quae consequeretur tyrannidem invidia, quae varietas, simulatio; et quod omnino qui nobis patricii dicuntur, inhumaniores quodam modo sint reliquis.</i></p>
<p>1.12 Παρὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Πλατωνικοῦ τὸ μὴ πολλάκις μηδὲ χωρὶς ἀνάγκης λέγειν πρὸς τινα ἢ ἐν ἐπιστολῇ γράφειν ὅτι ἄσχολός εἰμι, μηδὲ διὰ τούτου τοῦ τρόπου συνεχῶς παραιτεῖσθαι τὰ κατὰ τὰς πρὸς τοὺς συμβιοῦντας σχέσεις καθήκοντα, προβαλλόμενον τὰ περιεστῶτα πράγματα.</p>	<p><i>Ab Alexandro Platónico ne crebro, neve nisi necessitate coactus, cuiquam dicerem scriberemve me esse occupatum, neve identidem impendentia negocia praetendendo debita familiaribus officia detrectarem.</i></p>
<p>1.13 Παρὰ Κατούλου τὸ μὴ ὀλιγώρως ἔχειν φίλου αἰτιωμένου τι, κἂν τύχη ἀλόγως αἰτιώμενος, ἀλλὰ πειρᾶσθαι καὶ ἀποκαθιστάναι ἐπὶ τὸ σύνηθες: καὶ τὸ περὶ τῶν διδασκάλων ἐκθύμως εὐφημον, οἷα τὰ περὶ Δομιτίου καὶ Ἀθηνοδότου ἀπομνημονευόμενα: καὶ τὸ περὶ τὰ τέκνα ἀληθινῶς ἀγαπητικόν.</p>	<p><i>A Catulo ne parvi facerem si quid amicus conqueretur; etiamsi nulla id ab eo fieret ratione: sed anniterer eum in pristinam gratiam reducere. item ut summa animi contentione praeceptorum laudem praedicarem, uti de Domitio et Athenodoto traditum est. utque liberos vere diligerem.</i></p>

<p>1.14 Παρὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ μου Σεουήρου τὸ φιλοίκειον καὶ φιλάληθες καὶ φιλοδίκαιον: καὶ τὸ δι' αὐτοῦ γινῶναι Θρασέαν, Ἑλβίδιον, Κάτωνα, Δίωνα, Βροῦτον, καὶ φαντασίαν λαβεῖν πολιτείας ἰσονόμου, κατ' ἰσότητα καὶ ἰσηγορίαν διοικουμένης, καὶ βασιλείας τιμώσης πάντων μάλιστα τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῶν ἀρχομένων: [2] καὶ ἔτι παρὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τὸ ὁμαλές καὶ ὁμότονον ἐν τῇ τιμῇ τῆς: καὶ τὸ εὐποιοτικὸν καὶ τὸ εὐμετάδοτον ἐκτενῶς καὶ τὸ εὐέλπι καὶ τὸ πιστευτικὸν περὶ τοῦ ὑπὸ τῶν φίλων φιλεῖσθαι: καὶ τὸ ἀνεπίκρυπτον πρὸς τοὺς καταγνώσεως ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τυγχάνοντας: καὶ τὸ μὴ δεῖσθαι στοχασμοῦ τοὺς φίλους αὐτοῦ περὶ τοῦ τί θέλει ἢ τί οὐ θέλει, ἀλλὰ δῆλον εἶναι.</p>	<p><i>A fratre meo Severo amorem familiarium et veritatis iustitiaeque. per eundem cognovi Thraseam, Helvidium, Catonem, Dionem, Brutum. idem mihi au[c]tor fuit ut animo conciperem formam reipublicae in qua aequis legibus eodemque iure omnia administraretur, ac regni, cui nihil esset libertate subditorum antiquius. eundem observans curis esse vacuum, constantiam in honore philosophiae habendo, beneficentiam et liberalitatem perpetuam servare, bene sperare, ac de amicorum in amore certo sibi polliceri, a quibus animo esset factus alieno, id iis non occultum ferre. neque amicis eius opus esse, ut de ipsius voluntate coniecturam facerent, sed eam apertam esse.</i></p>
--	---

APPENDIX B

DIALOGUE PROJECT ORIGINAL MATERIALS

Prospectus Colloquii

LEARNING GOALS:

- 1) To develop critical thinking skills in proposing Latin grammatical structures and framing them correctly;
- 2) To use syntactic structures within constructed dialogue in an accurate, creative, and informed way;
- 3) To express ideas, feelings, contextual and social information in a culturally accurate way.

STEPS:

- 1) Choose a relevant historical figure, historical/political event, social situation, or monument from Roman antiquity (best to choose one that is somehow described in extant Latin prose);
- 2) Research the chosen subject (e.g. biographical information, cultural contexts, and primary sources, images, etc.);
- 3) Identify a context, time, place, and/or event that will underpin your dialogue composition (*first due date*);
- 4) Identify key vocabulary (in conjunction with *Vocabulary Assignment (Vocabularium Colloquii)*, *second due date*);
- 5) Construct a basic “script” or “panel layout” for your dialogue (*third due date*);
- 6) Construct a basic *Grammatical Palette* for your narrative and identify critical syntactic structures (in conjunction with *Grammar Style Sheet*, *fourth due date*);
- 7) Begin writing, revise, revise, revise – Draft Due *fifth due date*.

EVALUATION:

Evaluation of the project will be closely linked to adherence to the procedure guidelines above and the completion of benchmark goals by the assigned dates.

- 1) 3-4 page summary of research on your characters’ biographical information, cultural contexts, with an identification and description of a context, time, place, and/or event and the primary sources relevant for the dramatic context of your colloquium [10 points];
- 2) key vocabulary identified (graded separately as *Vocabularium Colloquii*);
- 3) basic “script” or “panel” framework for the narrative constructed [5 points];

- 4) basic grammatical structure for your narrative and critical vocabulary (see *Grammar Style Sheet*) [5 points];
- 5) Draft submitted for comment [5 points];
- 6) Final version [15 points]. TOTAL = 40 points.

Vocabularium Colloquii

STEPS:

- 1) Construct a subject and context vocabulary list for your Dialogue project of at least 15 key words and phrases;
N.B. You must demonstrate a balance between word-types (parts of speech). e.g., do not submit a list of adjectives.
- 2) Examine the word entries in Oxford Latin Dictionary;
N.B. When you read the entry in OLD, carefully copy out possible examples from ancient authors.
- 3) Identify major grammatical constructions or semantic interests associated with each word, if any.
N.B. if there are none, you need to ask yourself whether the word belongs in this assignment (although it may be appropriate for the final product).

GRADING:

- 1) On a 10 point scale, distributed as follows: 5 points for Steps item 1 (3 points accuracy, 2 points completeness), 5 points for Steps item 3 (3 points accuracy, 2 points completeness).

Grammatical Palette for Colloquium

Each Colloquium must make use of the following grammatical structures over the course of the colloquium. Students submit a *Grammar Style Sheet* with examples in Latin of at least five of the required structures from B. below (*fourth due date*).

All quantities below are a minimum:

A. Cases:

- a. (at least) two different uses of the genitive (e.g., partitive, possessive, quality)
- b. (at least) two different uses of the dative (e.g., reference, purpose, possession)
- c. (at least) two different uses of the ablative without a preposition

- B. Clauses (note that clauses are differentiated from phrases by the presence of a finite verb)
 - a. (at least) two examples of *oratio obliqua*
 - b. (at least) one dependent clause inside *oratio obliqua*
 - c. (at least) one Indirect Question
 - d. (at least) two noun clauses other than a. or c.
 - e. (at least) two Adverbial Clauses
 - f. (at least) two Adjectival Clauses
- C. Other Syntax
 - a. (at least) three Participial Phrases, one of which must be an ablative absolute)
 - b. (at least) three Prepositional Phrases
 - c. (at least) one use of a Verbal Noun (e.g., infinitive as a noun, supine, gerund)
 - d. (at least) one use of a complementary infinitive
 - e. (at least) two uses of a dependent subjunctive (see B. above)
 - f. (at least) three uses of the imperative or hortatory subjunctive
 - g. (at least) two different expressions of purpose
- D. Structural Requirements
 - a. (at least) two sentences with three levels of subordination (e.g., sentence with a dependent clause inside *oratio obliqua*, see B.b.)
 - b. Accurate use of (at least) five “particles” (*autem*, *atque*, *immo*, etc.)
 - c. formal greeting and closing elements