Latin is Not Different
by Robert Patrick, PhD
© 2011

Presented at the SALVI Board Summit
July 16-21, 2011 at Claymont Estate

- **Latin teachers are not normal. Latin is not different**

Before I share anything with you this morning, I'd like to place two points of departure before you that are extremely important to me. They inform almost everything else that I have to share with you.
Important Idea # 1: Latin teachers are not normal.
Important Idea #2: Latin is not different

The very fact that we are having this discussion in this place with this company of people gathered here indicates to me that we are at a new time in the business of teaching Latin. What I hope to do in this talk is weave together both my understanding of some vital research in second language acquisition as well as my understanding of certain dynamics that are at play in Latin classrooms, Latin programs, school systems, and the colleges and universities that most of us find ourselves working in. I qualify those of us gathered here as those interested in using communicative approaches in the teaching and learning of Latin. I use the term "communicative approaches" as an umbrella that covers several modern methods for helping students acquire ability in a second language. I first encountered the term in Ommagio-Hadley's *Teaching Language in Context*. It was the bible for National Board Certification in World Languages when I did that work, and continues to be that sort of reference for me. I find that most Latin teachers don't know the work and don't know the research that is in it.

That's a problem, but that's not why I say that Latin teachers are not normal. Latin teachers are not normal for the same reason that most language teachers are not normal. In the TPRS community, they identify certain students as the "four percenters". These are the students who, if you teach with a grammar-translation method will be at the top of the class. They are the ones who, if you teach in any way, badly, will be at the top of the class. These are the students who, if you put them in a corner, hand them a book, and give them just minimal instruction, will take off and excel in Latin (or any other language). In fact, they just might prefer that you did that. They are the ones who anticipate grammar structures before you teach them, who think case inflections are cool; who find verb synopses and writing them out an artform. Latin teachers are not normal because most of us were those four percenters in our classes when we first began learning Latin. Because we were, we have a particular difficulty understanding why others don't see the language connections we do other than to figure that they are just lazy or perhaps simply are not intelligent enough. Because Latin teachers are not normal, it is imperative that we know this about ourselves and take great care to develop a tool box full of tools that will allow us to help all kinds of learners—the ninety-six percenters—to make progress in their acquisition of Latin. We owe it to them to know this about ourselves.

Latin is not different. In almost every workshop or conference setting, certainly on every Latin teacher list serve, when the conversation turns to teaching Latin communicatively, like a modern language, you can almost bet money on hearing this refrain, and it always comes at that moment when it becomes clear that these methods are not the standard fare that we all were served via Wheelocks and Latin for Americans and Jenneys Latin. "But Latin is different." Latin teachers do not hold this position alone. In fact, one of the difficulties that you and I face is the atmosphere created by the label of "dead language" that Latin has worn for decades. Recently, I was explaining to a Bulgarian friend the communicative approach to teaching Latin, and he listened with great interest and asked intelligent questions, but then concluded: "But Latin is different. I mean, you cannot really talk about modern things in Latin, now can you? You are stuck talking to your students only about things in the past." When I indicated that that was not so, he asked: how could you possibly talk about the space shuttle flight?

I had to tell him two things at that point. First, because I don't spend my Latin speaking days talking often about space shuttles, I was not immediately able to recall how to say it in Latin, but second, I was certain that we could and I knew that if I went home and looked on the Ephemeris or the Finnish radio broadcast I would find a discussion of the space shuttle launch: navicula spatialis, Discovery, nomine , et quomodo volatum ultimum nuper suscepit. He was delighted to know that and had more questions about how Latin adds new words, which we continued to discuss. I find often that Latin teachers dismiss such conversations as a waste of their time. Latin is different, they maintain, and it must be taught differently. In my opinion, that has come to be code for: you are making me anxious and I don't know whether I can do what you are talking about. That, friends, is a real fear, articulated or not, and in my opinion it is a fear that we have to continue to work to help teachers of Latin overcome.

- **I want to talk about practical experience**

So, with those two principles in place—Latin teachers are not normal and Latin is not different—I want to say that I see the rest of what I have to offer as aimed at the practical experience of teaching Latin as a living language in a way that all kinds of learners can acquire it—with attention to how we help Latin teachers make these kinds of leaps especially when they are dealing with the inner demons of fear over their own adequacy to do this.

- **What do we want for our students: understanding Latin as Latin**

I find this to be an interesting problem. It is very clear to me, and I have to say—it was clear to me when I was 14—that there is a significant mental and interior experience of Latin in Latin as Latin without (or without much) use of or interference of English. There is a difference of interior and mental/emotional difference in reading this:

dedit oscula nato
non iterum repetenda suo pennisque levatus
ante volat comitique temet, velut ales ab alto
quae teneram prolem produxit in aera nido,
hortaturque sequi damnosasque erudit artes.

And this:

He gave kisses to his son
kisses that were not going to be sought again, and having lifted himself with his wings
before he flies he fears for his companion, just as a bird from the high nest who has led its tender offspring forth into the air,
and he exhorts him to follow and he teaches him the prodigal arts.

I stood in my classroom about 5 years ago. It was an AP Latin Lit class, and we were reading the story of Daedalus and Icarus. We were even doing some translation. And I was reading this passage aloud in Latin when I was suddenly overwhelmed with emotion. I could not help myself when I hit the words-- dedit oscula nato
non iterum repetenda suo

Suddenly, I flashed on my own son and the immediate prospect of going to kiss him knowing that I would never be able to do that again—Daedalus knew, on some level, Ovid wants us to know, that Daedalus knew that his son would not make it. I could explain that in English to my students about the passage, about the word order, about the importance of saving "suo" for the end of the line that modified "nato", but when I read Ovid's words in Latin and heard and felt and understood and knew them in Latin the emotion that they were designed to unleash came roaring through me. Isn't this something of what we want for our students, for ourselves?

- **objectification and subjective experience**

Here's my ongoing dilemma. This business of learning a language is really about experience, and many of our teachers don't trust certain kinds of experience as a way of learning . The learner must have an experience of and within the language in order for the new language to communicate to him/her and in order for the learner to communicate in the new language.

If the learner is presented lists of vocabulary, or charts of grammar, or explanations about either, the student can gain through such measures an objectification of the language, i.e. an objectified piece of knowledge about Latin. Latin, then, becomes an experience of something "out there", external to the learner, like any number of other objects that the learner knows about. We might even ask a learner who has had Latin objectified for him/her this way: Do you know Latin? Yes, she might say yes. Do you know Latin similarly to how you know Algebra.? I think so, she might say. Do you know Latin like you know chocolate ice-cream? No, not at all, she might say. Why is that, we could ask? And perhaps she would go into various descriptions of eating chocolate ice-cream, tasting it, loving it, experiencing it, etc. There is an experience with chocolate ice-cream, and it is personal, interior, subjective, unmediated. There is an experience with Latin for this same learner, and it is the experience of knowing about something at a

distance, a knowledge that has been mediated through a teacher, through a vocabulary list, through a grammar chart, and yes, even through translation. One of the most damnable experiences is for the Latin teacher who by now has spent thousands of hours translating Latin who thinks that he knows Latin like chocolate ice-cream. I am suggesting that translating Latin is just one other way of objectifying it, but it leads most who engage in it to believe that they are reading Latin, understanding Latin and experiencing Latin per se. Analogously, I offer that this is like a physician who claims that she knows personally the man whose appendix she just removed who was moments before whisked into the ER. She knows all about his appendix and his lower thoracic region, but she does not know this man, personally, at all.

The student who has had Latin objectified for him/her must still, usually through the student's own devising, have some additional experience with it for it to begin to communicate. (For me this "extra application" was to sit staring at a Latin sentence or story that I had translated as a 14 year old and trying to imagine how that Latin might mean something to me like the English sentence meant something to me. "Extra application" really has meaning when you consider that I might have spent an hour or two translating and then actually choose to spend more time staring at the Latin trying to imagine it as meaningful.) And, if it's not obvious, trying to imagine how the Latin might means something in itself only brings one nearer to a personal, interior experience of the language. It sets one up for such a subjective experience. For me, it would be many, many years later, at my first Conventiculum and then Rusticatio before I was sure that I was actually having a personal experience of Latin, in Latin, as Latin, per se.

I think that's why we find some teachers/other individuals who maintain that they learned a language via a grammar approach (these are the 4 percenters). Without telling us, perhaps without even knowing it, they took the objectified stuff and created for themselves some additional experience with that objectified stuff that became an experience of Latin mediating meaning through itself without the help of English.

Enter communicative approaches all of which design to give the learner an experience with the new language. It starts out very simple. You show me a round, colorful object that in English I know as a ball, but you say to me as you point to it and walk near me: pila! I may or may not say back to you "pila". You then call on a girl: Maria, capta pilam! You throw the ball to Maria. Maria catches it and you say: Maria, iacta mihi pilam. You gesture a bit, and Maria throws the ball back.

You know the drill. We are setting students up to have an experience of the language, more precisely, in this moment, to experience pila as pila, capta as capta, iacta as iacta and mihi as mihi. We proceed through the class this way. Next day, you want to assess Maria and her classmates. Two different things could happen, and these two different things happen all over the place in language classrooms.

Scenario A: You repeat yesterday's demonstrations to see if the students retain a demonstrable knowledge of pila, capta, iacta, mihi, tibi, etc (words you introduced and demonstrated). You find that most do, and you also identify a few who need a little extra attention, so you give it to them today and introduce a couple of new objects for them to throw as well.

In your grade book, you give very positive assessments for everyone because even the few strugglers today engaged the process and demonstrated understanding of the new words.

Scenario B: You give the students a paper test when they come in. On it are a list of the words you used yesterday and you ask for their English equivalent. You also ask them to explain the difference in pila/pilam, and whether mihi is the direct object or the indirect object. Over half the class fails the quiz, and only a handful make a B or higher. (The 4 percenters).

How we assess can mirror what and how we have been teaching, or we can become trapped by the ways that we have always been assessed which mirrored the ways we were always taught. When we assess in a way that reflects how Old Professor Gildersleeves taught, our students will fail because the assessment is looking for objectified knowledge while we have been setting them up for subjective experiences. Don't get me wrong: I am saying that I think we must set them up with daily subjective experiences of Latin, but if we are going to do that, then we must assess them with those kinds of assessments. Finally, in a few minutes, I will suggest that the two ways can possibly enter into a happy marriage.

- **Examine Krashen's theory**—because we deserve to be able to talk about what we are doing more often and more richly than the public lists allow us where we still spend too much of our energy defending ourselves.
-

Stephen Krashen, in the 1980's, formulated a series of hypotheses which he then put to various clinical trials. His work continues today to be the underpinning of some of the most exciting work in language pedagogy that I know of. It is the basis for TPRS—Teaching Proficiency Through Reading and Storytelling, but TPRS is just one application of Krashen's theory. I consider TPRS to be one of the tools in the toolbox—not the magic wand of all Latin teaching.

Krashen's theory of second language acquisition consists of five main hypotheses:
I am going to define each of these and give a brief summary of Krashen's approach, and then ask the "so what" question as it pertains to us who teach Latin.

1.   The Acquisition-Learning hypothesis:

According to Krashen there are two independent systems of second language performance: 'the acquired system' and 'the learned system'. The 'acquired system' or 'acquisition' is the product of a subconscious process very similar to the process children undergo when they acquire their first language. It requires meaningful interaction in the target language - natural communication - in which speakers are concentrated not in the form of their utterances, *but in the communicative act*.

The 'learned system' or 'learning' is the product of formal instruction and it comprises a conscious process which results in conscious knowledge 'about' the language, for example knowledge of grammar rules. According to Krashen 'learning' is less important than 'acquisition'.   This hypothesis is very much

behind what I have been calling the objectification of Latin and the subjective experience.

So what? So, the traditional Latin classroom for at least 100 years in the US has focused almost entirely on the "learning system" in which students who are good at that sort of thing (linguistic, logical, 4 percenters) learn a great deal about the language. Worse, they and their teachers think that they are "learning Latin" when in fact, at its very best (for a very few) they are learning how to decode Latin into English—SO THAT they can understand. If you have to turn a language into your own in order to understand it, then you really have not acquired that language at all. You may have learned a great deal about the second language, but you have not acquired ability in it. This has been true for me about my Latin for much of my career, and it is true for most of my colleagues in the US. And, a PhD in Latin did not change that. IN fact, all by itself, the doctorate in Latin only qualifies me to do more "teaching about Latin" to those very few who might find that fascinating. (side note: if it is not clear by now, let me say aloud—Latin has become the domain of an elite few who can learn about it in the way that we have traditionally taught it. I am personally convinced that every kind of student can acquire ability in Latin, but we must teach it differently. That's what makes me passionate about Krashen's work).

2. Krashen's Monitor hypothesis explains the relationship between acquisition and learning and defines the influence of the latter on the former.

According to Krashen, when we teach grammar, we help create inside the mind of the learner what he calls the "internal monitor". That internal monitor can be very helpful when the individual needs to edit text or even edit very careful speech. But, here's the problem. The internal monitor does not initiate communication. According to Krashen, it is the acquisition system that initiates communication. The need and the desire to communicate in the second Language is powerful and almost immediate.

Example: "lictene mihi ire ad latrinam?

The 'monitor' acts in a planning, editing and correcting function when three specific conditions are met: that is, the second language learner has sufficient time at his/her disposal, he/she focuses on form or thinks about correctness, and he/she knows the rule.

It appears that the role of conscious learning is somewhat limited in second language performance. According to Krashen, the role of the monitor is - or should be - minor, being used only to correct deviations from 'normal' speech and to give speech a more 'polished' appearance.

Krashen also suggests that there is individual variation among language learners with regard to 'monitor' use. He distinguishes those learners that use the 'monitor' all the time (over-users); those learners who have not learned or

who prefer not to use their conscious knowledge (under-users); and those learners that use the 'monitor' appropriately (optimal users). An evaluation of the person's psychological profile can help to determine to what group they belong. Usually extroverts are under-users, while introverts and perfectionists are over-users. Lack of self-confidence is frequently related to the over-use of the 'monitor'.

So what? In traditional Latin teaching, we have, in effect, been teaching students to edit before they have produced anything worth editing. Only the very rare (and not normal) student will endure much of that. How many of you have taken a course in "Latin composition?" Was that a course in journal writing, essay writing, etc? Of course not. Traditionally, Latin composition has been an inane series of exercises in reverse translation. Sentences from various classical authors have been taken, translated into what would likely be antiquated English, and then given to students to translate back into the original Latin. These approaches engage students in editing work that they did not produce and could not produce by engaging their memorized knowledge about the language. In my experience, Latin teachers tend to be those over-users of the monitor who are most often insecure about their own ability in Latin, and then we replicate that in our students.

And, teachers of active Latin beware. Because we tend to be over-users of the monitor, we also tend to impose it on our students or even on other Latin speakers around us. When we do that, we risk shutting down communication. Given a choice between allowing a student or fellow speaker to speak with mistakes and interrupting them to correct their grammar, this approach always allows them to continue speaking. The teacher, or trusted friend, might find a way to mirror back to the speaker the same information given with the grammar correction. Sometimes, the other is ready to hear and absorb that, and sometimes he is not. If the teacher or fellow Latin speaker persists in correcting, he will eventually only be left with the few who are willing to endure that kind of process.

3. The Natural Order hypothesis is based on research findings (Dulay & Burt, 1974; Fathman, 1975; Makino, 1980 cited in Krashen, 1987) which suggested that the acquisition of grammatical structures follows a 'natural order' which is predictable.

For a given language, some grammatical structures tend to be acquired early while others late. This order seemed to be independent of the learners' age, L1 background, conditions of exposure, and although the agreement between individual acquirers was not always 100% in the studies, there were statistically significant similarities that reinforced the existence of a Natural Order of language acquisition. Krashen however points out that the implication of the natural order hypothesis is not that a language program syllabus should be based on the order found in the studies. In fact, he rejects grammatical sequencing when the goal is language acquisition. To date

no one has been able to identify the natural order for any particular language, completely, and certainly not for Latin.

So what? I think we have some clues to how this works in some of our more modern developments in Latin curricula. Many of us were first taught about Latin by being introduced to the first declension. We did chapters of sentences or perhaps stories in which all the nouns were first declension. And so it went through five declensions, and six indicative verb tenses, etc.

Compare that to CLC which introduces nouns of various declensions, nominative and accusative and ablative almost from the beginning. That variety makes for more interesting stories. And while we might complain that "the genitive comes so late in CLC" I will tell you what I see happen every year. My Latin 1 students figure out, frequently on their own, that they can express possession with the dative long before we get to the genitive and with no explanation of the "dative of possession", and then, it's just no big deal—either usage. It was years before a dative of possession made any sense to me, except to decode it. While we may not have a clear picture of the natural order of acquisition with Latin, we are getting some clues, and the more we communicate in Latin with our students, from the beginning, the clearer that picture will become.

4. The Input hypothesis is Krashen's attempt to explain how the learner acquires a second language.

According to this hypothesis, Krashen observes that a student makes progress in a language (acquisition only), progressing through the natural order of the language when she/he receives comprehensible input in the second language and which is one step beyond his/her current level. According to Krashen the most important element in designing a syllabus is natural communicative input in the target language in a comprehensible way.

So what? I have reduced this aspect of Krashen's work to this question, which I ask Latin teachers to ponder often: what percentage of any given class period are you teaching in Latin at a level that is comprehensible to your students? 10%? 40?, 60? 75? 90? none at all? Around which kinds of classroom things do you and your students communicate in Latin? Roll call? Reading and discussing stories? Cultural and historical material? How often do you explain a grammar issue in Latin? For most of us, most of the time, the answers have been: none at all. Some have introduced a few "fun phrases" in Latin, but that was almost as a break and a diversion from the "serious" work that we have to do. But, if Krashen is right (and I have concluded for myself and my students that he is), the only way for all kinds of students to make progress in Latin is for me to communicate with them in Latin most of the time about all kinds of things. And that puts the burden on me: I must develop my own ability to speak Latin—a process that I expect to constantly be in for the rest of my life. This hypothesis also requires of me to agree to show up and be creative every day, every class period. Offering up Latin in comprehensible ways to students at their current level +1 requires creativity.

5. Finally, the fifth hypothesis, the Affective Filter hypothesis, embodies Krashen's view that a number of emotional variables play a vital role in second language acquisition.

These variables include: motivation, self-confidence and anxiety. Krashen claims that learners with high motivation, self-confidence, a good self-image, and a low level of anxiety are better equipped for success in second language acquisition. Low motivation, low self-esteem, and debilitating anxiety can combine to 'raise' the affective filter and form a 'mental block' that prevents comprehensible input from being used for acquisition. In other words, when the filter is 'up' it impedes language acquisition. On the other hand, positive affect is necessary, but not sufficient on its own, for acquisition to take place.

So what? Like it or not, all teachers, and particularly language teachers, must be more than lecturers. If we want our Latin students to make progress in the language not only must we be communicating with them in Latin in comprehensible ways, but we must find ways to do that that are interesting (motive), reassuring (confidence) and non-stressful (anxiety). (Tell about Nancy's "on the spot"). (Tell about driving up to Claymont and feeling the anxiety rising in me—you all have been here all week speaking Latin. I've just driven 9 hours, spent the summer doing a variety of things only some of which was in Latin. Fail. Fail. Fail.

The Role of Grammar in Krashen's View
According to Krashen, the study of the structure of the language can have general educational advantages and values that high schools and colleges may want to include in their language programs. It should be clear, however, that examining irregularity, formulating rules and teaching complex facts about the target language is not language teaching, but rather is "language appreciation" or linguistics.

The only instance in which the teaching of grammar can result in language acquisition (and proficiency) is when the students are interested in the subject and <u>the target language is used</u> as a medium of instruction. Very often, when this occurs, both teachers and students are convinced that the study of formal grammar is essential for second language acquisition, and the teacher is skillful enough to present explanations in the target language so that the students understand. In other words, the teacher talk meets the requirements for comprehensible input and perhaps with the students' participation the classroom becomes an environment suitable for acquisition. Also, the filter is low in regard to the language of explanation, as the students' conscious efforts are usually on the subject matter, on *what* is being talked about, and not the medium.

This is a subtle point. In effect, both teachers and students are deceiving themselves. They believe that it is the subject matter itself, the study of grammar, that is responsible for the students' progress, but in reality their progress is coming from the medium and not the message. Any subject matter that held their interest would do just as well.

Here's my final so what. So, in both the US and the UK, teachers and students face high stakes tests in most subject areas like never before. Latin teachers feel the pressure to teach the grammar, the vocabulary, the culture and history, and English is the most efficient way to deliver the content. Unfortunately, that contributes to the elitism of classics—only a

small percentage of learners will be successful and there will be tests to prove it. I believe that we stand at a crossroads where we know more about helping most students learn languages, including Latin, because—remember—Latin is not different—than we ever have. We do so at a time when the educational ethos pressures us to teach in ways that serve only the few. Add to that that we are already prepared and comfortable teaching in that way, and you begin to realize that the crossroads presents a real challenge. If I choose to teach Latin in a way that is best for most students—where most students can make progress in Latin that means that I must get my own speaking abilities up to snuff, so to speak. I have work yet to do on myself. And, each step along the way is going to feel non-intuitive to me (because, remember, Latin teachers are not normal). Taking this communicative approach will feel much more normal to most students however. It's a challenge.

I close with this. I was privileged to be in a session with Stephen Krashen in Atlanta in 2004. After spending the entire day with us talking about these 5 hypotheses, he summed it up like this. "Your students will make progress if every day you:
- offer comprehensible input in the target language
- around topics that they find interesting
- at a level that is just one step beyond their current ability
- in a non-stressful way.

In my opinion, the teacher that wants to teach Latin using communicative approaches, Latin as a living language, could stand to post these on the wall near his/her desk, or in the car on the dashboard, and treat them as a daily mantra: Today, I will offer comprehensible Latin to my students on topics they like, at a level that is just slightly beyond them, in a non stressful way. Let's play!

Hodie, discipulis meis Latinam perspicuam offeram, de rebus gratis, gradu vix elevato, modo haudquaquam sollicito.

References

http://www.sk.com.br/sk-krash.html

Crystal, David The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
Krashen, Stephen D. Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. Prentice-Hall International, 1987.
Krashen, Stephen D. Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning. Prentice-Hall International, 1988.

- **disclaimers for why "just Krashen"**

Over a year ago, I begn to work rather directly with some very interesting and talented teachers in the UK. I was invited to the Association for Latin Teaching, the organization founded by W.H. D. Rouse and his direct method. I presented information to them in a plenary session similar to what I am bringing here today, and I did a set of workshops demonstrating the TPRS approach. It was all very positively received and created several days of genuine and lively discussion at the ArLT. Since then, one of those teachers and I have been working together to create some initial training for teachers who wish to begin using communicative approaches in their classrooms. That work continues. IN the meantime, I have been asked to work both with the CUP editor of the 5th edition to create some teacher materials for the Teacher's Handbook that would be an aid to teachers who wish to use communicative approaches as well as to work with the CSCP. That's where we have run into a snag. The Director of the CSCP is a passionate, very intelligent, very creative teacher whose passion is to get more Latin in front of all kinds of learners (so, we share that passion) with special interest for public schools in the UK. The snag is that all of his Department of Education experts at the U of C have decided that Stephen Krashen is old news and that Latin simply is different and cannot be taught like a modern language. He is not convinced at all that there is any difference in reading Latin and translating Latin. He and I have had several very difficult if not also interesting conversations, via email and over late night drinks. I think we have emerged respecting each other, but still not with much disagreement. I say all of this to say to you why I only present Stephen Krashen.

There is a large body of research on second language acquisition, and like any academic field, there are varying and conflicting schools of thought. I lean toward those schools that see a correspondence between how we learn first languages and how we acquire second languages. These schools have predecessors in approaches like Oerburg's and the Nature Method and in Rouse's Direct Method even if none of these parties were talking to each other. They all tend toward what I have described as the teacher creating for the students a subjective experience of the language so that it becomes personal experience with MUCH repetition. Krashen's 5 hypotheses articulate these kinds of approaches as clearly as any I know, and I have become comfortable using them as a means of teaching other teachers about a theory that supports a practice that helps all kinds of learners. I have for you a short, select bibliography of additional works that you may want to consult for study beyond what we can talk about here even in a few days. Krashen's hypotheses are not new. They have been around for 30 years now. That does not make them obsolete. Krashen is still alive, still writing, still researching. His work is articulate and works in tandem with others. I consider his a very helpful theoretical tool in the toolbox, and there are others. You will see those on the bibliography. I will also own that in the list I have included two articles that I wrote about these same issues. The first is in online journal of CAMWS. I wrote a critique of the new APA/ACL Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation, and I also wrote an article for the JACT. That entire issue # 22 is dedicated to Communicative Approaches to teaching classical languages, and my own article is simply "TPRS and Latin in the Classroom".

- **the wedding**

Now, I'd like to make a few final observations about the experience of objectification and creating the subjective experience for students in our classroom. I think that ultimately, they can engage one another in a kind of wedding or happy marriage, if you will. I don't think that they "have to", but I am certain from my own experience that they can and that for some students it will be something they want and need.

1. For all kinds of learners to learn, we must set up daily classes in which students have a subjective experience of meaningful communication, Latin as Latin in Latin per se. This is how human beings acquire language. Whether our students know it or not (and some will have already engaged in personal reflection on these kinds of things while others will not and may never have these kinds of personal reflection), they already know how to learn language this way. It is in their body's memory to have words and objects shown them, mimicked to them, dramatized for them, drawn in front of them, and storied to them. So, if we did nothing else but create daily subjective experiences for our students in Latin, they all would make progress. All of them. In ragged lines of progression—no doubt. Some would zoom ahead of others, but they would all make progress in Latin as Latin. I no longer can justify doing otherwise. I know, equally, that if I teach Latin in objectified manner FIRST, I will be automatically determining that some students simply will not progress and will fall out of the ranks.

2. Along the way, students will have natural questions about what they are observing in the language that they are engaging in personal experience. We should be ready to answer those questions, as much as possible, in Latin, and always never more than they are asking for. (offer Oerberg's LL as wonderful model for teaching grammar points in Latin—per exempla, and the analogy of children asking about sex—you can see the immediate switch in their attention when you begin to tell them more than they wanted to know). TPRS calls this "pop up grammar". The TPRS approach advises that pop up grammar, meaning the kinds of natural curiosity students bring to grammar structures in the middle of a subjective experience, can and ought to be answered in no more than 30 seconds. Now, that's a real kick in the pants to the Latin teacher who "loves grammar" (the 4 percenters), but it's a good rule. I would add this. If you can respond to the question in Latin and it's comprehensible, do so. If you cannot, then respond in English, in 30 seconds or less, and jump right back to the story. By doing so, we have acknowledged the natural question about grammar, given a bit of objectified knowledge, and reiterated that the really important thing here is our subjective experience in the language.

3. Beware that the student's natural questions about grammar may not at all reflect what you may want to tell them about grammar. Sharuq may ask you why the word is hortus in one sentence and hortum in another? What's a good 30 second English answer to that? (allow for examples). What Sharuq is NOT asking for is an explanation of the case system, what each case is used for, the five declensions and the various endings that they must memorize. And I have done that. It's a disaster. If you do that, you must come back the next day and apologize for steering them away from the REAL learning—through our subjective experience in Latin. Remember: Latin teachers are not normal. Most of our students are. Listen to what they are asking for and give it to them. Side note: if you teach in a program where normal kids have been weeded out, you have a

different kind of problem, and it's a systemic one. You have to start working on the system to convince it that all kinds of learners ought to be allowed to take Latin WHILE you demonstrate with the few normal kids that you have that they are being successful. (Joey the wrestler: I don't know what Bob Patrick is doing in Latin, but he's got Joey reading from his Latin book in the weight room during breaks. Hell, if he can teach Joey to read Latin, he can teach anybody). Joey was a normal kid-athlete who had been told that he couldn't learn a language. He didn't start Latin until his Junior year, and he took two years making B's both years.

4. The 4 percenters in your classes (a few if you have normal kids, maybe most if you have weeded out the normal kids) will balk at the subjective experience, at first. They are very comfortable with objectified knowledge. They excel in it. They are not normal. If they are going to acquire a second language, they must go back to the kinds of learning they engaged in as small children. They will balk at that. That Latin is a "classical language" will keep them on board. They have likely signed up because Latin is for smart kids. Let them keep thinking that, but insist that they participate in the subjective experiences. When they ask their grammar questions, keep it to the 30 second rule DURING class, and then after class, offer to carry on more extensive grammar discussions with them. You can also:

   a. loan them student grammars for their personal and private reading
   b. give them differentiated reading and writing assignments that allow them to move ahead but insist that they work with the class during class time. Here's where for these kinds of students the "happy marriage" likely takes place.
   c. Offer to let them skip ahead from Latin 1 to Latin 3 if they can demonstrate competence.

5. By the third and fourth years of study, you can begin to offer singular days of grammar study, preferably still in Latin as much as possible, focusing on exempla a la Oerburg, but giving them grammatical terminology in Latin.

AS noted earlier in Krashen's notes on grammar study, that kind of objectified knowledge is only useful when editing of language is needed—either in writing Latin, or when making formal speeches. That is going to be rare for most of our students. I do have students do a good bit of writing, mostly to rehearse and repeat what they already know. I get my four percenters to engage in writing contests (SCRIBO and GJCL) and they do well and enjoy that. With all our students, we can and should model back to them correct usage. When Janella writes on her paper: Ego cibum consumer vult. We can walk over and point to ego and vult and say "ego volo". We also know exactly what she means even with the error there. We can acknowledge that she is communicating effectively even while we give her editing tips. When Mantel says out loud: ego fessus est. We can say back—ego fessus sum—and then model around the room: Maria, esne fessa? Maria: ego non fessa sum. Alexander, esne fessus? Alexander: ego fessus sum. Mantel, esne fessus? Mantel: ego fessus est. Est? quis est fessus, Mantel? Mantel: ego. Ah, ego fessus . . . sum. Alexander fessus est. Ego fessus sum. Mantel, cur fessus es?

And with that last question, we subtly remind everyone in the room that while we have taken this 30 second forray into grammar, the really important business of our time together is in the experience of communicating in Latin.

Select Bibliography
Communicative Approaches
compiled by Robert Patrick, PhD

Catherine Doughty, ed. Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Education. Cambridge, 1998.

Ellis, Rod. Understanding Second Language Education. Oxford, 1985.

_____. The Study of Second Language Acquisition. Oxford, 1999.

Krashen, Stephen. "Formal Grammar Instruction. Another Educator Comments." TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 26, No. (Summer, 1992): 409-411.

_____. Principles and Practices in Second Language Acquisition. Berkley, 1981.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane. Teaching Language: From Grammar to Grammaring. Boston, 2003.

Long, M. and Doughty, C., eds. The Handbook of Language Teaching. Chichester, West Suxex, UK, 2009.

Long, Michael. Problems in SLA. Mahwah, NJ, 2007.

Martin Bygate, Peter Skehan, Merill Swain. Researching pedagogic tasks: second language learning, teaching, and testing. Edinburgh, 2001.

Masciantonio, Rudolph. "Stephen Krashen and the Classical Languages." The Classical Journal, Vol. 84, No. 1 ((Oct. - Nov., 1988)): 53-56.

Ommagio-Hadley, Alice. Teaching Language in Context. Boston, 2001.

Smith, Frank. The Book of Learning and Forgetting. New York, 1998.

_____. Understanding Reading: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Reading and Learning to Read. Mahwah, NJ, 2004.

_____. Unspeakable Acts, Unnatural Practices: Flaws and Fallacies in Scientific Reading Instruction. Portsmouth, NH, 2003.

VanPatten, Bill. Processing Instrucion: Theory, Research and Commentary. Mahwah, NJ, 2004.

See also:

The Journal of Classics Teaching, Issue # 22—Communicative Approaches to teaching classical languages
TCL Online: Spring 2010—Perspectives on the New Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation
    http://tcl.camws.org/spring2010/TCL_I_ii_156-195_Perspectives.pdf
The International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching (online, free)
    http://www.tprstories.com/ijflt/