

Cornelia Vindicata: The Progressive Latin Curriculum at the University of Chicago Laboratory Schools under Mima Maxey (1885-1965) and Marjorie Fay (1893-1977)

**EVAN DUTMER
CULVER ACADEMIES**

Nam et Latina aliquando infans utique nulla noveram et tamen advertendo didici sine ullo metu atque cruciatu inter etiam blandimenta nutricum et ioca arridentium et laetitias alludentium.

Augustine *Confessions* 1.14.23

There was a time when, as an infant, I didn't know any Latin words either; but I nevertheless learned by paying attention, without any fear or pain, amid the pleasing words of my nurses, and playful teasing, and joyous happiness.

(My translation; drawing from Kim 2019 and Boulding 2012)

1. Introduction: Proficiency-oriented Latin Instruction Past and Present

Contemporary debates surrounding the efficacy of grammar-translation (GT) instruction in producing eventual Latin and Greek reading proficiency follow a long, thorny tradition of disagreement in Latin pedagogy.¹ Despite the ascendance of the GT method (also known as the Prussian Method, Philological Method, German Method) in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in high schools and universities across the world (typified by *Wheelock's Latin*), so-called “natural” or, more broadly, “proficiency-oriented” approaches to Latin learning have been introduced and defended with regularity for as long as Latin has been taught and studied (e.g., Hans Oerberg’s “nature method” in *Lingua Latina Per Se Illustrata*,

R.B. Appleton and W.H.D. Rouse's *Latin on the Direct Method*, and John Locke's "Interlinear Method").²

A reevaluation, retooling, and retrying of so-called "natural," "proficiency-oriented," or "vocabulary-driven" approaches across Latin and Greek curricula has ignited enthusiasm in both secondary and collegiate classics education.³ This essay is about one of the most systematic natural approaches to have been tried in the United States *before* the recent crop of communicative approaches to the teaching of Latin: the revolutionary reading-based curriculum developed by Mima Maxey and Marjorie Fay at the University High School of John Dewey's University of Chicago Laboratory Schools in the first half of the twentieth century.⁴ An historical reevaluation of this earlier model for natural method Latin language learning—before the advent of modern linguistics and, in particular, Second Language Acquisition theory—offers much in the way of (i) inspiration and historical edification, (ii) some practical classroom application, and, finally, (iii) a cautionary note.⁵

This curriculum featured no explicit grammatical instruction. Instead, following a simple pedagogical 'credo' (described in this essay), students learned to read, write, and speak in Latin from the earliest stages via simple, engaging stories (and extensive catalogues of images) meant to be understood by the very smallest language learners. The result is a revolutionary change in approach: a Latin curriculum developed on an understanding of the human psychology of language learning. This method produced immediate results—culminating in a report finding that Laboratory School students were reading at higher proficiency (via testing with the Ullman-Kirby Comprehension Test) than a control group of Lab students taught on the grammar-translation method.⁶

The Chicago Method—as I call it—didn’t catch on, despite several prominent publications in the Heath-Chicago Latin Series in 1933: *A New Latin Primer*, *Cornelia*, and *Carolus et Maria*. I don’t conjecture in this essay why that was the case. Instead, the second half of this essay concerns my attempts to reintroduce some of the texts of *Cornelia*, *Carolus et Maria*, and *A New Latin Primer* (adapted for today’s students) in my Latin 1 classes this past term. I include some examples from my students’ presentational writing assessments from just the first four weeks of Latin instruction with notes on how these items might be assessed according to ACTFL proficiency-oriented rubrics. Preliminary results (in conjunction with a Comprehensible Input-friendly Spoken Latin curriculum) have been promising—as I think the evidence I provide in the way of student examples will show.

This essay will be of interest to those interested in the history of Latin pedagogy and those looking to add to their repertoire of simple, comprehensible Latin texts.

2. *The Chicago Method for Learning Latin: Origins*

The University of Chicago Laboratory Schools were founded by American progressive education reformer and pragmatist philosopher John Dewey in Hyde Park, Chicago, in November 1894.⁷

His Laboratory Schools were ordered around foundational principles of progressive education (famously summarized in *The School and Society* and *The Child and the Curriculum*).⁸ In sum, these principles pointed to a child-centered curriculum aimed at regulating, directing, and celebrating the natural activities of

the child in a guided process of curiosity and free exploration, in contradistinction to traditional transmission models of education which largely aimed to inscribe on students (conceived as “blank slates”) important knowledge and literacy skills through rote and dictation.⁹ Successive generations of Lab School educators were raised in and continued this tradition of progressive schooling.¹⁰

Mima Maxey and Marjorie Fay, two Lab School Latin teachers who taught in the first half of the twentieth century (their tenures flourished in the 1930s), began to experiment with a child-centered, reading-based, proficiency-oriented approach to the teaching of Latin. Outside of partial forerunners in University of Chicago Laboratory School’s own William Gardner Hale (though his methods did not require the jettisoning of traditional Latin grammar) and Marion Schibsby, Maxey and Fay’s experiment was virtually without precedent in American Latin education.¹¹ It advanced on simple, clear principles of child-centered, proficiency-oriented language education and led to the creation of a series of powerful Latin learning texts in the 1930s, which I describe below.¹²

3. The Chicago Method: The Credo and Texts

In 1933, Maxey and Fay embarked on an ambitious and exciting publication program, giving wider distribution to their first-year Latin reading materials to the broader public from their experiments at the University of Chicago: they published *A New Latin Primer*, *Cornelia*, and *Carolus et Maria*.¹³ *Cornelia* and *A New Latin Primer* begin with a pedagogical “credo” and a few supplemental paragraphs to explain their bold new approach:

*The Chicago Credo*¹⁴

- Things exist written in the Latin language that are worth reading today.
- Latin should be so taught as to develop the power to read those things in Latin.
- One learns to read by reading.
- Material for reading in the early stages should be easy and repetitious, should introduce new vocabulary in self-evident situations.

The acquisition of the language itself is a sufficiently large task for the beginner. He should not be called upon to deal with situations outside his own experience or to acquire knowledge through the new medium; neither should his problem be complicated by the necessity of learning a formidable grammatical nomenclature or a science of grammar that the Romans themselves managed to do without until its introduction by Dionysius Thrax, who was born 166 B.C.

Omission of formal grammar need not result in inaccurate or incorrect Latin. A tendency to inexactness can be corrected by much oral reading of Latin and by writing in Latin. (Maxey vii)¹⁵

Striking resemblances appear at once between this *credo* and numerous formulations of applied comprehensible input theory in contemporary second language instruction. First, it is asserted that students learn to read Latin by reading.

(In contemporary parlance: students learn by receiving comprehensible input in the target language and using the target language in meaningful, communicative ways.) Second, Latin ought to be learned to produce reading *proficiency* in Latin (the common refrain of numerous CI Latin practitioners). Third, the grammatical apparatus with which many of us are familiar (traditionally held to be the product of the Alexandrian commentator, Dionysius Thrax) is ultimately unhelpful for early language learning, and, in stronger formulations, bears little similarity at all to the split-second, nearly automatic, complex natural processes used by the brain in language learning.¹⁶

It is worth pausing to reflect on how large of a departure this method was from Latin instruction across the United States and the Anglophone world in the period. According to the situation summarized in the *Classical Investigation* of 1924, students of Latin and Greek in the American school system were heavily inculcated in a “grammar and dictionary” method of classical language learning, with little emphasis on “natural” or “near-native” language comprehension.¹⁷ Owing to the prestige associated with the German universities of the nineteenth century, Latin education (and, indeed, modern language education) had become strongly influenced by the new science of academic philology. This mode of instruction focused heavily on rote memorization of grammatical paradigms, extended study of rhetorical devices and literary styles, and a deep commitment to extensive reading from Latin and Greek’s supposed “Golden Ages.”¹⁸

The Chicago Method advances on far different principles. Drawing on a wealth of contemporary research in the teaching of foreign languages available to

them, Maxey and Fay adopted their credo founded on the educational experience of the smallest language learner, trying as best as able to direct the student's basic language acquisitional activity—in the case of classical languages, reading—to the rapid (but simple, and carefully graded) recognition, memorization, and use of Latin vocabulary. The explicit, intentional choice to remove all grammatical instruction shows how far these teachers were willing to carry progressive principles: Dionysius Thrax's grammatical apparatus, they thought, was an artificial imposition on a child's natural activities (which, according to Dewey's educational philosophy, it was the task of the teacher to constructively, creatively direct).

Before Chomsky's Universal Grammar hypothesis, talk of the language acquisition device, and the advent of Second Language Acquisition as an academic discipline, these educators worried that introduction of explicit "book" grammar unnecessarily slowed the Latin language learning process and, worse, was unnatural. As Maxey puts it, "The Romans did without it" until the work of Dionysius Thrax in the second century BCE. Why couldn't we, they thought, do the same? The pedagogical approach contained in this credo is clearly demonstrated by a few illustrative examples, drawn from *A New Latin Primer*, *Cornelia*, and *Carolus et Maria*, respectively. See figures 1, 2, and 3.

UNIV. OF
CALIFORNIA

LESSON I

Salvē, discipula. Salvē, magistra. Salvē, discipule. Salvē,
magister. Salvēte, discipulī. Valē, discipula. Valē, magistra.
Valēte, discipulī.



Hic est discipulus.



Haec est discipula.



Hic est puer.



Haec est puella.



Hae sunt puellae.



Hī sunt puerī.

Fig. 1. Page 1 of *A New Latin Primer* (University of Chicago Press 1933).

I

Haec puella est Cornēlia. Cornēlia nōn est alta. Cornēlia nōn est magna. Cornēlia est puella parva. Haec puella est puella pulchra et bona quoque. Cornēlia nōn est puer; est puella parva. Cornēlia nōn est magistra. Cornēlia est discipula. Haec puella nōn est discipulus; est discipula.



Haec est magistra. Haec nōn est magister. Haec est fēmina et magistra. Haec nōn est discipula, nōn est discipulus. Haec est magistra. Cornēlia est discipula.

“Salvē, magistra.”

“Salvē, Cornēlia. Cornēlia est puella bona.”

“Magistra quoque est bona. Valē, magistra.”

“Valē, Cornēlia.”

1

Hic est puer. Hic puer est bonus. Parvus quoque est. Magnus nōn est. Altus nōn est. Pulcher nōn est. Hic puer est discipulus. Discipulus bonus quoque est. Puer est discipulus bonus. Nōn est magnus. Puer est discipulus parvus. Nōn est pulcher. Salvē, puer.



Haec est puella. Haec puella est bona. Parva quoque est. Haec puella est discipula quoque. Puella est discipula parva et pulchra. Nōn est alta et magna. Puer nōn est magnus. Puella nōn est magna. Puer nōn est pulcher. Puella est pulchra. Salvē, puella. Salvēte, puer et puella.

Haec nōn est puella. Haec est magistra. Fēmina quoque est. Magistra est magna et alta quoque. Magistra est bona

Fig. 3. Page 1 of *Carolus et Maria* (University of Chicago Press 1933).

On this method, students are led by the teacher through simple, engaging, student-centered stories—read aloud—which make use of high-frequency, high-impact Latin vocabulary.¹⁹ As seen above, students learned high-frequency Latin vocabulary in simple, declarative sentences and generous use of images. Students advanced in their reading proficiency, completing the initial Chicago Latin Course at what we would today call Intermediate-Mid Interpretive Reading proficiency according to the ACTFL proficiency rubrics.²⁰

According to Maxey's introduction to *Cornelia* (ix) under "Procedure," these texts were used as supplements to *A New Latin Primer*, which advances on the same principles as *Cornelia* and *Carolus et Maria*. However, Maxey notes that *Cornelia* was drafted as a standalone text, which was an easy-reading supplement to other contemporary introductory Latin courses popular in the 1930s. The texts were developed with the University High School students in mind (usually between the ages of 13 and 17). Each of the Chicago Method texts was drafted as part of a "first course," able to be taught and read together throughout a typical school year.

For an example of the eventual reading level achieved, see Fig. 4, the second to last page of *Cornelia*:

XL

Apud virōs antīquōs equitēs magnō honōre habēbantur. (Notāte bene, discipulī: eques nōn est equus; nōn est bēstia; est vir!) Equitēs domō exivērunt et per tōtum rēgnū, etiam per omnēs terrās ivērunt ubi eōs quī iniuriās tulerant petivērunt. Quandō eques pervēnit, eī quī iniuriā ferēbant aut fūgērunt aut id quod iniuriā cēpērunt restituērunt. Sī malī hās rēs restituere nōlēbant, eques secūrim sūmpsit et impetum fēcit. Eques numquam sē recēpit. Aut malum secūri cecidit aut malum pepulit aut eques ipse caesus est. Nisi ā multīs et malīs virīs circumventus est, eques numquam occisus est, sed victōriam reportābat.

Fābulās eius generis dē equitibus Cornēlia saepe legēbat et multum amābat. In quādam fābulā hoc lēgit: “Per ignem, per gladiōs, per aquam hī equitēs tūtī ibant.” Hoc nōn intellexit Cornēlia quod equitēs sunt hominēs atque ignēs et gladiōs iniuriā ferre sciēbat.

In aliā fābulā saepe dē equite quī album īnsigne in galeā gerēbat legēbat Cornēlia. Haec fābula ita incēpit: “Utrum est melius sī homō pācem vult, bonus gladius an bona vīta?” Hic eques nūllōs vigilēs disposuit, nocte erant nūllae vigiliae, milites aliīs militibus ad vigiliās numquam successērunt, pontēs nōn frēgērunt, quod hic eques nōn erat eques Rōmānus. Erat eques Gallicus quī erat rēx et rēgnū magnum regēbat. Ubi regere coepit, multī et nōbilēs equitēs convēnērunt. Ad suās domōs numquam rediērunt sed semper cum hōc rēge māsērunt. Eum summō honōre habēbant. Sī īnsigne album vīdērunt, ad eum locum ibant et numquam sē recipiēbant. Intereā malī virī fugiēbant et bonī rēs meliōrēs spērāre coepē-

4. Cornelia Vindicata: Practical Applications and Classroom Reflections

Now I'd like to spend a few moments presenting and reflecting on some applications of the Chicago Method texts in my Latin 1 classroom in a high school setting this past spring (2020), just before our campus transitioned to online learning in the wake of the Covid-19 pandemic. I'll (i) remark on the promising preliminary results of this experiment and (ii) show some student examples of original, written Latin after four weeks in my Latin 1 class, and (iii) conclude with a few notes on the limitations of these texts, especially concerning commitments to the inclusive classroom in 21st century US teaching context.

First, then, I'll say a little bit more about my teaching context, hypothesis, methods, and preliminary results.

Teaching Context

I teach at the Culver Academies, a grades 9-12 boarding school in rural Northern Indiana. I am Instructor in Latin, Ancient Mediterranean Cultures, and Ethics. Courses are small—we typically have between 9 and 12 students in a typical Latin 1 section. Some can be larger (16 is usually our largest). Our student body is predominantly white and affluent, with a considerable international student population (especially from China and Mexico—roughly 18% of our student body combined). Our domestic BIPOC representation is around 10%.

I teach with one colleague, Ashley Brewer, but I conducted my experiment this first quarter of 2020 in my two sections of Latin 1. I had nine students in each section, for a total of 18 students. Our Latin 1 students have no prior exposure to

Latin.

Hypothesis

Based on less formal implementation in previous Latin sections, I suspected generous use of Chicago Method texts (i.e., *A New Latin Primer*; *Cornelia*, and *Carolus et Maria*), in addition to other comprehensible Novice Latin reading materials (see note below), would produce Novice Mid Presentational Writing proficiency in a majority of my Latin 1 students in Spring 2020. I would evaluate this through a presentational writing task on their first term Integrated Performance Assessment (IPA).²¹

So, formally:

Hypothesis: *A majority of students in my Latin 1 sections will produce Presentational Writing at the Novice Mid proficiency level after four weeks of reading and listening activities ordered around Chicago Method and Nature Method (i.e., LLPSI) Latin selections in addition to my Spoken Latin delivery.*²²

Teaching Method

I teach Latin according to a proficiency-oriented method following CARLA and ACTFL best practice, where students hear, speak, read, and write Latin every day. I implement numerous reading-centered and input-centered activities throughout my class period (85 minutes), aimed at maximizing comprehensible input, student engagement, and lowering student anxiety (or the “affective filter”).²³

In these next few paragraphs, to give a clearer picture of what this teaching method *looks* like, I'll provide a quick introduction to how I introduce, use, and modify comprehensible texts and how I have students interpret, use, and modify those texts. In particular, I'll focus on what I did to introduce the Chicago Method texts in my classroom over my first four weeks of Latin instruction in my Latin 1 course this past spring. I'll focus on four simple activities that can easily be implemented in any proficiency-oriented introductory Latin classroom with minimal outside preparation: (i) *recitate pariter* (read aloud together), (ii) *dictatio cum picturis* (dictation with pictures), (iii) *convertio choralis* (choral translation), and (iv) *scriptura communis* (group composition).²⁴ I'll sketch, too, how these activities can build off one another by showing how vocabulary in one activity can blend into vocabulary in the next.

(i) Recitate pariter! (Read aloud together!)

The most basic activity in my classroom is reading. Simple, directed, communal reading aloud between teacher and students has been the bedrock of my teaching practice. I arrange students in my classroom in a circle and either sit in the middle of the circle in a swivel chair (so that I can quickly look at any student who is speaking) or walk back and forth between the front and back whiteboards as we read together, so that I can guide my students' comprehension via quickly written cues. I may write a key term on the board after we've just read it and ask the students what it means—"Quid significat Anglice?" I may draw a picture of an important object, asking, "Quid est hoc Latine?" or "Quae est pictura?" This allows us, as a class, to speak in Latin as much as possible while establishing the

meaning of key terms slowly as we go.

I solicit volunteers to read one to two lines of Latin when we read so as not to induce boredom among the other students if either I or students read for too long. Students are generally happy to read, so long as they are not excessively corrected and they feel like they have the power to read Latin aloud well.²⁵

But if boredom is inevitable and students are particularly antsy, I'll pass out individual whiteboards. We'll read a line. For example, take this sentence from *Cornelia*: "*Mater Corneliae non est parva; est femina magna.*" (*Cornelia* 2) ²⁶ After we've read the line, I ask students to "*Pingite sententiam!*" Students then go on drawing the mother of Cornelia, representing in all different ways how she's not small and how she is, in fact, big. They might draw a little girl for comparison's sake. This is a moment of choice for them—they get to show in whatever way they like that they comprehend the sentence. This can be straightforward, or it can be creative. In line with Dewey's methodology, I do what I can to let their natural propensity to curiosity and play direct these pauses. When enough of them have finished their drawings, I tell them: "*Demonstrate mihi picturas vobis!*" Students show their pictures to me, giving me an instant check on student comprehension. In sum, this is an easy, effective way to redirect student interest and activity back to the message of the sentence we've just read.

It was not uncommon for me and my students to read from *Cornelia* or another of the Chicago Method texts for 15-20 minutes without interruption. Owing to how the Chicago Method texts are structured, this is a significant amount of

comprehensible input. At the end of this 20 minutes, I like to introduce a different kind of activity: discrete vocabulary practice and manipulation.

(ii) *Dictatio cum picturis* (dictation with pictures)

I've adapted my classroom dictation activity (*dictatio*) after reading about the practice from a few different practitioners.²⁷ In my version, I recite one Latin word at a time from the reading we've just read. Students use notecards to write each Latin word down on one side, along with its English meaning, and draw a simple picture of the thing signified by the word on the other. In this case, let's say it's key vocabulary from page 2 of *Cornelia*, which I'm hoping students will acquire.

In the case that we've just read from page 2 of *Cornelia*, I might be interested in students starting to make visual associations with *mater*, *pater*, *non*, *est*, *sunt*, *bona*, *femina*, *parva*, *magna*, *frater*, *soror*, *amat*.

As I read aloud each of these words slowly and deliberately in Restored Pronunciation, students write down the word in Latin, its meaning in English, and then draw a picture of the thing signified by the word on the other side of the card.²⁸ This gives students a chance to slow down the language acquisition process: we take discrete Latin words out of context, but in so doing, we establish a clear, visual association. As long-lasting language acquisition is significantly linked to visual connections between word and object, this, in my eyes, is a worthwhile exercise.²⁹

Once students have these ready-made flashcards, I'll usually have students drill once or twice by using the images on one side and the Latin terms on the other.

Students will have fun as they try to guess Latin words from the pictures each drew. All the while, students are making important visual connections between Latin words and real-world things. That basic, unmediated connection—between word and thing—is another central element of my teaching practice.

Too often, Latin instruction proceeds on a strictly English-mediated translational system: students learn a Latin word as a signifier of an English word which in turn signifies a thing; they do not learn to use Latin for making signifiers of real-world *things*.

(iii) *Convertio choralis* (choral translation)

Once we've established the meanings of these discrete words, I'll have students return to a new reading from the selection we're reading from, or a slightly manipulated version of a text we've already seen, to perform what is called a 'choral translation' (*convertio choralis*). This is a common, comprehension-building activity for proficiency-oriented language instructors. In it, the teacher and students go through a text word by word, establishing meaning for each word through direct translation delivered by the class as a "chorus."

In this case, I might first have my students return to a passage from *Cornelia* (either from a little before or a little after where we left off in our first activity). Then, I'll slowly deliver each word of a sentence, pausing for students to call out the English meaning. For example, I'll read aloud, and students will call out in this pattern: "*Haec* (this!) *puella* (girl!) *non* (not!) *est* (is!) *soror* (sister!) *Corneliae* (of Cornelia!) *sed* (but!) *hic* (this!) *puer* (boy!) *est* (is!) *frater* (brother!) *Corneliae* (of

Cornelia!). *Hic* (this!) *puer* (boy!) *est* (is!) *filius* (son!) *feminae* (of the woman!).”
(*Cornelia* 2)³⁰

This gives students a chance to rapidly establish meaning for each Latin word in a sentence and offers me an excellent opportunity to check for which words students have still not acquired. This activity also lowers the affective filter by creating a sense of anonymity: students *all* call out the meaning of the pronounced Latin term. No one is put on the spot.

Once I’ve practiced these terms in various ways—making sure that classroom comprehensibility was my central goal—I’m ready to finish with my culminating activity for a class period: One which helps students not just to understand comprehensible input, but to produce, even if in just little bits, comprehensible output to share with their fellow students.³¹

(iv) *Scriptura communis* (group composition)

Lastly, I’ll have students practice manipulating vocabulary—and produce fun, comprehensible, freely-composed output—in an activity, I call ‘*scriptura communis*’ (group composition). In this activity, I’ll write a sentence in Latin at the very top of the board that serves as the beginning of an open-ended story. I’ll then give students an important word they’ll need to incorporate in a sentence to continue the story. The students work in pairs to craft Latin sentences that they’ll present as possible moves forward in the story. I have students vote which sentence gets chosen: keeping student engagement and feelings of ownership and vested interest high.

For example, a *scriptura communis* might look something like this (where words in parentheses are words I supplied for students to manipulate into sentences):

CHALKBOARD

[MAGISTRI SENTENTIA.] *Cornelia est in via.*

[DISCIPULORUM SENTENTIAE.] (puella) *Cornelia est puella.*

(parva) *Cornelia est quoque parva; sed mater valde alta, sicut arbor, est.*

(frater) *Corneliae frater, nomine Marcus, est etiam in via. Est altus.*

(pater) *Cornelia, pater Corneliae, et frater Corneliae sunt in via in Italia. Non sunt domi.*

(leo) *Illi vident leo(nem) in via in monte in Italia!*

(habere) *Leo habet multos dentes... in via.*

(volo) *Cornelia vult currere! Frater vult currere! Pater vult currere!*³²

This activity combines comprehensible input (in terms of each sentence's being read and understood by the classroom participants) and comprehensible output (in the form of the sentences constructed out of manipulated words from the students' vocabularies and the target word I provide). I often use this as a culmination activity for a class period. It combines reading, listening, speaking, and writing in Latin, all in a low-prep, student-driven classroom activity.

Now that I've given a better picture of how I use a comprehensible text as a springboard for other activities, I'll move on to how I went about assessing student work, gathering evidence of what proficiency they'd arrived at.

Assessment Method

In accordance with ACTFL best practices, our World Languages and Cultures Department strives to assess student performance through Integrated Performance Assessments.³³

At the end of 4 weeks of introductory Latin instruction, I implemented my first IPA of the term with my Latin I students. As part of this IPA, students were asked to write on the following prompt to demonstrate their presentational writing proficiency:

Presentational Writing Prompt.

Free Response: Dream Home.

For this section, please describe your dream home. You may do this for a modern home or for an ancient one. Please write at least 5 complete Latin sentences (noun and verb), and please do draw a picture of your dream house as well.

I then collected these responses and evaluated them according to the Novice Mid Can-Do statements. In particular, I was interested in these particular Can-Do statements under the general Novice Mid heading:

PRESENTATIONAL WRITING NOVICE MID

I can write lists and memorized phrases on familiar topics.

I can write about myself using learned phrases and memorized expressions. I can list my likes and dislikes, such as favorite subjects, sports, or free-time activities. I can list my family members, their ages, their relationships to me, and what they like to do. I can list my classes and tell what time they start and end. I can write simple statements about where I live.

Students were given 25 minutes to complete the prompt without access to a dictionary or a computer.

Student Examples

I'd like to continue with a few representative student examples from my Latin 1 courses this term. Transcriptions below are exact, containing numerous instances of non-standard usage and, on occasion, non-Latin words.³⁴

Ex. 1

Mi villa est magna. Sunt multi fenestras et ostiums. Est quinque hortuses cum floras. Mi familia non habitabit cum mihi! Mi villa est magna pro mihi, non pro te!

Ex. 2

Mihi villa est valde magna. Mihi hortus habeo rosas et liliums. Mihi familia placet hortus. Mihi villa habeo piscina. Mihi villa habeo multi fenestra. Mihi familia: Mater, pater, duo fratres, habitant et me.

Ex. 3

Volo habere domus antiquus. Habitabit in villa magna et pulchra. Volo habere multi hortus et peristylum! Mihi placet hortus et peristylum. Volo habere multi ostium et fenestra quoque. Amabo domus antiquus.

Ex. 4

Domus mihi in somniis magna est. In domo in somniis mihi habet duo ostium. Id habet unus magna atrium. Id habet unus peristylum quoque. Id multi cubiculum habet. Domo mihi placet!

Ex. 5

Mihi habitat est villa. Mihi villa habebit tres piscinas. Mihi habebit non liberis. Mihi villa habebit cento ostium. Mihi familia est mihi at mihi amor. Mihi villa habebit cento cubiculums. Mihi villa habebit dos culina et cento fenestras. Mihi villa est valde magnus.

Ex. 6

In domo habito cum tres culina. In mihi villa habet magna familia. Volo habere duo filia et duo filius. Quoque volo habere pulchrae hortus. Mihi habitabit in insula. Mihi habebit uno canes.

Ex. 7

Mihi somnium domus est magne. Et est in insula in Graecia. Est magne vitrum fenestra ad posse videre oceanus. Mihi cubiculum est pulchra et magne. Et est alba et aurea. Mihi laetus cum eam habeo.

Ex. 8

Volo habere pretiosus villa. Villa est magna. Amat villa mihi. Volo habere unus magna canes. Mihi placet nil feles. Mihi familia habitabit cum mihi in villa.

Results

Clearly shown by the above examples, students were capable of writing at the Novice Mid presentational proficiency level after their first four weeks in my Latin classes, where input consisted mainly in Chicago Method texts, *Lingua Latina Per Se Illustrata*, and Spoken Latin from me, the instructor.

Students were composing simple, declarative sentences on topics they understood and about which they had things to say with impressive accuracy and clearly comprehensible (if not stylistically classical) Latin.

Fifteen of my eighteen total students were assessed in the Novice Mid category.

In addition, students used heavily practiced core vocabulary freely in their

compositions, as evidenced above via the bolding incorporated in the students' presentational writing responses. The 14 words I mention above figure prominently in their compositions, rendering them easily accessible to both myself and their classmates.

Before I move on to some of the conclusions I drew from this data, I think it's worth noting how these compositions would compare to a Latin student on a Grammar-Translation curriculum at the same time period at which I assessed these Latin 1 students. At the end of 4 weeks, depending on the extent of introduction to the full Latin grammatical apparatus, students may have only been exposed to pronunciation, parts of speech, and the paradigms of the first declension of Latin nouns and the first conjugation of Latin verbs. Students will almost *certainly* not be composing Latin at the Novice Mid-range on such a curriculum. Exposure to comprehensible Latin that aims first at meaning (not at grammatical exemplarity) will simply be far too low.

But I return now to the results of my experiment with the Chicago Method texts.

Conclusion

Based on these preliminary results, my hypothesis was confirmed. Granted, the sample size was small. And, of course, there were input texts other than the Chicago Method texts exclusively. Still, I can confidently say that incorporation of selections from the Chicago Method texts appears to have had a demonstrable positive effect on my students' reading and written Latin proficiency, as evidenced

in this essay by the results of my IPA.³⁵

I say “selections,” as numerous texts within the Chicago series are inappropriate for the 21st century inclusive classroom. In the Chicago texts, most students are depicted as White, able-bodied children of (it appears) an affluent background. In addition, in keeping with prejudices of the era among White educators, certain chapters on warfare and military professions contain Eurocentric depictions of indigenous American peoples, referring, at times, to these peoples as *barbari* and depicting their conquest. Similarly, discussion of Saturnalia celebrations in *A New Latin Primer* lacks depth and results in a sanitized portrait of master-slave relations during the Saturnalia feast. Adaptation of these texts for current classroom use must be made to suit the aims and aspirations of a truly inclusive Latin learning environment.

5. Conclusion: What Happened to the Chicago Method?

We’ve now seen just a bit of the power of these texts in producing Latin reading and writing proficiency and, as we’ve just seen as well, the limitations. I’d like to conclude with a few notes on the authors, Mima Maxey and Marjorie Fay, say a little about what happened to the Chicago Method, and end on a cautionary note for those of us involved in progressive movements in Latin education (which nevertheless leads into a hopeful message).

To begin, then: What happened to Maxey and Fay after their flurry of activity in the 1930s? It’s hard to tell. According to my research, Maxey and Fay contributed sparsely in the pages of *The Classical Journal* and *The Classical Outlook* after

the publication of the Chicago Method texts. Mima Maxey died in 1965, aged 80, most likely in Carlyle, Illinois. She was a member of the American Philological Association as late as 1951 (the last record I can find of her in *Proceedings* 1951). Marjorie Fay died aged 84 in 1977 somewhere in DeKalb County, Illinois.

But what happened to their revolutionary method? The publication of *Cornelia*, *Carolus et Maria*, and *A New Latin Primer* elicited considerable interest upon publication. (Hutchinson Aug. 1934)³⁶ But by the 1940s, enthusiasm for this new method appears to have waned, despite initial encouraging results.³⁷

The *Cornelia* and *Carolus et Maria* texts have had somewhat successful afterlives in the Internet Age, circulating as “easy readers” for Latin readers looking for comprehensible texts. This perhaps unexpected resurfacing takes place in an exciting moment in Latin education: one, it would appear, not that different from the one in which Mima Maxey and Marjorie Fay found themselves.

The Chicago Lab educators I’ve profiled in this paper—Maxey, and Fay—were part of a group of Latin educators trying to meet the demands of the recently published *Classical Investigation* of 1924, commissioned by the American Classical League, in response to curricular crises facing classics (Latin was quickly becoming non-compulsory at both the high school and college level). (Lashbrook 151). The *Investigation*, among other things, emphasized the *reading* of Latin and Greek as primary goals for classics education—not just philological analysis (i.e., translating and navigating grammatical commentary). It stated emphatically: “The indispensable primary immediate objective in the study of Latin is progressive

development of the ability to read and understand Latin.” (*The Classical Investigation* 32)³⁸

Today, we find ourselves in a similar situation. The American Classical League, in conjunction with the Society for Classical Studies and ACTFL, has written for the need for extensive reform in Latin and Greek education to emphasize proficiency in the *language*, not in philological analysis, in accordance with the communicative needs of the twenty-first century learner.³⁹ Similarly, secondary Latin programs and classics departments around the country face the prospect of closure, in a trend that has alarmed classicists (and, at times, the larger public) for decades. Further, there is a deep divide among practicing Latin and Greek teachers on what exactly the aims of the discipline are.⁴⁰

In addition to this, we have, as I mentioned earlier, a vibrant, dynamic group of educators working to improve Latin and Greek education, insisting on proficiency-oriented methods of instruction that welcome all learners into the Latin and Greek classrooms. We should take note: In 1924, the American Classical League advanced principles, not unlike the 2017 *Standards for Classical Learning* in its *Classical Investigation*. In the 1930s, Mima Maxey and Marjorie Fay produced the Chicago Method texts, which, in many ways, resemble our current proficiency-oriented texts. Research suggested that these texts were producing Latin readers on par or better with students on the GT method. And, still, the method didn’t catch on. This is a cautionary tale for those of us involved in teaching Latin in a way different from how we were taught it. Progressive movements in education risk forgetting their progress—and there is sometimes an arduous process of relearning what has

already been tried.

Progressive Latin educators of the current generation would do well to note how much of the Chicago Method for Learning Latin that I outline here failed to gain traction in a succeeding generation of teachers (for a whole host of reasons outside the scope of this essay). The solution, I think, is to work all the more to celebrate and publicize each other's successes, student achievements, and the visible, exciting results of proficiency-oriented classical language instruction. We, too, need to remember what we've achieved. Record it, prepare it for public consumption, and disseminate it.

And so let this piece be a celebration—to Mima Maxey, Marjorie Fay, and the lasting contributions they made to Latin pedagogy—and a testament to their vision of Latin learning.

Bibliography

- Ancona, Ronnie. Ed. *The Classical Outlook*. Vol. 94, Iss. 2. American Classical League. Fall 2019.
- Bailey, Justin Slocum. "Teaching Latin to Humans: How to Honor both the Language and the Learner," *Eidolon* January 4, 2016.
- Carlson, Jacqui. "The Implications of SLA Research for Latin Pedagogy: Modernizing Latin Instruction and Securing its Place in the Curricula." *Teaching Classical Languages* (Spring, 2013): 106-122.
- Cavanaugh, Mary Patricia. "The Holistic Teaching Methods of Francis Parker, John Dewey, Rudolf Steiner, Hughes Mearns, and Laura Zirbes: Literacy via the Whole Child." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1990.
- C. D. B. "William Gardner Hale: 1849-1928." *Classical Philology* 23, no. 3 (1928): 278-79.
- Coffee, Neil. "Active Latin: Quo tendimus?" *Classical World*, Vol. 105 N. 2 (December 2012):255-269.
- Dewey, John. *The School and Society; The Child and the Curriculum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Dickey, Eleanor. *Learning Latin the Ancient Way*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2016.
- Durst, A. *Women Educators in the Progressive Era: The Women behind Dewey's Laboratory School*. New York, NY: Palgrave, 2010.
- Fay, Marjorie. *Carolus et Maria*. University of Chicago Press: 1933.
- Freire, Paulo. *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum, 1970.

- Gouin, Francois. *The Art of Teaching and Studying Languages*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1882.
- Hale, William Gardner. *The Art of Reading Latin: How to Teach It*. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1888.
- Hale, William Gardner. "An Experiment in the Teaching of First and Second Year Latin." *The Classical Journal* 1, no. 1 (1905): 7-18.
- Harms, William, and Ida DePencier. *Experiencing Education: 100 Years of Learning at the University Chicago Laboratory Schools*. Chicago: University of Chicago Laboratory Schools, 1996.
- Hildebrand, David. "John Dewey." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2018 Edition). Ed. Edward Zalta. 2018.
- Hunt, Steven. Ed. *Journal of Classics Teaching*, Vol. 20, Iss. 39. Cambridge University Press. (Spring 2019).
- Hutchinson, Mark. "Learning Latin by Reading Latin." *The School Review* Vol. 42, No. 4 (Apr., 1934): 316-317.
- "Some Needed Research in the Teaching of Latin." *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 5 (Feb., 1934): 335-356.
- "Realism in Latin Teaching." *The Classical Journal* Vol.30, No. 8 (May 1935): 477-488.
- Katch, J. A. *Discord at Dewey's School: On the actual experiment compared to the ideal*. Dissertation. University of Chicago. 1990.
- Kay, Charles. "Inflammat studia discentium, Augustine of Hippo on Learning Classical Languages." *The Classical Outlook* 94 (3): 139-149. 2019.

- Knoll, Michael. "Laboratory School, University of Chicago." *Encyclopedia of Educational Theory and Philosophy* 2: 455-458. Ed. D.C. Phillips. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage 2014.
- Lashbrook, Austin. "The Classical Investigation Forty Years After." *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 60, No. 4. (January 1965).
- Leonhardt, Juergen. *Latin: The Story of a World Language*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013.
- Lodge, Gonzalez. *The Vocabulary of High School Latin*. New York: Teachers College Columbia University Press, 1907.
- Maxey, Mima. *Cornelia*. University of Chicago Press: 1933.
- Maxey, Mima and Marjorie Fay. *A New Latin Primer*. University of Chicago Press: 1933.
- Mayhew, K. C., & Edwards, A. C. *The Dewey School: The Laboratory School of the University of Chicago, 1896-1903*. New York: Appleton-Century, 1936.
- Monthly Review* 4(4): 50, Oct. 1946. Department of Justice. Immigration and Naturalization Service.
- Oerberg, Hans. *Lingua Latina Per Se Illustrata*. Hackett/Domus Latina: 2010.
- Patrick, Robert. "Latin is Not Different; Address to SALVI: The North American Institute of Living Latin Studies" SALVI: July 2011.
- Pavur, Charles. *The Ratio Studiorum: The Official Plan for Jesuit Education*. Saint Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources. 2005.

“Proceedings: American Philological Association Eighty-Third Annual Meeting and Philological Association of the Pacific Coast Forty-Ninth Annual Meeting.” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 82 (1951): I-LVI.

Program of the Twenty-Third Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South. CAMWS. <https://camws.org/sites/default/files/CAMWS%2023%20-%20FINAL.pdf>.

Rouse, W.H.D. and R.B. Appleton. *Latin on the Direct Method*. University of London Press: 1925.

Tanner, L. N. *Dewey's Laboratory School: Lessons for Today*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 1997.

The Classical Investigation. American Classical League. Princeton, New Jersey: 1924.

University of Chicago. Laboratory Schools. Records. Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.

University of Chicago. Laboratory Schools. Work Reports. Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.

Smithies, Elsie. *An Experiment in the Teaching of Latin*. M.A. thesis. University of Chicago Press: 1926.

Vassar Miscellany. Volume 27 (7): 365. 1 April 1898. <https://newspaperarchives.vassar.edu/?a=d&d=literary18980401-01.2.14&e=-----en-20--1--txt-txIN----->

White, Woody Thomas. “The Study of Education at the University of Chicago, 1892-1958.” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1977.

Endnotes

1 The author dedicates this article to the memory of Mima Maxey and Marjorie Fay—two teachers who, like so many before and after them, worked selflessly for the learning of their students, and who may have never seen the true fruits of their labor, and never received the recognition they deserved.

In addition, I would like to thank the librarians of the University of Chicago Special Collections Research Center for their help in procuring records regarding the University of Chicago Laboratory Schools. They couldn't have been more helpful. For the thorny debate abovementioned, see, e.g.: Ancona 2019, Bailey 2017, Coffee 2012, Gouin 1882, Hale 1888, Hunt 2019, Hutchinson 1935, Lashbrook 1965, Patrick 2011, *The Classical Investigation* 1924. A particularly interesting episode in the history of Latin teaching in the USA, for instance, concerns *The Classical Investigation* of 1924 (commissioned by the American Classical League in response to severe challenges to Latin's place in the high school curriculum in the 1910's) which, among other things, recommended teaching methods which produced *reading comprehension* in students (not only translation skills). Lashbrook's 1965 retrospective on the aims, success, and failures of the *Investigation* are sobering for those involved in Latin education reform today.

2 These earlier methods didn't use the term "proficiency-oriented", of course. For this terminology I draw from the Center for Advanced Research in Language Acquisition (CARLA) at the University of Minnesota. CARLA, in its "Articulation of Language Instruction", includes a definition of "proficiency-oriented language instruction and assessment" (POLIA) which has been influential in secondary and collegiate language education, especially through research and professional development conducted through the American Council of Foreign Language Teachers (ACTFL). This official formulation can be found here: https://carla.umn.edu/articulation/MNAP_polia.html.

In addition, the examples of active/proficiency-oriented Latin teaching I mention here are relatively recent (dating from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries) with the exception of Locke's "interlinear" method (itself a large influence on the nineteenth century "crib" tradition). Communicative Latin instruction has a long history. It was prevalent in antiquity (as evidenced in ancient Latin-Greek textbooks, the so-called *Colloquia Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*, compiled for classroom use in Eleanor Dickey's *Learning Latin the Ancient Way* [Cambridge 2016]). Augustine remarks on the superiority of the natural method for learning languages in *Confessions* 1 (as contained in the epigraph to this piece; see too Kim 2019). It was prevalent in the Carolingian and Renaissance periods and, to some extent, in various Catholic religious orders continuously since antiquity. The *Ratio Studiorum*

of the Society of Jesus (1599) combines both communicative Latin exercises and more grammar-intensive teaching (Pavur 2005). And in the early modern European universities “easy” neo-Latin was the *lingua franca*. See, in particular, chapter 3, “Europe’s Latin Millennium”, of Juergen Leonhardt’s magisterial *Latin: Story of a World Language* (Harvard 2013).

3 As evidenced by two entire volumes devoted to the practice of active Latin in *The Classical Outlook* and *The Journal of Classics Teaching* in 2019, for instance. Skye Shirley, Emma Vanderpool, Justin Slocum Bailey, Robert Patrick, Keith Toda, John Brace, and Lance Piantaggini are all accomplished secondary school practitioners in the USA of proficiency-oriented Latin instruction of one stripe or another. (Patrick and Toda have introduced the “Vocabulary-Driven Curriculum” at Parkview High School in Atlanta Public Schools.) Each also has a strong web presence that is easily discoverable. At the college level, John Gruber-Miller’s (Cornell College) and Steven Hunt’s (University of Cambridge) advocacy for proficiency-oriented approaches have been widely influential. Jacqueline Carlon has been another influential voice—as have been the teacher training initiatives of the entire University of Massachusetts Boston Classics program. The University of Kentucky Institute for Latin Studies has been another leading college voice for active Latin usage—but with less focus on implementation of CI principles.

4 Elsie M. Smithies, who was Chair of the Latin Department at the Lab Schools in the 1920s and 30s, also seems to have played a prominent role in crafting and supporting this curriculum. But my research has yielded relatively little about her: She wrote an A.M. thesis at the University of Chicago in 1926 on application of the Ullman-Kirby Comprehension Test, led the Latin Department for some time in the 1920s and 30s, rose to the rank of Assistant Principal at the Lab Schools, and presented at the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South on Friday, April 15th, at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, on “What is the Reading Method in Latin?” (CAMWS Program 23).

5 As I’ll go on to note later: Progressive/reform movements in education risk forgetting their own progress—and there is sometimes an arduous process of having to relearn what has already been tried. Progressive Latin educators of the current generation would do well to note how much of the Chicago Method for Learning Latin that I outline here failed to gain traction in a succeeding generation of teachers (for a whole host of reasons which are outside the scope of this essay). The University of Chicago Laboratory School itself had this problem at its genesis as an institution. See Katch 1990 and Tanner 1997.

6 Smithies 1926, Hutchinson 1934. The Ullman-Kirby Comprehension Test was a Latin reading comprehension test designed at the University of Iowa along principles similar to ACTFL's contemporary *ACTFL Latin Interpretive Reading Assessment* (ALIRA): i.e., reading *comprehension* was measured as opposed to skill in philological analysis.

7 Dewey only remained with the school until 1904, when he relocated to Teachers College at Columbia University in New York City. But in his tenure he exerted wide-ranging influence over every feature of the school's mission, curriculum, and day-to-day methods and practice.

8 See Dewey 1991 for reprints of Dewey's *The School and Society* (1899) and *The Child and Curriculum* (1903).

9 For more, see 5.1 "Experiential Learning and Education" of "John Dewey" in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. For a classic criticism of the transmission model as a "banking model" of education, see Freire 1970.

10 For more on the history of progressive education at the University of Chicago Laboratory Schools, see Knoll 2014, Durst 2010, Mayhew and Edwards 1936, Harms 1996.

11 Hale was the author of an influential "polemic" on teaching the actual *reading* of Latin (not just the translating of Latin) in the late nineteenth century (Hale 1888). He was professor of Latin at the University of Chicago from 1892 to 1919, serving as one of the Lab School's first Latin educators. He began to develop a reading-centered, "contextual" approach in his two years teaching in the Lab Schools under Dewey's initial administration. He details this "experiment" in Hale 1905. This experiment evidences strong criticism of nineteenth century grammars, but largely consists in his developing a new grammatical apparatus for his students. His teacher training course at Chicago was an influential yearly event in Latin pedagogy (CDB 1928). A more interesting potential forerunner is briefly mentioned in Mayhew and Edwards 1936. There is brief mention of a conversational and dramatic mode for teaching Latin to eleven-year-olds, and even tantalizing details of its results: "Words were always associated with the appropriate objects, action, or quality. By writing from dictation and answering questions on a Latin story, the children grew familiar with the story in Latin before they attempted to translate it into English. In some cases they were able to tell the story in Latin without having made any conscious effort to commit to memory." (198) The enterprising teacher

credited with this work is not Hale, but rather Marion Schibbsby. Schibbsby, an immigrant to the USA from Denmark, was an 1897 graduate of Vassar College, and had received a fellowship at the University of Chicago to work in the Laboratory Schools in 1898. (*Vassar Miscellany*) She continued teaching Latin and English at various schools across the country before devoting herself to immigration services and advocacy. (*Monthly Review*)

12 Maxey and Fay found inspiration for their work (as many contemporary proficiency-oriented Latin instructors do) in the work of modern language colleagues and in research being carried out in the teaching of modern languages. In particular they seem to draw from work of Michael West in teaching English to Bengali children in Michael West, *The Construction of Reading Material for Teaching Language* (Oxford University Press 1927), and from Helen Eddy's work in creating French novice and intermediate readers in *Beginning French, Training for Reading* (University of Chicago Press 1929).

13 A contemporary review noting the excitement surrounding this publication can be found in Hutchinson 1934. Mark E. Hutchinson was himself an influential Latin education reformer at Cornell College (Iowa) in the first half of the twentieth century.

Each of these three titles from the University of Chicago Press is easily found online via a simple Google search. Consult especially *The Internet Archive* for numerous copies.

14 In the original, it is simply called "the credo."

15 Maxey *Cornelia* vii.

16 For helpful, language education-focused discussion of all these theoretical points, see Bill Van Patten, *Language* (Routledge 2017). For further reading surrounding Dionysius Thrax (and challenges to his being the author of the famous *Techne Grammatike*, i.e., *The Art of Grammar*) see Vincenzo Di Benedetto's influential "Dionisio Trace e la Techne a lui attribuita," *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* (ASNP). 62/28: 169–210, 87–118, 1958-9, and Casper De Jonge, *Between Grammar and Rhetoric: Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Language, Linguistics, and Literature*, Brill, 2008.

17 *Classical Investigation* 1924. See especially Chapter 4, Section 3: "Examination of the Present Course." Authors of the *Investigation* make repeated,

direct, and impassioned appeals to teach comprehension of Latin as *natural* comprehension: i.e., with as little use of intermediary English as possible. Translations are discouraged in favor of understanding Latin *as Latin*. They note numerous contemporary studies establishing the “Grammar-Translation” or “Grammar and Dictionary” or “Analytical” methods as dominant in American schooling.

18 Barnas Sears’s (sometime president of Brown University) *The Ciceronian: Or, The Prussian Method of Teaching The Elements of The Latin Language, Adapted to the Use of American Schools* (Gould, Kendall & Lincoln, 1844), itself an adaptation of Prussian scholar Ernst Ruthardt’s own teaching method for use in the Prussian gymnasias, appears to be the first major publication in the US that shares some (though not all) of these sentiments. See especially pp. 5, 6, 9. For example: “When the pupil shall have learned perfectly the more common elements of grammar, by studying, committing to memory, and re-investigating again and again a suitable quantity of well-chosen Latin prose, he will be found to possess a feeling of assurance and a consciousness of power...”; “A definite period of Roman literature should be chosen—which can be no other than the Golden Age... and the style of some one writer... who represent[s] the true genius of the Roman language, and no writer has better claim to this distinction than Cicero” (9).

19 For their frequency statistics, Maxey and Fay relied on Gonzalez Lodge’s *The Vocabulary of High School Latin* (Teachers College, Columbia University Press 1912).

20 The ACTFL performance descriptors (and descriptions of the proficiency levels) can be found on ACTFL’s website. In particular, consult *Performance Descriptors for Language Learners* (ACTFL 2015), found here: https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/ACTFLPerformance_Descriptors.pdf.

21 In addition to the Chicago texts, we read from Oerberg’s *Lingua Latina Per Se Illustrata: Familia Romana* (selections from capitula 1-3, 5). We watched novice-level videos on the *Divus Magister Craft* page on YouTube (on the Roman city). We also produced and read student compositions. The course is also conducted for the majority of the class period in Spoken Latin, delivered by me, the instructor. No text (or input mode) is used exclusively. This is in accordance with our larger Teaching and Learning Model at Culver, which emphasizes dynamic, student-driven use and manipulation of engaging and various resource materials. For a helpful schema of the presentational writing proficiency levels (including

Can-Do Statements for Novice Mid), please consult ACTFL's website, in particular: <https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/PresentationalWriting.pdf>.

22 I was particularly curious how a list of around 14 core terms (drawn both from the Chicago Method and the 'Vocabulary-Driven Curriculum' at Parkview High School [see: <https://latinbestpracticescir.wordpress.com/2020/03/08/vocabulary-driven-curriculum/>]) would feature in students' compositions. These 14 terms are as follows: *mihi, tibi, est, sunt, habere, multus, magnus, et, quoque, domus, amare, filius/a, pater, mater, frater, soror, pulcher*.

23 For helpful, extensive notes on this teaching style (though by no means does his method match exactly my daily classroom practice), consult Lance Piantaggini's pedagogy blog, *Magister P: Making Languages More Comprehensible*.

24 I've adapted a number of these activities from various proficiency-oriented language practitioners: some have come from Lance Piantaggini, Keith Toda, and Robert Patrick; others have been passed along to me by my colleague, Ashley Brewer; others still I've found from other language teachers who have put their techniques into the public domain. To be clear: None of these activities is a wholesale copy of another teacher's practice. I would highlight and thank them if I borrowed any activity without adaptation.

25 Which, in my view, they do. The English alphabet is Latin. With extensive use of Spoken Latin and encouraging, patient practice in reading Latin aloud students learn to pronounce and spell Latin with amazing rapidity. Pronouncing Latin is a case where lowering the affective filter is key. I *never* criticize a student's spoken Latin. Producing standard, restored pronunciation of the Latin language in one's own spoken output is all that is needed for students to start to mimic the instructor, bit by bit.

26 *Cornelia 2.*

27 Keith Toda, for instance, mentions its importance in his classroom practice on his blog, *Todally Comprehensible Latin*.

28 I should note that my reference for Restored Pronunciation is W. Sidney Allen's classic *Vox Latina: The Pronunciation of Classical Latin* (2nd ed.) (Cambridge University Press 1989).

29 For example, see Jane Arnold's "Visualization: Language Learning with the Mind's Eye" in *Affect in Language Learning* (Cambridge University Press 1999).

30 *Cornelia 2.*

31 Scholarly opinions divide on the efficacy of *required* output in the language classroom. The output I require mirrors ACTFL's presentational and interpersonal communicative modes. In general, I aim to give students the chance to produce output in Latin to *empower* them.

32 With only minor variation (a few sentences left out) this is an actual sample from one of my Latin 1 classes. It took students about 20 minutes to generate about 10-12 lines of Latin text using vocabulary largely drawn from the high-frequency, high-impact vocabulary of the Chicago Method texts.

33 For more on the research supporting (and practice of) IPAs in the language classroom, see ACTFL's *Implementing Integrated Performance Assessment* (ACTFL 2013) by Bonnie Adair-Hauck, Eileen W. Glisan, and Francis J. Troyan.

34 Bolded words represent words of high frequency in the first chapters of the three Chicago Method texts which I hoped would present in students' presentational writing responses on their first IPA. Some of these words also appear in *Lingua Latina Per Se Illustrata*, but for many of these words, students' main repeated exposure was through Chicago Method texts.

35 Further exhaustive research would be needed (including a control group), of course, to prove scientifically that other texts don't do the same. That's not my intent here. My aim is more modest: I want to show just *some* evidence that these texts are powerful pedagogical tools. However, it's important to note in what ways I think my classroom practice changed upon incorporation of these Chicago Method texts. First and foremost, I think these texts provided graded readings for core, high-frequency, high-impact vocabulary at a level even more sheltered than *LLPSI*. These texts are also less concerned with imparting a grammatical point, which *LLPSI* does even when it is trying to instill a grammatical point inductively. Lastly, these texts seem to have had a lasting effect on *how* the students wrote. Much of their composition had a Maxeyan flavor—just as sometimes it has an Oerbergian flavor—and their choosing to write with clear Maxeyan turns of phrase points to its sticking better in their minds than some of the *LLPSI* texts they were also exposed to over the first four weeks of Latin instruction.

36 Hutchinson Aug. 1934.

37 I can find no mention of these titles in the pages of *The Classical Journal* or *The Classical Outlook* in the 1940s and 1950s.

38 *The Classical Investigation* 32.

39 See, for instance, the *Standards for Classical Language Learning* (2017) on the ACL website: https://www.aclclassics.org/Portals/0/Site%20Documents/Publications/Standards_for_Classical_Language_Learning_2017%20FINAL.pdf.

40 For a useful, illuminating discussion of these topics, see again Leonhardt 2013, especially the last chapter. Relatedly, recent discussions regarding the discipline's racist roots in the nineteenth century have resulted in vigorous debate as to the future of a 'classical philology' at all. See a recent *New York Times* feature on Dan-el Padilla Peralta's scholarship: <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/02/02/magazine/classics-greece-rome-whiteness.html>. For the threat of closure faced by (even established) classics departments, see the recent case of the University of Vermont in *Inside Higher Ed*: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/12/07/u-vermont-faculty-members-pledge-fight-planned-cuts-liberal-arts>.