**The Art of Speaking Latin: Two Thousand Years of Latin Pedagogy**

By

Nicholas Lawson

Classics, University of Colorado at Boulder

Defense Date April 10th, 2024

Thesis Advisor:

Andrew Cain, Classics

Defense Committee:

Andrew Cain, Classics

Sarah James, Classics, Honors Council Representative

Scot Douglass, Herbst Program for Engineering, Ethics & Society, Outside Reader

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**Introduction**

Imagine the following scenario: John studied Spanish for years in school, but he didn't really know it until he lived in Mexico for a year. Most of us may have heard something like this or similar, in fact, we might have even experienced this truth in our own lives. Thus, if one were to be so bold, they might even say this fact is practically "common" knowledge and is the only way to truly learn a language, any language. Learning languages is similar to learning how to cook. You could read about cooking for years, study and memorize all the best recipes from all the world's greatest cooks. However, until you actually put yourself into the kitchen to use that knowledge to cook something, it is only then that you would be forced to use that knowledge in real time, to make something, and most likely, to make many mistakes at first. But after a year, all of that knowledge would have turned into something masterful, that is, a real skill.

This thesis is about Latin pedagogy over the last two millennia and how spoken Latin was a part of that pedagogy until only recently. Chapter One begins with two case studies, one concerning how the Romans taught Greeks Latin, and the other how Latin was taught in both the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, both focusing on the spoken aspects of its teaching and methods. The Third Chapter will delve into modern Second Language Acquisition research, and how one learns their first language, and how one might learn a second language. The Fourth Chapter will compare this research with the two case studies and see how ancient pedagogy lines up with Second Language Acquisition. The Fifth Chapter will give a brief history of the grammar-translation method and how spoken Latin came to be a legitimate method by the end of the twentieth century. The Sixth Chapter will be an interview with Terence Tunberg who is a professor at the University of Kentucky and is one of the leading proponents of spoken Latin.

Below each interview question will be my thoughts about professor Tunberg's answer and my

conclusions based of the case studies and research throughout this thesis.

**Chapter One**

**Case Study One**

**Roman Pedagogy**

In our current era of teaching Latin using the grammar translation method, it is difficult to comprehend fully how different the teaching methods were in medieval and Renaissance times. It is only too human to assume how one was taught Latin in their childhood or adolescence, must have been the method that was taught ever since the Romans and Cicero learned their Latin in school. Hence, any "new" method proposed to teach Latin potentially runs the risk of being criticized as a "fad" or "distraction" from those who wish to keep the "tradition" going, that is, the grammar translation tradition. However, this tradition of analyzing Latin sentences and translating them into the vernacular is a relatively new method in Latin pedagogy, having come into its own only in the last two hundred years or so.[1] Although this may be surprising to many who have either learned or taught Latin using the grammar translation method, it is impossible to ignore this historical fact, and thus, to put it candidly, the grammar translation method is in fact the "fad" that has to prove itself against the "other" more traditional method that was used more or less ever since the Romans vanished into history.[2] This method will be the topic of this present case study.

---

[1] Waquet (2001): 14. Waquet describes in her book how Latin slowly lost its status in France in the late ninetieth century. "Latin verse was dropped in 1872 by the Minister of Public Instruction, Jules Simon, and the attempt by his successor Batbie to restore it bumped along inconclusively; in 1880 Latin composition and the Latin speech were dropped from the baccalauréat and the concours général (examination for teacher recruitment), then, in 1902, from the lycée curriculum; Latin composition had already declined and the exercises set for pupils were virtually becoming restricted to translations for Latin."

[2] Tunberg and Minkova (2005): 8–9. "The move to oral Latin may seem radically new, but it is in fact a return to something quite traditional in the pedagogy of Latin after the collapse of the Western Roman Empire. Although Latin was nobody's native language in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, a spoken use of Latin existed among the educated, tied chiefly to the fact that Latin remained the universal *lingua franca* of the church, law, the world of learning, and even secular administration."

# Roman Language Pedagogy

It goes without saying that the Romans learned Latin in their homes as children like any other native language is learned today. The child would not have learned it by books or studying (or declining nouns!), but by listening and communicating with their parents (and other family members etc.) day in and day out. The Roman child would have been exposed to his or her parents speaking it daily for years until they spoke their first Latin utterance around the age of two. These first Latin words may well have been *mater,* or *pater,* as children are wont to do in any spoken language either ancient or modern.[3] Furthermore, the child would not have learned "grammar" *per se*, at least not how we think of Latin grammar today, but only the grammar that was necessary to speak and communicate to their parents and siblings. To be sure, when making "mistakes," they would have been corrected as children are today by their parents and older siblings, but they would not have been taught "grammar" as we think of it, but only what was necessary to clarify their speech for better communication. Perhaps when thirsty, a child would have mistakenly said to their mother, *bibere aqua volo* (I want to drink water), however, their mother would have politely corrected them by saying, *visne aquam bibere?* with the accusative ending instead. All of these corrections would have been intuitive and happened on a daily basis, with "grammar" only as a secondary consideration, while learning to communicate properly was the real purpose of the correction.

Furthermore, this "Latin" spoken in the Roman household would not have been the polished or rhetorical Latin of a Julius Caesar or a Cicero, but a more simple and colloquial Latin that any learner (child or foreigner) could have easily understood.[4] Thus, although there is much

---

[3] Hart (1991): 289-300.

[4] Marrou (1982): 262. Young Roman children would have learned both Greek and Latin by a Greek slave hired to teach them. Here they would have learned to read and write both languages. Furthermore, this would have been an

scholarly debate concerning what this "Latin" was and how much it differed from the "Classical Latin" of the prose and poetry writers, there can be no doubt that it would have been the "same" Latin language, but only a simpler version of it called "Vulgar Latin."[5] This linguistic phenomenon can be compared to an English speaker of today (even a very educated English speaker) and the differences between their daily speaking and writing habits. The former will be of a lower register, and the latter of a higher register, but both are undoubtedly contemporary English and are of the same tongue; Classical Latin was no different.[6] Thus, a Roman child would not have learned Ciceronian Latin in the household,[7] with its lengthy periods and complicated syntax, but a simpler and more conversational Latin; that was easier to communicate with and understand by any native speaker. It was only after Roman boys entered school, that they would learn how to read and write, that they started to officially learn "grammar, and later on, rhetorical skills and polished Latin as we think of it today.[8] However, it must be stated, all of this happened after they had been speaking conversational Latin for years and knew its grammar intuitively. However, this begs the question, how did the Romans themselves learn foreign languages such as Greek, or teach the Greeks Latin?

---

immersive language environment, thus learning Greek would have been as "natural" as learning spoken Latin. In fact, Marrou mentions this was such a common practice, that Roman author Quintilian warned not to wait too long to have a child learn Latin, otherwise they might have a "foreign accent."

[5] Palmer (1954): 149. Palmer calls Vulgar Latin a "shimmering mirage" that is practically impossible to detect through the writings of the educated Romans. "It is only through their occasional inadvertences, almost willy-nilly, that the writers give us hints that their natural speech deviates from the language of the schoolroom which they are at pains to use."

[6] Eskhult (2018): 208–9.

[7] Janson (2006): 33. "Quite a lot can be gleaned from the texts that we have; but most writers do adopt a colloquial style, preferring instead to write in a deliberately artistic way, using a wide range of vocabulary, often with long sentences and always with the utmost respect for the rules of grammar… the elements of spoken language that can be found in Cicero or his peers are therefore not very representative."

[8] Marrou (1982): 265. The Roman children entered the grammarian school – *grammaticus* – at the age of eleven or twelve.

## Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana

The *Hermeneumata* (or *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*) are a collection of schoolbooks, or instruction manuals, from the first or third century CE written by an unknown author. These bilingual educational manuals[9] can be divided into two categories: the first are dialogues written for Roman school boys, and the latter are, something akin to a modern-day phrasebook for adults (think a French phrasebook) written for Greek speakers learning Latin, or perhaps, Latin speakers learning Greek.[10] What is fascinating about these dialogues is the simplicity of the language contained within, either Latin or Greek, compared to the more refined Latin prose or poetry of Roman authors.[11] What is more, these dialogues, or *colloquia,* are even simpler in their syntax and grammar than the comedies of Plautus or Petronius' *Cena Trimalcionis*, thus, showing that these authors were offering a more refined version of "colloquial Latin" in their plays than the Latin spoken in the streets of their day.[12] However, this last point must be taken with some caution, inasmuch as the dating of the *Hermeneumata* ranges from the first to the third century CE, while Plautus wrote his comedies in the beginning of the second century BCE, and hence, the everyday Latin spoken in the streets of Rome could have changed considerably by the time of the writing of the *Hermeneumata.*

---

[9] Kelly (1976): 24. "Though bilingual lexicography first appeared among the Akkadians in the 2500 B.C., as far as the West it is a Roman invention."

[10] Dickey (2016): 10. Dickey's book will be sited extensively in the following section.

[11] Tunberg (2022): Spoken Latin and Latin in the Renaissance Interview by Nicholas Lawson.
Tunberg mentioned in this interview that "(these) colloquia were written to teach Greek speakers in the Roman Empire how to talk Latin and not to talk it like Cicero or Tacitus or the great writers but to talk it to do business."

[12] Marek (2017): 127–52. "These works are, after all, purely literary and so they contain many artistic touches: they play with the phonetic quality of words; they intentionally include morphosyntactic allusions; and they present deliberate and elaborate choices of lexis, etc."

Nevertheless, no matter the ongoing debates about what the "exact" colloquial or "vulgar" version of Latin was in the streets of Rome, the *Hermeneumata* equally sheds new light on something just as interesting; Greek and Roman language pedagogy. Within the *Hermeneumata* are various dialogues concerning daily activities, or *sermo quotidianus,* that demonstrate how the Romans and Greeks thought about language learning. These dialogues usually contain simple stories starting from the beginning of the day till the end, *ab exordio lucis usque ad vesperam,* often involving a boy going to school among other activities. For example, the boy will get up, wash his face, put on his clothes, and then go to school etc., all with the corresponding dialogue that would happen naturally during his day, that is, speaking to his parents, teacher and peers. What is more, these dialogues cover the activities that an adult Greek speaker would need to know if living among Latin speakers, or vice versa, that is, going to the bank to conduct financial business, or other governmental or administrative duties. After the student had learned their alphabet, it is believed that these *colloquia* would have been in the beginning sequence of the curriculum of learning either Latin or Greek.[13]

A sample of one of the dialogues is below. Notice the simplicity of its grammar and how concise and to the point the syntax is. This simplicity would have aided greatly in memorizing it. Although this is not high-register "Classical Latin" by any means, and has a few slight grammatical differences compared to Latin authors, for example, purpose is expressed with an infinitive construction instead of an *ut* clause (as in the Vulgate), nevertheless, it is utterly comprehensible as Latin and could never be confused as anything else.

**A child gets up in the morning**

| Ante lucem | Before daylight |
| --- | --- |

---

[13] Dickey (2016): 4

| | |
|---|---|
| vigilavi | I awoke |
| de somno; | from sleep |
| surrexi | I got up |
| de lecto, | from the bed, |
| sedi, | I sat down, |
| accepi | I took |
| pedules, | gaiters, |
| caligas; | boots; |
| calciavi me. | I put on my boots. |
| poposci | I asked for |
| aquam | water |
| ad faciem | for my face; |
| lavo | I wash |
| primo manus, | my hands |
| deinde faciem | then my face; |
| lavi; | I washed; |
| extersi. | I dried myself. |
| deposui dormitoriam; | I took off my night-clothes; |
| accepi tunicam | I took a tunic |
| ad corpus; | for my body; |
| praecinxi me; | I put on me belt; |
| unxi caput meum | I anointed my head |
| et pectinavi; | and combed (my hair); |
| feci circe collum | I put around my neck |
| pallam; | a mantle; |
| indui me | I put on |
| superariam | an outer garment |
| albam, supra | a white one, (and) on top |
| induo paenulam. | I put on a hooded cape. |
| processi | I went out |
| de cubiculo | of the bedroom |
| cum paedagogo | with my *paedagogus* |
| et cum nutrice | and with my nurse, |
| salutare | to greet |
| patrem | my father |
| et matrem. | and mother. |
| ambos salutavi | I greeted them both |
| et osculatus sum, | and I kissed them, |
| et sic descendi de domo. | and then I came down from the house. |

Another dialogue for Greek speakers learning Latin is the following *colloquium* concerning a

trip to the bank. It was written sometime in the Greek-speaking part of the Roman empire,

however, as it stands, it plays as a "continuation" of the Roman boy going to school but now he

goes about doing "adult" business during his lunch. The reason for this is these were originally

two separate stories, but in the manuscript tradition, the eastern story has been inserted into the

schoolbook sections at one point in time, thus becoming one story.[14] This dialogue is from the

Colloquia Monacensia-Einsidlensia.

**A trip to the bank**

"Domine,
quid imperasti?"
"Numquid habes
pecuniam
vacuam?"
"Quid opus habes
Mutuari?"
"Si habes,
commoda mihi
quinque sestertia."
"Etsi non habuissem,
undecumque
explicassem."
"Pignus vis?"
"Absit,
Non opus habeo.
Cave mihi
te accepisse."
"Quibus usuris?"
"Quibus vis."
"Cavi."
"Gratias tibi ago;
signa."
"Signavi."
"Numero
numera."
"Numeravi."
"Proba."
"Probavi."
"Sicut accepisti,
probum reddas."
"Cum tibi
reddidero,

"Sir,
what did you order"
"Do you perhaps have
any money
available?"
"What do you need
to borrow?"
"If you have it,
lend me
five thousand sesterces."
"Even if I hadn't had it,
from somewhere
I would have sorted it out."
"Do you want some security?"
"Heaven forbid!
I have no need (of one).
Certify for me that
you have taken (the money)."
"At what rate of interest?"
"At the rate you want."
"I have certified it."
"Thank you;
(now) put your seal on it."
"I have put my seal on it."
"By number
count (the money) out."
"I have counted it."
"Examine it."
"I have examined it."
"Just as you took it,
return it in good coin."
"When I return (it) to you

---

[14] Dickey (2016): 27

et satisfaciam."                                    I shall also give satisfaction."

Looking back at the stages of curriculum listed above, it should be noted that not every

Greek learner would have wished to learn Latin to the advance level of being able to read its

highest literature fluently, but only to learn it adequately enough for matters of trade, commerce,

and future careers as lawyers or civil servants.[15] Furthermore, for those Greek speakers who were

learning Latin for practical reasons, there were other beginner Latin materials to read than only

*Aesop's* fables in school.[16] In ancient times, just as in modern times, it is important for language

learners to find reading content that is not only at their reading level, but also engaging and

interesting (if not practical) to read.[17] Thus, for those Greeks inspiring to be future civil servants

or lawyers, there was a wide range of beginner "adult" content to read in Latin schools.

One of the more interesting of these texts was the *Judgments of Hadrian,* a bilingual legal

text espousing moral virtue, not only in general, but of the emperor Hadrian as well, who was

regarded as wise in the Eastern parts of the empire.[18] A running theme found in ancient education

was that virtue and right living should be taught in school and learned at a young age, not only in

stories and myths[19], but even in simple dialogues and legal texts such as these. This trend of

"moral education" will transcend itself into medieval and renaissance Latin pedagogy as well.

Additionally, this text, as the dialogues mentioned above, would have been easy to digest and

memorize in whole, on account of its simple, straightforward syntax.

---

[15] Dickey (2016): 3. Dickey mentions the immensely practical need of learning Latin for speakers of Greek aspiring to be lawyers. "The law schools were obliged to provide instruction in (Latin)."
[16] Dickey (2016): 64. With classrooms full a "future lawyers, many Latin teachers may have found it difficult to arouse interest in topics like Aesop's fables."
[17] See Stephen Krashen's Compelling Input Hypothesis below.
[18] Dickey (2016): 64.
[19] Marrou (1982): 235.

What follows below is a short excerpt from this legal text showing the virtues of Hadrian who looks at the "heart" of possible candidates for his Praetorian Guard, and not just the height requirement of his prestigious entourage.[20]

**Judgments of Hadrian; a recruit seeking the Praetorian Guard**

| | |
|---|---|
| Petente quodam | When someone asked |
| ut militaret, | to serve in the army, |
| Adrianus dixit, | Hadrian said, |
| "Ubi vis | "Where do you want |
| militare?" | to serve?" |
| illo dicente, | when he said, |
| "In praetorio," | "In the Praetorian Guard," |
| Adrianus interrogavit, | Hadrian asked, |
| "Quam staturam habes?" | "How tall are you?" |
| dicente illo, | When he said, |
| "Quinque pedes | "Five feet |
| et semis," | and a half," |
| Adrianus dixit, | Hadrian said, |
| "Interim | "For the time being |
| In urbanam | serve in the city guard, |
| militia, | |
| et si bonus | and if a good |
| miles fueris, | soldier you are, |
| tertio stipendio | in your third year of service |
| poteris | you will be able |
| in praetorio | to transfer to the Praetorian Guard." |

A basic summary of how learners of either Greek or Latin might have used the colloquia in their curriculum follows below. Eleanor Dickey has done breathtaking scholarship in this area.[21]

1. Students would have memorized the alphabet as learners do today, either the Greek or the Latin.
2. Following this step, or in tandem with it, they would begin to read simple dialogues to learn and practice their pronunciation (as seen above). These simple stories and dialogues would be memorized like travelers today memorize basic phrases before going to a foreign country, so as to be able to buy food, rent a car, or find a hotel etc. What is more, these dialogues or phrasebooks had two columns on each page, with Latin on one side,

---

[20] Dickey (2016): 64.
[21] Dickey (2016): 4-6.

and Greek on the other, thus, the learner could see the meaning of what they were memorizing without necessarily knowing the grammar behind it. Hence, in some ways, emulating how a language learner learns their first language.

3. Following this, the student would start learning simple stories like Aesop's fables, philosophical maxims, and legal texts, and sections of Virgil's *Aeneid.* Furthermore, all of these texts would still follow the bilingual trend of having interlinear translations on the following side of the page to help with unknown words or syntax that were difficult to understand.

4. From here the students would start learning paradigms and grammar, although ancient grammar books were decidedly different than grammar books of today. It was conventional in those times that grammar books be written in the target language, thus Latin grammar books were written in Latin and Greek grammar books in Greek. Although this seems hard to understand today, it would have compelled the students to advance in their studies so as to be able to eventually decipher it.

5. After this, the student would start reading Latin texts without the aid of a translation. This would be accompanied with a dictionary, if not a commentary, to help the student in reading. It is known that students would write translations of words they did not know on the margins or above the words, including macrons to help them, thus proving that correct pronunciation was important. Latin works read at this stage would be Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* and Seneca's *Medea* among others.

6. Quite surprisingly there were different varieties of dictionaries to choose from in the ancient world. There were dictionaries arranged in alphabetical order like those found today, although considerably smaller by comparison, however, some could contain up to 30,000 words. One type of dictionary that was popular was what is now called a classified dictionary, or topical dictionary. These were used for memorization of vocabulary, with the student memorizing one whole topic at a time. Furthermore, all dictionaries were in the target language only, bilingual dictionaries are a relatively recent invention.[22]

Thinking on the sequencing of learning Latin in this proposed curriculum decidedly demonstrates the differences and similarities between the modern grammar translation method of learning Latin and the ancient method. The most conspicuous difference, but one that it is easily overlooked when reading a list like the one above, is that Latin immersion would have been readily available to any learner seeking it, even in Greece or far beyond. No matter where a student lived in the Roman empire, finding someone with whom to speak Latin would have been as easy as finding someone to speak English with today. This factor alone cannot be downplayed

---

[22] Kelly (1976): 25. "Only from the late eighteenth century did the bilingual dictionary become a standard part of the teacher's arsenal."

in understanding how this sequence of learning actually worked and how it was successful in the ancient world. Everywhere a student went, whether in the streets, a temple or church, or doing business, Latin would have been spoken or passively heard, and thus, a multitude of opportunities would have presented themselves on a daily basis, not to mention the practicality of needing to learn it. Furthermore, the students right from the beginning started to speak Latin and learn basic phrases to be used almost immediately, not only in daily life, but also in the classroom. This is important for two reasons. Firstly, it demonstrates that learning any language (Latin, in this case), is not an end in itself, but a means to an end, namely being able to communicate with and read its literature fluently, or in Roman times, to be able to communicate and make a living. There is vital differentiation that must be made between leaning about a language, and learning to use a language fluently. The former is a science, the latter is an art form and skillset that any curious mind can acquire if they so desire.[23] Secondly, and related with the first point, since students were memorizing and using phrases right from the beginning, they would have acquired basic Latin grammar and inflections more intuitively instead of overtly, which is similar to how children learn their first language.

What is more, after learning and memorizing these simple dialogues, Roman children moved on to simple, easily digestible stories like *Aesop' fables* or the *Judgements of Hadrian,* and not Cicero and Caesar, that is, "real Latin." Although there is nothing wrong with reading Caesar in the second year of Latin today, it must be borne in mind that no one is actually "reading" Caesar, but only translating him into English, hence, the difficulty of such a taxing endeavor. Ironically enough, even though these ancient students would have been able to speak basic Latin and

---

[23] Ganss (1956): 98. "The process (language learning) as a whole is, in fact, the acquisition of an art. It requires as many hours of constant practice to learn how to use a new language as it does to learn how to play a piano." Ganss here is referring to language learning in the Renaissance, but this could be applied to language learning in general.

"conjugate" and "decline" verbs and nouns quickly and extemporaneously, they still were not given "real Latin" at first, but only easy Latin, that would have been appropriate for their level of comprehension. There is great wisdom in this method, because no modern English teacher would hand a second-year ESL student Charles Dicken's *Great Expectations* as reading material, simply, because it would be too hard for the student to understand. If they did so, the bewildered student would spend all their time in a dictionary and working out the difficult syntax, without ever truly reading Dickens as Dickens.

Interestingly enough, the students were also not expected to learn grammar or memorize paradigms until phase four of the learning sequence. Of course, there is no harm in learning the paradigms earlier or even some grammar, however, this was not the norm in ancient pedagogy. When the goal of Latin was not learning about Latin *per se* but learning how to use it properly and proficiently, then grammar itself was less important, especially at first. Only after the student had acquired the language in an intuitive sense and could speak impromptu in class and to others on the street, that it was necessary to start learning grammar as grammar, even more so if they desired to polish their writing. This is similar to how native speakers learn English today, but only after they have internalized the grammar and language for years by speaking and listening before going to school. Moreover, the concept that students would be learning Latin in grammar books written only in Latin, strikes the modern language learner as odd or even extreme, even though it is a relatively modern idea that a language can even be properly understood by using another.[24] It was only after the student had gone through all of the steps above that they were formally exposed to real Latin – that is, high literary Latin - like one finds in the writings of

---

[24] Dickey (2016): 82

Sallust or Caesar, and even then, they would still need dictionaries and help in understanding them.

This fact demonstrates a significant point. Even with these ancient students in an immersive situation, that is, with spoken Latin or Greek readily available and spoken every day in class, these "real Latin" texts were still somewhat difficult for students aspiring to read them, thus showing how lofty of a register these texts were written in. How much more difficult, then, is it to approach these same Latin texts in the modern era, by those educated in the grammar translation method, where speaking and writing extemporaneously is rare instead of the norm, and the texts are taught and discussed in English and not in the target language?

**Case Study Two**

**Latin Pedagogy in the Medieval and Renaissance Periods**

Although it is easy to grasp the practical realities of learning Latin in the ancient world of

the Roman empire, it is quite another thing entirely to compass how Latin was taught during the

medieval and Renaissance periods. While it is intuitively understood that students of Latin

during the Roman period spoke and wrote Latin and thus had a much different learning

experience than we learn it today (that is, visually, through grammar books), what is not

understood and often ignored is how similar the learning experience was for a Latin student in

the Renaissance as it was in the Roman period. This historical fact often seems to be unknown by

modern classicists, where it is almost assumed by both teacher and student, that the grammar

translation method has been passed down from generation to generation ever since Rome fell to

the "barbarians." However, as I hope to show through this case study, this is an historically

imprecise assumption. Latin since Roman times has been spoken and taught as a living language

in every generation in one form or another up to the modern period. What is more, the grammar

translation method is a relatively new phenomenon in Latin pedagogy (certainly in its present

incarnation) and has only assumed its prestigious role within the last two hundred years of Latin

instruction.[25]

**The Distichs of Cato**

A highly praised schoolbook of the medieval period was a collection of Latin sayings or

proverbs called the *Distichs of Cato*, or in Latin, *Catonis Disticha*.[26] The word distichs means

---

[25] Ganss (1956): 221. It is true the grammar-translation assumed its "prestigious role" within the last two hundred years of Latin pedagogy, however, the grammar-translation method started in the Renaissance, but only to supplement the teaching, and not to replace spoken Latin.

[26] Connolly (2022): XIV – Introduction. "The work of "Cato" was highly regarded through the Medieval period: a panegyric of Charlemagne compared the king and emperor to Cicero and Homer, but its highest compliment was

couplet, or two-line verse, and each proverb in the *Distichs of Cato* contain two lines of hexameter. Now these sayings or proverbs were attested in the medieval ages as having been handed down from Cato the Elder, the famous Roman censor himself, though what remains true of that sentiment has mostly been rejected by scholars.[27] However, what can be agreed upon is that this collection of proverbs was written in the 3rd to 4th century AD by some unknown author and was used to teach Roman boys the basics in writing and proper Roman moral conduct.

The *Distichs* of *Cato* is divided into 4 books of proverbs, and in some manuscripts, there was an extra section attached at the beginning with simple commands and imperatives that would be memorized by young Roman school boys. These pithy sayings can be divided into three categories of Roman virtues: worship of god(s)[28], Roman family values, and education. Some of the more memorable sayings are:

| | |
|---|---|
| *Deo supplica* | Worship god |
| *Cognatos cole* | Love your family |
| *Datum serva* | Preserve what is entrusted to you |
| *Foro pare* | Obey the laws |
| *Cum bonis ambula* | Keep good company |
| *Mundus esto* | be neat |
| *Saluta libenter* | be prompt to salute |
| *maiori concede* | give way to your elder |
| *cui des videto* | be careful to whom you loan |
| *conviva raro* | party seldom |
| alienum noli concupiscere | Don't covet another's possessions |
| quae legeris memento | Remember what you have read |
| liberos erudi | Educate your children |
| liberalibus stude | Strive after noble things |
| Iracundiam rege | keep thy temper |

---

that "He outdid the renowned sayings of Cato"

[27] Chase (1922): 2.

[28] Treharne (2003): 465. "In their origin, the Disticha were non-Christian, but gradually in the course of their dissemination, the nature of the text was Christianized, particularly during the Carolingian period when it was adopted by the *grammatici* an in integral and elementary part of the pedagogic curriculum."

These terse moral proverbs were useful for easy memorization for the student in the Middle ages. What is more, their moral value system, though some couplets would be questionable to modern sensibilities, would be tangible and easy to digest for young boys. However, the real substance of the textbook were the hexameter couplets in books 1-4. Here are some of the more notable ones.

> *Si deus est animus, nobis ut carmina dicunt*
> *Hic tibi praecipue sit pura mente colendus,*[29]
> > If God is spirit, as the poets sing their songs to us:
> > You must worship with a pure mind, especially here.
>
> *Virtutem primam esse puto, conpescere linquam:*
> *Proximus ille deo est, qui scit ratione tacere.*
> > It's one's highest virtue to restrain their tongue
> > One is nearest to god who knows to keep quiet his opinion
>
> *Clemens et constans, ut res expostulat esto;*
> *Temporibus mores sapiens sine crimine mutat.*
> > Be kind and stern as the situation demands
> > The wise can change their manner without crime.
>
> *Rumores fuge neu studeas novus auctor haberi;*
> *Nam nulli tacuisse nocet, nocet esse locutum.*
> > Flee rumors, lest you desire to be held the immature author:
> > For it hurts no one to be silent, but it hurts one to be spoken of.
>
> *Officium alterius multis narrare memento;*
> *At quaecumque aliis benefeceris ipse, sileto.*
> > Remember to tell the deeds of others to everyone that listens:
> > But whatever good you've done yourself keep to yourself!

What is remarkable about the *Distichs of Cato,* and the continuous use of it up to the Renaissance [30], was its relative simplicity of memorization for the student, made helpful by its

---

[29] Connolly (2022): 9. Continuing the tradition of moral maxims starting from Roman education to the Medieval and Renaissance periods, Connolly remarks that this first maxim "introduces a nexus of ideas that will be key to the collection. First the maxims that follow will appeal to and perhaps find a home in the readers' *animus,* i.e., good sense, or rationality… second, the Author claims that our good sense is the divine element within us and, as a result, it must be nurtured and privileged, with the mind kept pure."

[30] Black (2007): 37. Although the *Distichs of Cato* were used well passed Medieval times, they were slowly replaced, especially in Italy, by the Psalter. Black says, "In the early middle ages, however, a significant change of curriculum occurred: the *Disticha Catonis* were replaced as the first reading text by the Psalter. This change of reading matter began first in monastic schools and soon spread to parish and ecclesiastical schools, as well as to lay education. Throughout the middle ages, being *psalteratus* was synonymous with literacy. In the early middle ages, novice monks had had to learn all 150 psalms, a process which could take up to three years for normal pupils, whereas the gifted might accomplish the feat in as little as five months."

poetic hexameter. This simplicity of syntax and style is similar to the simple dialogues of the

Greeks and Romans mentioned in the first case study, although it must be acknowledged that no

one in the Middle Ages or Renaissance spoke Latin natively, and most had to learn it at school.

However, these schools were different than many Latin programs today.

### Latin Schools in the Renaissance

One way of understanding how Latin schools differed in the Renaissance, is to look no

further than the *Ratio Studiorum,* a manual established by the Jesuits in 1599 setting out

educational precepts for schools to follow. Just one example follows below.[31]

*Latine loquendi usus severe in primis custodiatur, iis scholis exceptis, in quibus discipuli Latine nesciunt, ita ut in omnibus quae ad scholam pertinent, numquam liceat uti patrio sermone, notis etiam adscriptis, si quis neglexerit: eamque ob rem Latine perpetuo magister loquatur.*

"Let the practice of speaking Latin be strictly preserved – with the exception of those classes in which the students are untrained in Latin – so that in all activities pertaining to the class it is never permissible to use the vernacular, with the provision of bad marks for anyone who neglects [this injunction]. For this reason, the teacher should constantly speak Latin."

Although the *Ratio Studiorum* was written at the turn of the seventeenth century, its

methods and pedagogical ideas were based of the writings and practices of Ignatius of Loyola,

who was a Catholic priest and educational reformer at the height of the Renaissance. What is

more, Ignatius' ideas of education were based upon his own educational experience in the

Renaissance schools of the day, and those institutions traced their pedagogy as far back to the

early Renaissance and Medieval age.[32] The main pedagogical idea of these schools was not to

---

[31] Tunberg and Minkova (2005): 8-9.

[32] Ganss (1956): 17. Ganss points out that the *Ratio Studiorum* was a compilation on the works of Ignatius before his death (1556), and that his ideas on education were a reflection of what had come before, especially in his own educational experiences. "Through personal experience amid the contemporary conflict of opinions about the organization of studies and the methods of teaching, he discerned and esteemed what was good both in the older medieval education and in the new education of the Renaissance."

learn "about" Latin per se nor even the appreciation of literature,[33] but rather, to learn how to use the language in all its aspects: reading, writing and speaking, so as to be as fluent as possible in the language.[34] Latin at this time was the lingua franca of the universities of Europe,[35] and classes would be conducted entirely in Latin, thus, the importance of mastering it at an early age was necessary.[36] A student would usually start at the young age of five to seven, studying from eight in the morning to five in the afternoon, eleven months of the year, and continuing this process for eight to ten years.[37] At the beginning stages, they were taught the rudiments of grammar in the vernaculars, with grammar being less "scientific" than in later eras to come.[38] Following this, the teacher would start incorporating spoken Latin daily into the classroom and have students start memorizing basic dialogues. These dialogues (similar to the simple dialogues of the Romans) consisted of everyday activities that the schoolboys would find useful while also being easy to comprehend.[39] At this time, they would also be engaged in writing composition, both verse and prose, recitations and even translations into the vernacular.[40] These dialogues were interlinear, with the Latin on one side and a literal translation of the vernacular on the other, thus making it easier to understand for the student. Furthermore, in the Renaissance period there was no push to read any challenging authors until the fourth or fifth year, and thus, only after the

---

[33] Ganss (1956): 124.
[34] Ganss (1956): 69.
[35] Leonhardt. (2013): 123.
"For about a thousand years, Latin was the indispensable language of culture and science in Europe, and so it is no exaggeration to speak of Europe's Latin millennium."
[36] Waquet (2001): 21. "In Lausanne, the college that prepared students for the Academy, and thus for the ministry, taught in Latin in compliance with a ruling of 1547. In the youngest class, the seventh grade which accepted children of six or seven, the basic disciplines – spelling, reading and writing – were taught in Latin, the only use of French being to provide translations of the basic vocabulary"
[37] Ganss (1956): 81.
[38] Tunberg (2020): 66-67.
[39] Ganss (1956): 98.
[40] Waquet (2001): 15. "Henry VIII in 1540 imposed throughout the kingdom as the "Common" or "Royal Grammar". The child was expected to acquire mastery of spoken as well as written Latin: conversational training took the form of dialogues, recitations, grammatical debates, frequent exercises in translation and composition in both prose and verse."

pupils had read easy dialogues and stories, spoken and written Latin for years and had a firm command of the language communicatively, did they embark on the difficult journey of reading Caesar or Livy with their complex syntax and long sentences.[41]

The most famous writer of these colloquia at this time was a Dutchman named Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus,[42] or better known as Erasmus. Erasmus was a humanist who was as fluent in Latin as any Roman ever was. His copious letters, books, and essays only prove this point. And although his colloquia are more polished and satirical than others such as Cordier and other humanist of his time[43], they are mentioned here for both their glimpse into Renaissance pedagogy and their delightful wit.

---

[41] Ganss (1956): 99-100.
[42] Leonhardt (2013): 190. Erasmus' *Colloquia familiaria* was "the most successful" colloquia and "was used and quoted throughout Europe for centuries."
[43] Tunberg (2020): 68.

**Chapter Two**

**Second Language Acquisition and Latin Pedagogy**

Second Language Acquisition (hereafter SLA) research contributes many insights into effective methodologies for learning a second language, also called the "target language," or TL. What this relatively new discipline[44] has discovered in regards to language learning can equally be applied to Latin pedagogy as well. What is more, how these new methods can be incorporated into the modern classroom is an exciting and thought-provoking, though sometimes controversial, exercise.[45] In the present chapter I apply the findings of SLA research to Latin pedagogy and its future possibilities. In the following chapter I will be comparing and contrasting this research with the previous case studies and highlighting where they are both congruent and divergent in their methodologies.

One of the most prominent representatives of SLA research is linguist Stephen Krashen, whose insights into explicit an implicit grammar, and especially his comprehensible input hypothesis, where groundbreaking in the 1980s.[46] What follows below is a brief summary of his Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis.

---

[44] Ellis (2020): 191. SLA has been in existence about sixty years.

[45] Moran (2019): 20. Moran in this article posits that since there is no way to know how the Latin in the streets was actually spoken, there is no reason to try to speak it, because this "spoken Latin" is unknown, and only Classical Latin, the literary language, remains. However, whatever this "vulgar Latin" was at the time of the Romans is not what is trying to be recreated in the classrooms of today. "Spoken Latin," either in the Renaissance or today, bases its grammar and syntax on the literary language of Classical Latin and not on what was spoken in Romans times.

[46] Carlon (2013): 107.

## The Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis

Krashen's first hypothesis is that a distinction must be made between true acquisition of a language and "learning" a language, that is, learning about a language.[47] He posits that true acquisition happens only subconsciously, as it does for a child learning a native language from his or her parents. This process is automatic and cannot be forced through memorizing declensions charts and long vocabulary lists, but happens only after a long period of time by being exposed to the language, and more often than not, by listening. Furthermore, since the learning is subconscious, learners are not aware of the rules and grammar of the language but only have an intuitive feel for what it is right and wrong by how it "sounds" or "feels" to them. For example, an English speakers might not be able to explain why the sentence *She go to the car* is wrong grammatically, but they will know that is sounds incorrect. Just as a non-educated Roman would know that the phrase *Necesse est me edere* is wrong and feels "off" without necessarily knowing why it is incorrect. An educated student in English would one day learn in school that the third person singular in English is *goes,* and the educated Roman would learn that in the phrase, *necesse est,* the pronoun *ego* will be in the dative case, thus, *mihi,* forming what Latin grammarians call a dative of possession, and not in the accusative case, *me*. However, these grammatical rules will be learned after the fact, and after the language has already been acquired by the learner. Thus, Krashen's first hypothesis is that a differentiation must be made between true acquisition of a language, and learning about a language. It must be stated that children five and under do learn some rules concerning their language (mostly from their parents), but the vast majority of their "learning" is subconscious, and surprisingly, is learned in a natural order.

---

[47] Krashen (1982): 10.

One aspect of Krashen's theory is the importance of listening in the acquisition of a new language.[48] In the first five years of childhood, a child implicitly learns grammar, proper syntax, and semantics, and almost all of these skills are learned through only listening to family and peers.[49] This fact is remarkable in and of itself; however, it also shows the differences between learning about a language (explicit knowledge), and learning to use and understand a language (implicit knowledge).[50] Obviously, an adult learner does not need to completely follow the path of language acquisition as a child does, that would not be practical, however, this does show the importance that listening has for fully understanding a language.

## Auditory Verbal Imagery

Furthermore, when children first learn how to read, they sound out the letters so as to help them internalize the sounds with the letters.[51] As this becomes a natural process for them, the reading aloud stops and they begin to silently read to themselves. However, this "sounding out" process never really stops, even as adults, who continue to read with an internal voice going on in their head. This inner process is called auditory verbal imagery, and it is a field that is showing how our brains are hardwired for language learning. But what has been groundbreaking about some of these recent discoveries, is the interrelatedness between the process of reading mere words on a page, and the auditory response that goes on in the brain, even if the reader is reading in silence.[52] This would heavily suggest the importance of hearing and listening to a language, as Krashen posits.

---

[48] Feyten (1991): 175.
[49] Feyten (1991): 174. Feyten: "As much as listening is the foundation of formal education, it is also the foundation of language acquisition. At birth we know nothing about language, and yet we will complete much of the first language acquisition process within our first five years, depending almost exclusively on listening."
[50] Ellis, Loewen and Erlam (2006): 340.
[51] Bertolotti, Kujala, Vidal, Hamame, Ossandon, Bertrand, Minotti, Kahane, Jerbi, and Lanchaux (2012). 1.
[52] Bertolotti, Kujala, Vidal, Hamame, Ossandon, Bertrand, Minotti, Kahane, Jerbi, and Lanchaux (2012). 7.

Krashen's hypothesis asked legitimate questions concerning the reasons how one could study a language for years in school, know its grammar better than a native speaker, yet still was hardly able to communicate in the target language. Did this not prove that "knowledge" of a language and acquisition (or fluency) were entirely two different things? Furthermore, was Krashen's extreme view of these two dichotomies correct or was there a middle ground somewhere, where both knowledge of grammar and acquisition could possibly meet in the middle?[53] Krashen's theory was completely contrary to the traditional grammar-translation method, which focused extensively on formal grammar and instruction "about" the language and where reading and writing took precedence over listening and speaking.[54]

### The Weak Interface Position[55] – The Middle Way

Linguist Rod Ellis posits that there is a middle way between both implicit and explicit grammar called the "weak interface" model, according to which both grammar (explicit) and "acquisition" (intuitive learning) are important for language learning.[56] Krashen's argument is considered an extreme view of the noninterface position, where no matter how much explicit knowledge one has learned, that is, knowledge of the language and its grammar, this knowledge will never cross over to the acquisition sector of the brain,[57] and can only be used to "correct"

---

[53] N.C. Ellis (2017): 2. N.C. Ellis posits that Krashen's hypothesis is "an extreme "noninterface" position" as opposed to a "strong-interface" that is, the grammar-translation position. The middle position is the "weak interface" position.

[54] Richards and Rodgers (2010): 6.

[55] Ellis (1994): 709. The 'weak interface position" can also be called the "interface position."

[56] Ellis (1994): 643. "On balance the available evidence indicates that an explicit presentation of rules supported by examples is the most effective way of presenting difficult material. However, the effectiveness of the implicit or explicit instructional treatment may depend on the type of linguistic material being learnt and characteristics of the individual learner."

[57] Ellis (1994): 356. "Krashen argues that 'acquired knowledge' can *only* be developed when the learner's attention is focused on message conveyance, and that neither practice or error correction enables 'learned knowledge' to become 'acquired'."

output, that is, speaking and writing the language.[58] However, the weak interface position posits that "learned" grammar will turn into fluency and "acquisition" if practiced, that is, in speaking, writing and outputting the language.[59] Thus, modern SLA research has arrived somewhere between these two extremes, that is, "learning" about a language in a formal sense (grammar translation), and the intuitive sense of "acquiring" it as children do in childhood, by listening and speaking extempore, which can only come from much practice.[60] Although true a child does learn their first language in a "natural" sense without explicitly being taught grammar, it is also true that children do not possess the cognitive abilities to "learn" about abstract ideas and rules of grammar as adults do.[61] Thus, the best approach for adults might be the middle road, where they can both "learn" about the target language and practice listening, reading, and speaking the language at the same time. However, listening and reading brings up another topic in SLA research, comprehensible input.

## The Input Hypothesis – Comprehensible Input

Krashen's input hypothesis states that a language learner moves from one level of the language to the next by understanding the meaning that is being spoken, and not the form of it, that is, the grammar.[62] He presents it in a formula as *i + 1,* where /i/ represents what is understandable to the learner, and /1/, what is a little beyond their current level. How a language

---

[58] This is Krashen's Monitor Hypothesis, which states that "learning" a language can only act as a "monitor" or "editor" at any moment of output of the language, and the two processes are entirely different from each other. Thus, when a language student speaks or writes, he does so from the language that has already been acquired, and not from the "rules" he has learned in a text book. What has been learned is only useful to modify or monitor the speech or writing before or after the fact, and not in the moment or "performance" of communication. My paraphrase.

[59] Smith (1981): 166. "Whatever the view of the underlying processes in second language learning are concerned, it is quite clear and uncontroversial to say that most spontaneous performance is attained by dint of practice."

[60] N.C. Ellis (2017): 5.

[61] Smith (1981): 165. One reason why a multi-faceted approach to learning might be preferred is that it takes into account the possibility that second language learners can employ methods that that are not open to the child L1 learner. The increased cognitive maturity and knowledge of the outside world is brought into play."

[62] Krashen (1982): 21.

learner is able to understand a new grammatical form without it ever being explained, is because of context and linguistic clues that an acquirer will pick up from his or her environment.[63] Thus, Krashen's hypothesis is completely opposite from how most languages are taught, especially ancient ones. Ancient languages are taught as if students should learn the grammatical forms and structure first, and following that, meaning will appear when reading. However, Krashen's theory runs counter to that, because it posits that if a student focuses on meaning first and understandable communication, the form and structure of the language will automatically appear later on. Thus, if the student understands the meaning of what is being communicated, they will naturally acquire the language. Furthermore, he states that the output of a language (that is speaking or writing) cannot be forced, but comes naturally from acquisition, that is, more input (listening and reading).[64]

## The Output Hypothesis

There are many disagreements with Krashen's Input Hypothesis in continuing SLA research, with one study showing that the "no grammar" classroom approach can fall short of a classroom where instruction of both grammar and communicative approaches were incorporated.[65] Furthermore, in opposition to Krashen's Input Hypothesis, Merrill Swain contested with her Output Hypothesis that language learners can benefit greatly from producing output in the L2, because, as she quips, "Practice makes perfect."[66] What is more, this practice in

---

[63] Krashen (1982): 21.
[64] Krashen (1982): 22.
[65] Spada, Nina, and Lightbown (1993): 218. "Because the comparison group apparently received instruction and corrective feedback over a much longer period of time than the experimental groups, it is difficult to attribute differences solely in differences in *type* of instruction. Nevertheless, our current hypothesis is that it is precisely this context-embedded focus on form, made available over an extend time period, that led the comparison students (instructed students) to their superior performance."
[66] Swain (1995): 125.

producing the language shows the current blind spots, or "noticing,"[67]of the learner's abilities, and thus, areas of the L2 they need to improve on. Additionally, Swain states that with input only, it is easy for the learner to say they "understand" when in reality they do not, whereas in outputting the language, either in written or spoken form, this is not possible and their knowledge or lack thereof will be noticeable. Hence, to output the L2 is to "stretch the interlanguage" of the learner and push the boundaries of their knowledge.[68]

Other exciting research, following Swain's theory, elaborates further on the "noticing" function of the output hypothesis. For example, when a learner notices that they cannot produce in speech or writing what they wish to output in the L2, this causes them to search for ways to fix this lack of knowledge.[69] Thus, this "noticing" causes them to be hyper-aware of the input they listen to or read, so as to "fix" their output at a future time. Hence, this action creates a learning moment for the learner. Furthermore, continuing with Swain's hypothesis, outputting the language in spoken form and not just relaying on input, begins as a cognitive external process that is reliant on others at first, but soon becomes internalized and hence the regulatory actions become normalized.[70] This process is what Swain calls the metalinguistic function of her Output Hypothesis.

---

[67] Swain (2005): 474. This "noticing" is the first part of Swain's three functions of output hypothesis, that is,
  1. The Noticing/Triggering Function
  2. The Hypothesis-Testing Function
  3. The Metalinguistic Function

[68] Swain (1995): 127. "Learners (as well as native speakers of course) can fake it so to speak, in comprehension, but they cannot do so in the same way in production. They can pass themselves off as having understood, as Hawkins (1985) so clearly demonstrated. Hawkins showed that learners would often claim to understand the interlocutors, when in fact they did not. However, to produce, learners need to do something; they need to create linguistic form and meaning and in doing so, discovery what the can and cannot do."

[69] Izumi (2002): 545. "In psycholinguistic terms, it may be assumed that grammatical encoding and monitoring mechanisms play particularly important roles for learning purposes by functioning as an internal priming device for grammatical consciousness-raising for the language learner."

[70] Swain (2005): 478. "The claim here is that using language to reflect on language produced by others or the self, mediates second language learning. This idea originates with Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of mind. Sociocultural

## The Compelling Input Hypothesis

Krashen's sixth and most recent hypothesis posits that, not only should the input of the target language be comprehensible to the acquirer, but also compelling in every way.[71] Krashen describes this as reading that is so "compelling" for the reader, that he or she forgets they are even reading something above their current level, but they are so engrossed in the subject and the content, that they can read for hours at a time without thinking about it. This kind of compelling input is the key to true language acquisition, because it is often unconscious and the learner improves without "effort".

Krashen mentions a case study with a 12-year-old boy named Daniel from China, who had moved to the US when he was eight. After being in the US for years, his Mandarin was slowly fading, and although his parents tried to motivate Daniel to practice it (either by sending him to a Chinese Heritage language school, or a summer heritage language school) he simply was not "interested" in learning Mandarin. However, after Daniel began reading illustrated comic books that were slightly beyond his level, he devoured them one after another, and began to become "interested" in Mandarin, or more to the point, in the stories written in Mandarin. Thus, he was acquiring the language without even thinking about it, all because he found these stories both compelling and interesting.

---

theory is about people operating with mediating tools… Speaking is initially an exterior source of physical and mental regulation for an individual—an individual's physical and cognitive behavior is initially regulated by others. Over time, however, the individual internalizes these regulatory actions— actions such as reasoning and attending. Internalization is an "in growing" (Frawley, 1997) of collective to individual behavior, and this growing inwards is mediated by speaking (and other semiotic tools)."
[71] Krashen (2011): 17.

**Chapter Three**

**Contrasting SLA Research with Roman and Renaissance Latin Pedagogy**

**Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis**

Krashen's Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis states that a distinction must be made between true acquisition of a language, and "learning" about a language. However, Rod Ellis demonstrated with his "weak interface" position that a more balanced approach to this question is necessary, because, although it is true that humans "acquire" their first language intuitively by listening and so forth, it also true that adults can learn using other methods, including "learning" about a language formally in school. Nevertheless, at the heart of Krashen's hypothesis lies the great importance of listening to the target language and emulating that "intuitive" part of childhood when a child first learns their native language.

For the Greeks wishing to learn Latin, as mentioned in the first case study, this whole aspect of language acquisition would have been a completely different experience than learning Latin in school today, because of the obvious ease of finding an "immersive" Latin experience wherever one went.[72] However, when reflecting on Latin pedagogy in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, this important facet of language acquisition becomes startling in how similar it follows much of SLA research. At that time, the teacher taught Latin grammar in the vernacular in the first year, but in the second, would have the students memorize colloquia and dialogues and slowly switched the classroom over into being conducted entirely in Latin. Thus, although Latin was no one's first language in the Renaissance, after many years of a student listening to their teacher and fellow classmates speaking daily, they would have had an "intuitive"

---

[72] As mentioned before, these dialogues were memorized before learning formal grammar, thus in some ways emulating Krashen's Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis, where chucks and bits of the languages are learned in childhood before actually understanding the "grammar" behind the syntax.

acquisition of the language, just as a child would when learning their first language[73]. Hence, Latin pedagogy in the Renaissance fulfills Krashen's and other's research in the importance of listening to the target language.

**The Weak Interface Position – The Middle Way**

Rod Ellis' stance on the "weak interface" position of language acquisition also follows closely with both Roman and Renaissance Latin pedagogy, although with a few differences. Although there were many opportunities to hear and listen to Latin at this time, a Greek speaker learning Latin would still formally learn grammar, however, only after learning the alphabet, memorizing simple dialogues, and reading basic stories.[74] Thus, even being in an immersive Latin environment was not enough for Greeks speakers seeking fluency in Latin, and official knowledge of grammar was still necessary to "master" it. This falls in line with Ellis' "weak interface" position, were both listening and learning formal grammar is helpful for language learners, and what is more, contrary to Krashen's "noninterface" position, language that is "learned" can turn into true acquisition and thus there is no "barrier" between learning and acquisition.

Latin pedagogy in the Renaissance period followed this same trajectory as well. This first year was devoted to memorizing the rudiments of grammar in the vernacular, and then moving

---

[73] Erasmus (1529): 168-169. "For my own part I advise that when this stage is reached *the child begin to hear and imitate the sounds of Latin speech*. Why should it be more difficult to acquire Roman words or even Greek, rather than the vernacular? No doubt my prescription demands the environment of a cultivated home-circle. But the master may secure even under the conditions of school-life *that boys be brought to speak Latin with precision, if patience be shown in encouraging and correcting uncertain efforts, and in insisting upon careful observation of the Teacher's own usage.* By degrees devices for increasing fluency may be introduced; as, for instance, a game of forfeits and prizes for faults and corrections, the Master choosing the judges from amongst the top boys. The more common phrases suitable for play, for social life, for meal-times, must be early learned and be apt, and ready to hand." (Emphasis mine).

[74] See a summation of Dickey's in the first case study.

on to simple dialogues and speaking. This inverse in starting with grammar as opposed to memorizing and speaking as the Greeks did, makes sense in that Latin was a living language at the time, and spoken in all parts of the empire, thus, there was a real practical need to practice using and hearing it on a quotidian basis. However, in the Renaissance period, Latin was confined to the language of the learned only[75], and since it was no one's native language, it makes sense that the grammar was introduced first before speaking and writing commenced. Nevertheless, this pedagogy still follows Ellis' "weak interface" position in that Latin was both learned "about" and intuitively picked up by constant use and listening in the classroom for years. However, this grammar that was taught at an early age should not be confused with much of the grammar that is taught now at the very beginning of most Latin courses. Latin pedagogy in the Renaissance used an inductive method[76] of language learning in regards to learning grammar and syntax, whereas even in the Middle Ages, the deductive method ruled the day.[77] Thus, even though the goal of learning Latin was to speak and write it in the Middle Ages,[78] it was believed that only through a full grasp of its grammar was one able to attain that goal.[79] However, during the Renaissance, although grammar was learned and considered important, the inductive method was fully embraced by Erasmus. For example, quoting Erasmus (emphasis mine)

---

[75] Colella (1999): 6. "During the Middle Ages, protected by the Church thus ensuring its survival, Latin was the only language used for teaching, and in addition was the sole language of international communication and culture throughout Europe. As a result, Latin was taught intensively and was part of the common curriculum of education from elementary grades to university. The medieval educated man was a bilingual individual."

[76] Kelly (1976): "Since the beginning of language teaching, the manner of learning the syntax and flexions of language have been disputed. Accepted methods have ranged from the inductive, from which the pupil himself arrives at rules from examples, to the deductive whereby one precedes from rules to a knowledge of a language."

[77] Colella (1999): 6.

[78] Colella (1999): 7. "The goal of the L2 class was to enable clerics to speak, read and write in Latin. Nearly all academic learning was done in Latin."

[79] Kelly (1976): "During the Middle Ages and the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, languages were usually presented through the codifications of the grammarians. It was expected that skill in using languages would follow from an intellectual knowledge of their formal analysis. However, during the classical era, the Renaissance, and the early twentieth century, it was intuitive command of the target languages that was required, *formal knowledge being seen as a mere reinforcement of practical mastery*."

But I must make my conviction clear that, whilst a knowledge of the rules of accidence and syntax is most necessary to every student, still they should be as few, as simple, and as carefully framed as possible. I have no patience with the stupidity of the average teacher of grammar who wastes precious years in hammering rules into children's heads. *For it is not by learning rules that we acquire the power of speaking a language, but by daily intercourse with those accustomed to express themselves with exactness and refinement, and by the copious reading of the best authors*.[80]

Thus, Erasmus' method of Latin pedagogy falls equally in line with Ellis's "weak interface" position, where both knowledge of explicit grammar and implicit acquisition are mutually important. Furthermore, Erasmus in a letter to Cominius, dated June 21, 1520, strongly refutes him for insisting that grammar be removed *in toto* from curriculum. Erasmus makes clear to his colleague that formal grammar is important for beginners, but the inductive method should be incorporated at more advance levels.[81] Thus, Erasmus took the middle way in this debate,[82] as modern SLA research has taken the "middle way" as well.

## The Input Hypothesis – Comprehensible Input

Krashen's Input Hypothesis when compared to Latin pedagogy in Roman time falls short in its practical application as it often does today. Since right from the beginning, as was demonstrated above, a Greek student would memorize simple dialogues to start speaking instantly, thus, this runs contrary to Krashen's theory that forcing "output" is the exact opposite of how one "acquires" a language.[83] What is more, although the dialogues memorized were bilingual and easy to understand, or perhaps, were "comprehensible," they were only

---

[80] Erasmus (1529): 163-164.
[81] Kelly (1976: 36-37. "(Erasmus) makes it quite clear to Cominius that he regards the rejection of grammar as an excess which was every bit as reprehensible as the opposed devotion to analysis."
[82] Kelly (1976: 37. Kelly mentions here how Erasmus "was always a man who chose the middle way."
[83] Krashen (1982): "The final part of the input hypothesis states that speaking fluency cannot be taught directly. Rather, it "emerges" over time, on its own. The best way, and perhaps the only way, to teach speaking, according to this view, is simply to provide comprehensible input. Early speech will come when the acquirer feels "ready"; this state of readiness arrives at somewhat different times for different people, however. Early speech, moreover, is typically not grammatically accurate. Accuracy develops over time as the acquirer hears and understands more input."

comprehensible by using the student's native language (Greek) and not in the target language (Latin), thus, the dialogues would have only provided "scraps of comprehensible input."[84] Furthermore, Krashen's theory falls short in Renaissance pedagogy too, where Latin was taught first by learning formal grammar and then following that with easy dialogues. Additionally, although both time periods were "immersive" environments which would match Krashen's theory of the importance of listening for acquisition, they were also both "output" heavy in their approaches to language learning.

## The Output Hypothesis

Swain's Output Hypothesis matches surprisingly well with Latin pedagogy in Roman times. Here, the students would almost instantly be producing Latin by reading and memorizing simple dialogues and thus, speaking Latin to each other in the classroom. Furthermore, as Swain pointed out in the "noticing" function of her hypothesis, producing this output would help the student to instantly realize their shortcomings in the language, thereby compelling them to listen to "input" more mindfully to correct their speech or writing for the next opportunity. Clearly there was a real practical need to learn how to use Latin at this time, and not just learn it for its literary merits, but be that as it may, Swain's theory melds better to reality than Krashen's; input is extremely helpful for acquisition, but output is equally so. Furthermore, in the Renaissance, after formal grammar had been learned, simple dialogues were also incorporated into the classroom with the students expected to speak daily, so much so that they often knew Latin better than their native language.[85] What is more, in addition to "outputting" spoken Latin, the students

---

[84] Krashen (1982): 128. "As discussed above, grammar-translation fails to provide a great deal of comprehensible input. The small amount of comprehensible input in the model sentences, the readings, and exercises is, moreover, rarely supplemented by teacher talk in the target language."

[85] Waquet (2001): 22-23, Lavopa (1983): 63, 81. "'In German-speaking countries, as elsewhere, German was learned discovered, even – via Latin. This experience is described, in a late eighteenth-century setting, as it applies

were expected to engage in composition. This composition differed remarkably from Latin prose composition today, in that the student was asked to write their own prose or verse works, and not translate premade English sentences into Latin.[86] Students were given "prompts" to write on,[87] these would range from retellings of mythology or moral dilemmas from ancient history, such as, "Eloquence too little restrained brought Demosthenes and Cicero to their ruin."[88] Hence, the student would write their opinion on the matter. What is more, it was only after the student had acquired an ability in both writing and speaking that Erasmus would recommend learning more advance grammar.[89] Thus, this method bodes well with Swain's and Ellis' hypotheses, in that true acquisition comes from a balance of both "learning" about a language and "outputting" the language.

## The Compelling Input Hypothesis

Krashen's Compelling Input Hypothesis also matches with Latin pedagogy in Roman times. In the first case study, it was shown that if a Greek student was aspiring to become a lawyer but had no desire to read *Aesop's fables,* he could find other "compelling" reading material such as the *Judgments of Hadrian* or the *Treatise on Manumission*.[90] Conversely,

---

to the eponymous hero of the psychological novel Anton Reiser. When in the second grade, the young Reiser was conscious that he spoke '*That language more correctly than German. For in Latin he knew how to make deliberate use of the dative and the accusative. But it had never occurred to him that in German mich, for example, was an accusative and mir a dative, or that it was just as necessary to decline and conjugate in his own language as it was in Latin. In unconscious fashion, however, he was absorbing a number of concepts at this time that he was later able to apply to his mother tongue.'"

[86] Arnold's Latin Prose Composition comes to mind with this point. And although this is "output" and is very useful for acquisition, it is entirely different than producing one's own output, no matter how simple this output might be when first begone.

[87] Similar to English composition classes today.

[88] Erasmus (1529): 170.

[89] Erasmus (1529): 171. "But I must repeat that when once the simpler rules of composition, in prose and verse, and the commoner figures of speech have been mastered, the whole stress of teaching must be laid upon a close yet wide study of the greater writers. Fortified with this the student can produce original work in prose, under the criticism (this is most important) of a thoroughly skilled instructor."

[90] Dickey (2016): 69. "This difficult technical treatise on Roman Law seems at first sight like peculiar reading material for language learners, but its bilingual transmission in the Hermeneumata Leidensia tells us that it was

*Aesop's fables* were an option for children learning Latin, which they would memorize and translate in and out of the both languages.[91] As Krashen has rightly demonstrated, having this option in language learning, where the learner can choose for themselves what to read or not is necessary for the learner to stay engaged with the target language. This engagement with compelling content also was found in the Renaissance as well. For children learning to read, there were the easy *colloquia,* also *Aesop's fables,* and of course the *colloquia* of Erasmus, including his *convivium religiosum,* which was full of names of animals, trees, and plants.[92] What is more, returning for a moment to Latin composition, Erasmus made it clear that these "prompts" to write should involve moral dilemmas and myths that would interest the student, thus, even Latin composition was more "free-form" and geared to some degree to what the pupil thought was compelling to write about.[93] Thus, although ancient pedagogy falls short of what one would expect concerning compelling input for learning modern languages, nevertheless, it still tried to find interesting content for the different ages of the learner.

---

indeed so used. Probably the demand for it came from law students who wanted to start practicing on a real legal manual at an early stage of their Latin learning, but owning to its difficulty the treatise is not completely suitable for beginners."

[91] Dickey (2016): 61.

[92] Woodward (1904): 106.

[93] Erasmus (1529): 169. "When this time has arrived care must be taken to propound themes not only worthy in subject but suitable, *as being within the range of the boy's interests.*" (Emphasis mine)

**Chapter Four**

**A Short History of the Grammar-Translation Method and the Living Latin Movement**

Although Latin over the last few centuries has ceased to be taught actively in general, there has always been a few pockets of "rebel" teachers holding out on the ancient tradition.[94] Ironically, it was Latin that held out the longest amongst the other languages when turning over to the grammar-translation method.[95] Although in its essence, grammar-translation had been around since the Renaissance, it was only at the end of the eighteenth century that its modern visage came into fruition. Originally, it was called *vulgaria* in the Renaissance, which were translations meant to teach style to students.[96] However, one branch of Renaissance scholars thought these would be a great method to teach grammar as well, and thus, here lies the beginning of having one rule to each chapter of Latin grammar textbooks.[97] Nevertheless, the "translation" aspect did not begin until the end of the eighteenth century. The two textbooks that changed everything were by Meidinger and Seidenstucker. However, although many modern languages started to use this method in the early nineteenth century, Classicists were still unsure of this new method, because at that time there was still a heavy emphasis on Latin composition, a holdover from older times. However, since spoken Latin was also in decline in the classroom, if not entirely gone, eventually the grammar-translation method was accepted and thus all output in the language practically stopped as well.[98] Furthermore, Karl Plotz streamlined this process in the later part of the century by making it more analytical and more "about" the language, and less

---

[94] Tunberg (2011): 8–9.
[95] Kelly (1976): 52. This grammar-translation history is a paraphrase from Kelly.
[96] Kelly (1976): 52.
[97] Kelly (1976): 51.
[98] Kelly (1976): 53. "Language skill was equated with ability to conjugate and decline."

about using it.[99] It was also at this time that sentences from real Latin authors were replaced by

"synthetic" ones to correspond to the grammar concept or rule being taught in each chapter.[100]

Some rebels at this time to the grammar-translation method were the Direct Methodists,

whose biggest star was W.H.D Rouse.[101] Rouse was an interesting character who believed that

the direct method of learning languages was the only way to learn.[102] He eventually came to

teach at the Perse School, Cambridge, which was a grammar school of little note. He would

speak and ask questions in Latin and the classroom was an immersive experience from day

one.[103] However, his teaching methods never caught on completely, and were constantly

competing with the grammar-translation method.[104]

After the second World War, the *Academia Latinitati fovendae* was established with its

mission to promote culture, Latin literature, and spoken Latin.[105] Joseph Eichenseer, who was a

member of the ALF, would later go on and take up the torch that Rouse had lit with the Direct

Method, starting his own spoken Latin summer program in Germany in 1973.[106] This action laid

the foundations for spoken Latin's resurgence in later years.[107] Furthermore, Father Reginald

Foster in 1985 started his *Aestiva Romae Latinitatis*, a free summer program in Rome.[108] Ten

---

[99] Leonhardt (2013): 273. "These grammars were written in large part because people non longer heard, spoke, or wrote Latin as a matter of course. Grammarians become necessary whenever a language ceases to be in active use, as we saw earlier during the crisis at the end of antiquity. People who do not actually speak a language regularly need reference works."

[100] Leonhardt (2013): 274. "Our image of Latin as a logical language that sharpens thinking reflects precisely the analytical perspectives that went into writing these grammars."

[101] Stray (n.d.): 5.

[102] Stray (n.d.): 5.

[103] The direct method is different than how Latin was taught in the Renaissance, where grammar was first learned in the vernacular. Here, from day one, the student is immersed in Latin and not their native language. This is similar to the comprehensible method today, which follows Krashen's theories closely.

[104] Stray (n.d.): 7. "Rouse's vision would not have saved the day, but it might have injected life into the sterile debates on the 'grammar grind' and the disciplinary befits of Latin."

[105] Coffee (2012): 257.

[106] Coffee (2012): 257.

[107] Coffee (2012): 257.

[108] Coffee (2012): 257. This program founded by Reginald was the origin of the Paideia Institute, which gives living Latin conferences in New York once a year and both Living Latin in Rome and Living Latin in Paris in the summer and winter.

years later professor Terence Tunberg from the University of Kentucky started his

Conventiculum Latinum in 1995, which is a summer immersion program.[109] Tunberg has also

started a Graduate Certificate In Latin Studies, where Latin is not only spoken at all times, but all

writing is focused on Latin composition as well. Furthermore, there are successful Latin

programs in high schools following more or less the comprehensible input theory set down by

Krashen, although currently, there are no universities in the states that have done so. The Polis

Institute in Jerusalem, run by Christophe Rico, is the only program that follows a pedagogy that

is similar to that proposed by Krashen at the university level. Polis offers both a language

certificate, or a graduate program through a third-party university in Spain. From day one, all

students are taught only in koine Greek or ancient Hebrew, with a method called TPR (Total

Physical Response). This method was started by James Asher, and incorporates commands

(imperatives) to be given to students to follow through on, much like how children learn their

first language by their parents doing the same.[110] Though the results seem to be very impressive,

this method has not caught on at the university level. Therefore, it is exciting to see the living

Latin movement that originally started out as something small, become a burgeoning movement

that has been slowly recognized as something legitimate and longstanding.[111]

---

[109] Coffee (2012). 258.
[110] Asher (1969): 254.
[111] Coffee (2012). 260.

**Chapter Five**

**Interview with Professor Terence Tunberg and Reflections on Latin Pedagogy**

In the fall of 2022, I interviewed professor Tunberg from the University of Kentucky to get his opinions on Latin pedagogy and spoken Latin in the classroom. Professor Tunberg has been a strong advocate of spoken Latin at the University of Kentucky. The following interview contains rebuttals against arguments of spoken Latin in modern day pedagogy. The following is an edited version of our interview. Furthermore, following every section of our interview in single space, is my opinions about the interview and Latin pedagogy after researching this thesis in double space. All opinions in double space are mine and are not professor Tunberg's.

**No One Knows How Latin Was Spoken**

**Interviewer:** What do you say to people who say no one knows how Latin was spoken, and all we have is the literary language?
**Terence Tunberg:** That's exactly the point. I'm right with the humanists on this one and Erasmus. This is what people don't understand. When Erasmus wrote his colloquia and when humanists wrote their textbooks for spoken Latin, they weren't trying to recover what the ancient Romans would have said at home or in the street. That doesn't matter. And that's unrecoverable anyway, except to know what we now know from looking at graffiti in Pompeii, that it was actually already in the first century changing. It was not the language of literature, most surely. What we do is speak a simplified version of the literary language and there's nothing absurd in that. That's actually not only practical but more stable because the norms are there in the text. Those are the norms. And in speaking a language like Latin and Sanskrit, you can do what you can't do in English or French or in international languages. You could say this is right and this isn't right. You do that in English, a linguist will say, well, you know, what is right is a moving target. But with Latin and Greek, we have the texts. And the texts are the norm. And so, we are indeed doing something very artificial and we should love it because it's useful. We don't know how the ancient Romans spoke. So, like those colloquia that Eleanor Dickey edited, those illustrate my point.[112] Those colloquia were written to teach Greek speakers in the Roman Empire how to speak Latin and not to speak it like Cicero or Tacitus or the great writers but to do business. She had to change the liturgy to coincide with the grammar that we teach with now. And our grammar is based on, guess what, the literary texts. So, we are learning to speak the literary language, which the ancient Romans had to do too because by the time of the second maybe even the first century they had to go to the upper-class grammarian and the rhetorician to learn the educated talk. I mean it was still the same language but it was a different level.

---

[112] These are the dialogues that Dickey compiled together which my first case study was based on, that is, the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana.

**Interviewer:** Yes, I find all those distinctions funny. We all speak different registers of language, often switching many times a day. We might speak a lower form of language with friends, but a higher register at work. That's just normal. To say that speaking Latin should be thrown out because we don't know what the lowest register sounded like is missing the point entirely.

**Terence Tunberg:** Well, we know the high form of language and that's all the matters.

**Interviewer:** Anything else more to add to that question?

**Terence Tunberg:** Yes, this is a really important distinction, because what it is we're doing is misunderstood by the spoken Latin people themselves. They don't realize this, because we have some of the comprehensible input folks saying, Latin is just like all the other languages. And I say, no it's not. I mean, there are some languages like Latin, but precisely languages that have no native speakers are like Latin. And that's the problem. And that's also the gift. It's a gift because it's accessible to everybody equally if they can get the text. That's why reading is so much a part of it.


  As Professor Tunberg makes very clear in our interview, no scholar actually knows how Latin was spoken in Roman times, thus, speaking Latin is in every sense an artificial endeavor, which is a nuance that some critics of spoken Latin do not understand.[113] What is more, even if Latinists or linguists could ever agree on how the Romans officially spoke, that would only be one version of spoken Latin. There is no such thing as one "monolithic Latin" in Roman times, because there would have been many dialects of Latin, not only between the elites and the plebs, but even just regional differences, as English has today.[114] Thus, although these studies are interesting in a historical and linguistic sense, none of it has anything to do with speaking Latin today. Furthermore, just because Latin speakers do not have recordings of how the Romans

---

[113] Ball and Ellsworth (1996): 82. "Yet by clinging to politically correct phrases like "living languages" and "language of communication" they are turning a unique discipline into the travesty of the challenge that it has always represented. And by calling some scratches on paper living languages, they make the distinction between living and dead languages meaningless – short of calling French and Spanish *really* living languages." (Emphasis not mine).

[114] Adams (2003): 184-205. Adams makes a case that there were many regional dialects of Latin among the populations of Italy, and differing accents as well. What is more, during the Republican period, the Roman accent, that is, the accent of the city of Rome, was in general considered superior than the rustic accents, although some poets might have disagreed with that estimate.

actually spoke, does not mean that speaking Latin is a frivolous endeavor.[115] Although it is true

that literature as a general enterprise uses a higher register of language than speaking, there is no

doubt that it is still the same language. Thus, Cicero's letters and orations, Caesar's prose and

Virgil's poetry, all used the basic foundations of whatever the spoken version of Latin was;

otherwise, none of it would have been intelligible. For example, suppose in two-thousand years,

English is not a spoken language anymore, but a group of students wish to start reading and

speaking it. They decide to choose many books to base their speech on, one of them being Jane

Austen's *Pride and Prejudice.* Now, just because they would be talking as Elisabeth and Mr.

Bennet, would not mean that their endeavor was "artificial English." To be sure, Modern English

speakers would think it a little archaic sounding (not to mention extremely witty), and

commoners in the eighteen-hundreds would have possibly thought it haughty and aristocratic,

but no one could ever deny it was not "real" English. Hence, even though scholars will never

know exactly how the Romans spoke, we can be sure, that it was nothing extraordinarily

different than how they wrote. Moreover, the idea that Latin speakers are trying to revive the

Latin language just for the sake of speaking it, is something that misses the point entirely.

Speaking Latin is a means to an end, the end being to read Latin better and more fluently.[116] Of

course, speaking is fun, and language learning should be fun as well,[117] but students learn Latin

to read its eternal literature, and not just to learn how to order a coffee in Latin. Although Latin

should be taught more or less like a modern language, there is a difference that must be

addressed.

---

[115] Ball and Ellsworth (1996): "At the very least, the study of hyperreal Latin (speaking Latin) has the effect of watering down the teaching of Latin at the secondary level, where Latin has reappeared as a trendy, Hollywood-style Jurassic Park."
[116] Keeline (2019): 57.
[117] Keeline (2019): 57.

Latin is a literary language, that is, a standardized and fixed language like Sanskrit.[118] Thus, even though Latin can acquire new words for things and concepts the Romans did not have, it must always follow the standards and grammar that were established by Cicero and Caesar, among other authors.[119] Literary languages do not change like modern ones do. For example, modern linguistics would say that there is technically no proper form of English, and that all dialects are "correct" in their own way.[120] This is not so for Latin or any standardized literary language. There is an official way to speak and write Latin correctly, and this is a good thing, because in some ways it makes it easier for the learner to learn it since it will not evolve like modern languages do.[121] Thus, if a student internalizes Latin grammar completely, they can be sure that the language will remain the same. This brings up the next big question regarding speaking Latin: the importance of learning its grammar.

## Learning Latin Grammar

**Interviewer:** What were you researching when you discovered that Latin used to be spoken in the classrooms and was more or less a living language? Were you reading Erasmus? Was there anything in particular that you were like, wow, this is a whole different world than just learning grammar only?

**Terence Tunberg:** Right, well I think we should learn grammar too. I mean, I'm not anti-grammar. I think maybe grammar and translation. I'm not so keen on the translation part, but grammar, it may not be a language acquisition, but it's good.

---

[118] Leonhardt (2013): 19. Leonhardt argues quite convincingly that Latin (as Sanskrit) is a fixed language in its grammar and syntax. He describes a fixed language as a "Language that is closed and can no longer develop but a language in which several core components remain unchangeable." Thus, one can create new words but it has to the previous established rules. See Tunberg's comment below.

[119] Tunberg (2022). In our interview, Professor Tunberg mentions how to "properly" create Latin sayings for new inventions. "You can certainly say new things in Latin. I can talk about a computer or I can talk about a camera, or an airplane, things that the ancient Romans had no idea about. But I don't use a new verb. Latin didn't do this very much. Cicero already showed us how to put new words in, because he did it with philosophical concepts. What you tend to do is put a substantive noun, or a new adjective sometimes but not a new verb. So, for example, if I'm going to telephone you, I wouldn't say, *Die crastino te telefonabo.* Right away, anybody who knows Latin sees that's barbaric. That's not Latin. But I could say, the way Cicero says, I'll write you a letter, *Te per literas adibo.* I will approach you through letters. So, I could say, *Die crastino per telefonum petam*, or *adibo*. And so, I'm speaking Latin with a new word about a new thing. But it's still standard.

[120] Cushing (2020):322. This article discusses the ideology of the "Queen's Speech" and how teachers of "standard language role models" are placed in schools to guard proper language English schools systems.

[121] Tunberg (2022). Spoken Latin and Latin in the Renaissance Interview by Nicholas Lawson

**Interviewer:** I would agree.
**Terence Tunberg:** It's hard to pinpoint a moment, but my interest in Neo-Latin writers wasn't always in the way they used the language. My earliest articles were on how Lorenzo Valla constructed sentences and selection of works and things of that kind. So, I always had an interest in what we find on the written page and bit by bit I got into it and learned about the controversies about imitating Cicero.[122] Then the question of spoken Latin sort of came up by way of that and I began to collect in my notebooks a lot of references in the works of those guys and how to speak correctly, especially Erasmus who mentions it quite a bit.

I appreciate what Professor Tunberg said here about the importance of learning grammar, because it is true, knowledge of grammar is important to mastering any language, either ancient or modern. However, what is the difference between explicit knowledge of Latin grammar and implicit knowledge? For example, if a student has leaned spoken Latin in high school,[123] and knows how to intuitively decline nouns and conjugate verbs on the fly, but does not know what a partitive genitive is in a college Latin exam, can it really be said that student knows no grammar? As has been demonstrated in the linguistics section, explicit knowledge and implicit knowledge of a language are two different things, though there is some overlap.[124] However, an important differentiation must be made between grammar that is useful for the understanding of a language (reading, writing and speaking), and, "metalanguage," a term linguists use to describe a method of talking "about" a language in order to analyze it.[125] For example, it might be an interesting

---

[122] This was a movement in the Renaissance to return Latin back to a more "standardized" form, that is, as its name implies, writing like Cicero. This was "controversial" because Latin in the Medieval period had become more laxed and simplified in its syntax. Thus, the Ciceronians were trying to "purify" the language and remove its "barbarisms." Erasmus took a middle position on this issue, as he did with teaching grammar. In fact, he wrote a satire called *Ciceronianus,* mocking Ciceronians who he felt had gone too far in their imitation of Cicero.

[123] Most spoken Latin programs in America are only at the secondary level. Many of these Latin programs are based upon the comprehensible input methods of Krashen.

[124] See Rod Ellis' Weak Interface Hypothesis.

[125] McCaffrey (2006): 117. "The chief question about the decoding process is How much grammar must students know in order to read Latin? In a living language, it is possible and even common to read without a conscious knowledge of the grammatical rules. The Romans themselves got along perfectly well without having a very formal understanding of the system of latin grammar. It was only in the first century B.C.E that the grammarian Varro, for example, made the crucial conceptual breakthroughs that let to the identification of the five noun declensions so familiar to us… modern students, like their Roman predecessors, learn to speak their native languages as children and generally, do not acquire a grammatical metalanguage until years later in school."

anecdote for a student to know that *pars nostrum* (a part of us) is grammatically called a partitive genitive, however, no one needs to know this fact in order to become a good reader or speaker of Latin. As long as the reader knows their basic Latin grammar, that is, that *pars* is in the nominative and singular, and *nostrum* is in the genitive and plural, they will understand the phrase perfectly. It is somewhat ironic that many of these grammatical concepts that Latin students learn today, would have been unknown to the greatest writers and speakers of Latin throughout the ages, including the Romans and the Renaissance writers![126] How many great writers of the English language would be able to explain the inner workings and technicalities of English grammar? Few indeed, because, using a language beautifully and learning about a language technically, are two entirely different subjects. Furthermore, much of the "grammar" learned today in Latin classes is a relatively new concept coming from the nineteenth century when spoken Latin was in its decline.[127] Before that time, grammar books only consisted of conjugating verbs, tables of nouns declensions, and basic tools of analysis, and nothing more.[128] In fact, the correct use of the relative pronoun was only "discovered" relatively recently by Lorenzo Valla in the Renaissance.[129] Thus, a differentiation must be made between the two types of grammar knowledge being discussed here. Learning the conjugations and declensions is the "knowledge" that both Willis' and Swain's hypotheses demonstrate turn into true acquisition, that is, the skillset of speaking and writing. The other knowledge is metalanguage about the language, which is a skillset to be sure, but does not make one a better reader or speaker. One is useful in

---

[126] Leonhardt (2013):147 Leonhardt mentions the amusing fact that "whether a master of Latin prose and poetry like Petrarch (1304-1374) could have explained the use of a Latin gerund to the satisfaction of a twentieth-century Latin teacher is highly doubtful."

[127] Leonhardt (2013): 147.

[128] Leonhardt (2013): 147.

[129] Leonhardt (2013): 147. Leonhardt mentions that this discovery "obscure(s) the fact that efforts to find fundamental rules of grammar were limited *and that theory was placed in the service of actual language use.*" (emphasis mine).

"using" the language, and the other is interesting when learning "about" the language, but they are not one in the same.[130] Thus, the best grammar one can study is to study the masters and emulate them in speech and writing as Professor Tunberg and many others have mentioned.[131] Furthermore, following Professor Tunberg's comment about translation and grammar, translating from L2 to L1 (or vice versa) is not a bad exercise in of itself, and it can be very helpful in language learning.[132] What is more, translating can be strategically used in a diverse classroom to meet each and every student where they are at, and to differentiate between the more hands-on students, extroverts and introverts, and the more abstract minded ones.[133] However, the question remains, are there better ways to learn Latin than only using this one monolithic method?

### What Is The Point Of Speaking A Dead Language?

**Interviewer:** I always hear this from people who ask what is the practicality of speaking a dead language that you can't use day to day like Spanish? They say people learn Latin to read its literature not to speak it. How would you answer a question like that? I'm sure you hear it all the time.
**Terence Tunberg:** Yes, I've heard it. I would say that it helps you read better. I would also say that there's groups of Latin speakers now, and the old view that there's nobody you can speak with is no longer true. There's nothing better than to be reading something and talking about it in the target language. So, for me, reading is still the goal, and even if there weren't as many circles of speakers as there are now, I would still say some kind of active output would help me read. I mean that was the old justification for teaching composition. Well, this is just composition on

---

[130] Bossing (1935): 566. Bossing says that "There is only one royal road to a speaking use of a language and that is to speak it, just as the only sure route to an easy reading knowledge of a language is to read it. Attention to grammar should be incidental, if not omitted entirely, until facility in speaking or reading the language has been acquired."
[131] Owens (2016): 507-523. In this honest critique of spoken Latin by a Latin speaker, Owens mentions the importance of speaking Latin correctly to the best of one's abilities, and that some of the criticism of the spoken Latin moment is legitimate. Thus, following the example of Cicero and other prestigious writers is imperative.
[132] Liao (2006): 208. This article describes a survey asking EFL (English as a Foreign Language) students what they thought about translating into their L1 language and if it was useful or not in learning their L2 language. It was concluded that the majority of students did find it useful in understanding difficult parts of their L2 language, and that it sped up the process of learning. Nevertheless, many of the students felt conflicted about their use of translation, as if it would obstruct their thinking in the language they were striving to learn.
[133] Cohen (2014): 167. Cohen discusses students with different learning styles: those who are more visual and hands-on in their approach to learning, and those who are more particular and detailed oriented, compared to those who are more deductive or inductive, and most importantly, those students who are introverted or extroverted in their general personalities. He proposes different methods of teaching for each and every student, although he acknowledges there is overlap as well.

steroids.[134] In fact, composition is great. Both writing and speaking are two of the sisters (writing, speaking reading), because with writing you've got more time to think about getting it right, and with speaking you've got to come up with it faster. So, one helps the other, so that if you practice writing quite a bit, your spoken usage would be better because you develop over time a sense of what is an appropriate construction for a certain set of ideas and what isn't. You learn certain things about the way the Latin language works. You see what the authors writing allows you to model those things for yourself. And then speaking makes it faster, because you don't have time to think. So, if you do both, you read better. So, there's the three sisters. There's reading, there's writing, and there's speaking.

**Interviewer:** So, following that thought, how did speaking or writing Latin as a real living language change your fluency abilities in reading Latin?

**Terence Tunberg:** Oh, easy. It's a natural thing. I mean, I actually am curious about how different writers construct their writings. So, I go and look, I trace things down. But I don't have to. I do that because I want to know. We all run into difficult passages. I do, I was just reading something the other day, and I had to read it a few times before it clicked in. But most of the time I don't run into obstacles. *I feel like it's part of me. In the same way that the language I'm talking to you in now. I read something written in English and I don't feel like I'm interpreting to get there. It's just the way the words are on the page, they make sense to me. They talk to me.* (Emphasis mine).

 

This response from professor Tunberg is wonderful and cognitive psychology has proven his claim that speaking (outputting) in an L2 does increase one's abilities in reading fluency.[135] Thus, it is imperative to use every tool in the toolbox to gain true acquisition. What is more, Swain's Output Hypothesis aligns with his claim that speaking Latin is "composition on steroids," because one needs to produce the language to actually gain fluency. Moreover, Professor Tunberg backed up Swain's noticing function of her hypothesis when he mentioned

---

[134] See Swain's Output Hypothesis.

[135] Chang, Taylor, Rastle, and Monaghan (2020):18. Much of the policy discussion relevant to reading instruction has focused on the provision of systematic phonics in the initial stages of learning to read (e.g. Rose, 2006). Systematic phonics instruction is necessary in alphabetic writing systems because knowledge of how graphemes relate to phonemes does not come naturally to most children (see Castles et al., 2018 for discussion). However, psychological research on reading acquisition has long recognized that systematic phonics instruction is just one component of the journey to skilled reading (Castles et al., 2018*). Foundational oral language* (e.g. Hjetland et al., 2019; Nation & Snowling, 2004), print experience (e.g. Nation, 2017), morphological knowledge (e.g. Rastle, 2019), and higher-level comprehension (e.g. Perfetti & Stafura, 2014) are all building blocks to developing reading expertise (Castles et al., 2018). Our work provides a computational basis for understanding why phonics instruction is so powerful in the initial stages of reading acquisition, *and also shows why it is so important that children start reading instruction with foundational oral language skills in place.* (Emphasis mine).

"Both writing and speaking are two sisters, because with writing you've got more time to think about getting it right, and with speaking you've got to come up with it faster. So, one helps the other, so that if you practice writing quite a bit, your spoken usage would be better because you develop over time a sense of what is an appropriate construction for a certain set of ideas and what isn't." As discussed previously, this noticing function is a key to language acquisition, because stopping to think about how to say or write something, causes the language learner to be engaged in the activity.

Thus, to learn a language to such a degree that one is able to produce it *ex tempore*, is the very essence of being fluent in the language, even if our only intent is to read its literature. For these important reasons, Latin composition[136] and spoken communication should be placed on equal footing with translating into the student's native tongue, especially after the intermediate stages of learning.

**Learning How To Speak Latin Is Not Practical**

**Interviewer:** No one knows how Latin was actually spoken day to day. And all we have is high literature. So, speaking it is a useless exercise. It's all just archaic.

**Terence Tunberg:** I think that the reason for doing the useless exercise is just those three sisters I put out before, because maybe then if it's archaic and a dead language, why do we want to read the text at all? So maybe we can throw them away? But if we agree that we want to read the text, maybe there is a better way to read it and make yourself more Latinate while you're doing it. Furthermore, I no longer speak French with people. I used to speak quite well, but I just kind of let my spoken ability atrophy. But the fact that I did once speak it means that reading secondary sources in French is just a snap for me. It's easy. So, I think that speaking creates fluency, even if you don't want to join the local spoken Latin club, but still if you did it for a while, it creates a residue that sticks. So, I would argue that you shouldn't drop it. You should always find friends that you can do it with. Now we have the web.

---

[136] Composition as the Renaissance saw it, where the student wrote from prompts and was free to compose their own writing.

This criticism follows closely on the heels of the last one. Ironically, Latin teachers who use this argument against proponents of spoken Latin, are unwittingly using the same arguments of those who preach that learning Latin in general is practically useless in this age of science. With STEM fields rising in importance, there are many who argue that studying the Classics is nothing but a waste of time, and furthermore, that there is no practicality to be found in any of it. At this point, it should be dutifully noted that in this new age of *homo economicus*, studying the classics is not profitable in any way, no matter if one prefers the "old" method of grammar/translation, or something of the "new". It takes an extremely long time to learn the ins and outs of Latin grammar, especially the language and analysis of metalanguage, and none of it is practical or easy either. Thus, to use this argument against those who wish to speak Latin defeats the entire argument from the onset. Although studying Latin is not economically profitable, it can however be extremely profitable in many other ways: as a source of beauty, history, and poetry, and furthermore, as a study of the very best and worst aspects of humanity throughout the ages. In fact, studying the cultures of the ancient past is one of Latin's best benefits, which is the next concern against speaking Latin.

## There Will Be No Time For Cultural And Historiographic Conversations

**Interviewer:** This is another concern I've heard, that is, studying the Classics is not just about learning Latin, it's also about learning the cultures of ancient Rome and Greece. Thus, we can't have these important cultural discussions if we're only learning the language? How would you answer that?

**Terence Tunberg:** Classics is often defined as studying the culture of Greece and Rome. Well, that's a good definition for an ancient historian, but to me that's not a Classicist, because a Classicist is interested in Greek and Latin literature, and that's very different, and it goes on after antiquity. And that's what's wrong with Classics, by the way. Classics is overwhelmingly focused on one half of one percent of all Latin. Not that those texts are bad, they are the basis. I'm all for them, but for me it's not just about learning the cultures of Greece and Rome. Of course, you've got to learn about them because the mythological concepts, the top-layer comes from that matrix. But for me to make sense of the text that I'm interested in, I need more than that. I deliberately

work on post-antique authors, although I have worked on ancient authors as well, on Cicero and Livy to be precise. Can you imagine a Spanish department where nobody studies any Spanish after Cervantes who lived in the 16th century? Can you imagine a French department where nobody studies French who lived after Rabelais who was Renaissance Frenchman? I mean it's absurd. So, I don't agree. I wouldn't agree about the first premise about what Classics is or should be. I'm on a different page. However, I love history and I think it's important. We need to know something about it to be a good Classicist, but we need to know maybe a little bit about the history of other periods as well where Latin is being used.

This cultural question and concern, although well meant, is a product of black and white thinking. Although I do agree with professor Tunberg that focusing on the 99.5% of Latin output is flawed and lacks perspective in regards to Latin's entire history, however, I would also posit that many students turn to Latin at first to "learn about the Romans" and have no interest in Neo-Latin or even know of its existence.[137] Thus, there needs to be a way to balance both learning Latin and learning about the cultural aspects of the Romans, especially in secondary schools, where learning about the Romans is one of the big drawls. This does not have to be an either-or proposition. It is completely possible to have both spoken Latin, and cultural conversations in the class room, even in universities, it would just need to be implemented wisely and prudently with no extreme measures. Like many things, spoken Latin can become a contentious issue, where its proponents make a "fetishization" out of it, and it becomes the end in of itself instead of a means to an end, that is to become better readers.[138] It is important to remember how things currently stand, most Classic programs have other goals in mind than just learning Latin, there is also history, learning about grammar (and English grammar in return), and important cultural conversations to be had,[139] thus, it would be reasonable and practical to work within these

---

[137] Neo-Latin should be taught and considered just as "real" as Classical Latin, however, it should be studied in upper division undergraduate and graduate courses. However, professor Tunberg makes a great point. When one studies English, they study Old English, Middle English and Modern English, why isn't this done for Latin as well? No one would consider The Canterbury Tales not "real" English.
[138] Keeline (2019): 57.
[139] Keeline (2019): 57.

realities. It is obvious at this time that most professors do not speak Latin, much less fluently, thus, to give lectures about Roman historiography in Latin (although entirely possible[140]) would be unrealistic, even if it was the norm in Latin pedagogy until very recently.[141] However, what would be beneficial and reasonable, would be to conduct half of the class in Latin, especially when talking about the text and its grammar, while leaving the other half for discussing the cultural and historiography of the text in English.[142] This would be especially true for upper division undergraduate classes, where it is necessary to discuss both the cultural aspects of the author, say Catullus' neoteric style (which would use a more sophisticated register of language) and speaking about the text in Latin, which is relatively more easy.[143] Additionally, simple cultural conversations can be had in Latin as well. For example, the teacher could demonstrate a painting of a scene from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (there are many!) and ask in simple Latin about what is going on, what is happening in the story and so forth.[144] And for teachers or professors worrying about transitioning to spoken Latin or making mistakes, starting off using greetings and imperatives such as, *Salvete omnes! Aperite libros vestros*, or *vertete ad paginam tertiam*, would

---

[140] See on YouTube Aloisia Aguilar give a speech about Dido titled *Monumenta litterarum X: in Didonis imaginem.* Or Georgius Tarrega titled *Monumenta litterarum VI: Sallustius.* Or any speech by Terence Tunberg among countless other Latin speakers today.

[141] Waquet (2001): 24. "So Latin was surviving well, and the failure of reforms further strengthened its position. In Poland, the Commission on National Education, set up to reform an education system falling into decadence, had ended the monopoly of Latin with its rulings of 1774. These banished the ancient language completely from parish schools – so that small children would henceforth learn to read in Polish – and made it a subsidiary subject in the Palatinate schools, with Latin coming not just after Polish but after natural ethics, law, political economy and science, and no longer learned as a spoken language. The vigorous opposition to this reform included the withdrawal of children from school by some families and, of course, the continuing use of the old methods by some teachers. *In 1788 the Commission made a complete about-turn and restored the use of spoken Latin in the schools; in the senior classes the professor of rhetoric was even required to speak nothing else.*" (Emphasis mine)

[142] Keeline (2019): 59.

[143] Keeline (2019): 59. Keeline makes a great point here. Only the best of Latin speakers (not to mention Latin listeners) could have conversations at this level of discourse, thus the importance to constantly ask the question, what is the end goal? If the end goal on a particular day is to give "the details of Nero's diplomatic relationship with Armenia and King Tiridates, and more broadly to consider critically the value of Cassius Dio as a source for Roman history, and most broadly to think about how we use sources in reconstructing ancient history, period*, using Latin seems almost absurd."* (Emphasis mine).

[144] Keeline (2019): 60.

warm them up to start speaking more.[145] What is more, there are many ways to dive into the text without necessarily being "fluent" in spoken Latin. For example, when reading Ovid's *Amores,* something like this below could help guide conversations in Latin, though this would be more for intermediate students of spoken Latin. The teacher could start off by asking a student:

Teacher: *Quid est "Militat"?* (What is *militat?)* Student: *Militat est verbum.* (*Militat* is a verb). Teacher: Quid significat militat? (What does *militat* mean) Student: *Militat significat miles esse aut bellum gerere.* (*Militat* means to be a soldier or wage war).
The teacher could continue this questioning throughout the whole passage.

### Ovid's *Amores:* Book 1 Elegy IX

Militat omnis amans, et habet sua castra Cupido;

   Attice, crede mihi, militat omnis amans.

quae bello est habilis, Veneri quoque convenit aetas.

   turpe senex miles, turpe senilis amor.

quos petiere duces animos in milite forti,

   hos petit in socio bella puella viro.

pervigilant ambo; terra requiescit uterque -

   ille fores dominae servat, at ille ducis

militis officium longa est via; mitte puellam,

   strenuus exempto fine sequetur amans.

| |
|---|
| mīlitāre = mīles esse, bellum gerere |
| amāns = amātor = qui aliquem vehementer amat |
| castra = locus qui muro fossaque mūnītus |
| habilis = aptus, |
| convenīre = aptus esse |
| quae aetās |
| Venus = dea amorum, id est, amor |
| turpis = indignus, foedus |
| senex miles (est) turpe (ac) senilis amor |
| petiēre = petiērunt |
| quos = animos = fortes milites |
| socius = qui societate iunctus est |

Thus, the class could read Ovid's whole passage in Latin and understand it in Latin. What is more, since each student would be producing output on the spot and hearing the language continuously for an hour, this method would fall in right line with what is proposed by SLA research and Latin pedagogy reaching back to the Renaissance. Furthermore, although it would

---

[145] Starting to speak Latin is not an either-or proposition, but can start gradually and at one's own pace.

be beneficial for graduate students to write papers and essays in Latin, this too would need to be balanced with the need for each student to learn how to write quality research papers in English as well, especially in graduate programs.[146]

Although Latin should be treated like a "living language" in its teaching methods, it should also be realized that it is not the lingua franca any longer as it was in the Renaissance, thus, it will never be as it was in the times of Erasmus. Treating Latin as a real language has many positive benefits, and it can make the language learning experience much more enjoyable to the learner, and more productive in the end.

---

[146] Keeline (2019): 60.

**Conclusion**

Latin pedagogy from the Romans to today has always been a pedagogy of active Latin. Although there have been times when speaking Latin was less so than others, the fact remains it has always been a means to communicate as all languages are. From the simple dialogues of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana of the Romans, to Erasmus's colloquia in the Renaissance, and on to today's active classrooms, Latin continues to be spoken and used as a form of communication. This thesis has shown by copious examples that this fact was not a random occurrence, but a fact of history that repeated itself over and over again for the last two thousand years. Spoken Latin is not a "new" thing or some passing fad; it is an ancient pedagogy that has been passed down from generation to generation to this day. What is more, although grammar-translation might have momentarily "killed" it in the nineteenth century, it was never able to shut it up completely, and today, spoken Latin is on the rise again.

What is even more exciting is that SLA research has proven that many of the ancient methods of teaching Latin are still relevant for today's classroom. This thesis has shown that Swain's theory of the Output Hypothesis is necessary for language acquisition, and that one must produce in the L2 to turn their "knowledge" of grammatical forms into acquisition, thus proving the correctness of Ellis's weak interface Hypothesis as well. What is more, Krashen's Hypothesis is also important in showing the necessity of listening to the target language as a child does when learning their first. This research shows that Latin did not die when grammar-translation took over the classroom, but rather, died when the teacher and student stopped speaking and writing in the classroom. Where Latin pedagogy goes from here is hard to discern, but looking at it through the lens of the past two millennia, it would seem its future is on the rise.

Bibliography

Adams, J N. 2003. "'Romanitas' and the Latin Language." *The Classical Quarterly* 53 (1): 184–
205. https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.184.

Asher, James J. 1969. "The Total Physical Response Technique of Learning." *The Journal of
Special Education* 3 (3): 253–62. https://doi.org/10.1177/002246696900300304.

Ball, Robert J. and J. D. Ellsworth. 1996. "The Emperor's New Clothes: Hyperreality and the
Study of Latin." *The Modern Language Journal* 80 (1): 77–84.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1996.tb01142.x.

Black, Robert. 2007. *Humanism and Education in Medieval and Renaissance Italy: Tradition
and Innovation in Latin Schools from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century*. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.

Bossing, Nelson. 1935. *Progressive Methods of Teaching in Secondary Schools*. Houghton
Mifflin Co.

Carlon, Jacqueline. 2013. "The Implications of SLA Research for Latin Pedagogy: Modernizing
Latin Instruction and Securing Its Place in Curricula." *Teaching Classical Languages* 4
(2): 106–22. https://tcl.camws.org/sites/default/files/Carlon_0.pdf.

Chang, Ya-Ning, J.S.H. Taylor, Kathleen Rastle, and Padraic Monaghan. 2020. "The
Relationships between Oral Language and Reading Instruction: Evidence from a
Computational Model of Reading." *Cognitive Psychology* 123 (December): 1–20.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogpsych.2020.101336.

Coffee, Neil. 2012. "Active Latin: 'Quo Tendimus?'" *Classical World* 105 (2): 255–69.
https://doi.org/10.1353/clw.2012.0007.

Cohen, Anderew, and Alastair Henry. 2014. "Focus on the Language Learner Styles, Strategies
and Motivation." In *Strategies in Learning a Second Language*, 165–89.
ImprintRoutledge: Routledge.

Colella, Carmela. 1999. "Renzo Titone's Holodynamic Mode1 for Language Behaviour and
Language Learaing: Implications and Applications for the Second Language Teaching."
The University of Toronto.
https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/13051/1/NQ45725.pdf.

Connolly, Serena. 2022. *Wisdom from Rome*. Walter De Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.

Cushing, Ian. 2020. "'Say It like the Queen': The Standard Language Ideology and Language Policy Making in English Primary Schools." *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 34 (3): 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2020.1840578.

Dickey, Eleanor. 2016. *Learning Latin the Ancient Way*. Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, N.C. 2017. "Implicit and Explicit Knowledge about Language." In *Language Awareness and Multilingualism: Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02240-6_7.

Ellis, Rod. 2020. "A Short History of SLA: Where Have We Come from and Where Are We Going?" *Language Teaching* 54 (2): 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444820000038.

Ellis, Rod. 1994. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, Rod, Shawn Loewen, and Rosemary Erlam. 2006. "Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback and the Acquisition of L2 Grammar." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 28 (02): 339–68. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263106060141.

https://archive.org/details/studyofsecondlan0000elli/page/692/mode/2up?view=theater.

Eskhult, Josef. 2018. "Vulgar Latin as an Emergent Concept in the Italian Renaissance (1435–1601): Its Ancient and Medieval Prehistory and Its Emergence and Development in Renaissance Linguistic Thought." *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 17 (2): 208–9. https://doi.org/10.1515/joll-2018-0006.

Feyten, Carine M. 1991. "The Power of Listening Ability: An Overlooked Dimension in Language Acquisition." *The Modern Language Journal* 75 (2): 173–80. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1991.tb05348.x.

Hart, Betty. 1991. "Input Frequency and Children's First Words*." *First Language* 11 (32): 289–300. https://doi.org/10.1177/014272379101103205.

Marrou, Henri Irénée. 1982. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press.

Izumi, Shinichi. 2002. "OUTPUT, INPUT ENHANCEMENT, and the NOTICING HYPOTHESIS: An Experimental Study on ESL Relativization." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 24 (4): 541–77. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263102004023.

Janson, Tore. 2006. *A Natural History of Latin*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Keeline, Tom. 2019. "'Aut Latine Aut Nihil'? A Middle Way." *The Classical Outlook* 94 (2): 57–65. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26774722.

Kelly, Louis. 1976. *25 Centuries of Language Teaching*. Rowley: Newburry House Publ.

Krashen, Stephen. 2011. "The Compelling (Not Just Interesting) Input Hypothesis." *The English Connection* 15 (3): 15. https://www.koreatesol.org/sites/default/files/pdf_publications/TECv15n3-11Autumn.pdf.

Krashen, Stephen. 1982. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Pergamon Press.

Lavopa, Anthony J. (1983) 2002. *Grace, Talent, and Merit: Poor Students, Clerical Careers, and Professional Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Germany*. Cambridge, U.K.; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Leonhardt, Jürgen. 2013. *Latin: Story of a World Language*. Translated by Kenneth Kronenberg. Cambridge, Massachusetts; London, England: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Liao, Posen. 2006. "EFL Learners' Beliefs about and Strategy Use of Translation in English Learning." *RELC Journal* 37 (2): 191–215. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688206067428.

Marek, Bořivoj. 2017. "The Hermeneumata (Pseudodositheana) and Their Didactic Use." *AUC PHILOLOGICA* 2017 (2): 127–52. https://doi.org/10.14712/24646830.2017.17.

McCaffrey, Daniel V. 2006. "Reading Latin Efficiently and the Need for Cognitive Strategies." In *When Dead Tongues Speak*, 113–33. New York: Oxford University Press.

Moran, Jerome. 2019. "Spoken Latin in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance." *Journal of Classics Teaching* 20 (40): 20–24. https://doi.org/10.1017/s205863101900028x.

Owens, Patrick M. 2016. "Barbarisms at the Gate: An Analysis of Some Perils in Active Latin Pedagogy." *Classical World* 109 (4): 507–23. https://doi.org/10.1353/clw.2016.0047.

Palmer, L R. 1954. *The Latin Language.* London: Faber.

Richards, Jack C, and Theodore S Rodgers. 2010. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/approaches-and-methods-in-language-teaching/3036F7DA0057D0681000454A580967FF.

Smith, M. S. 1981. "Consciousness-Raising and the Second Language Learner1." *Applied Linguistics* II (2): 159–68. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ii.2.159.

Spada, Nina, and Patsy M. Lightbown. 1993. "Instruction and the Development of Questions in L2 Classrooms." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15 (2): 205–24. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263100011967.

Stray, Christopher. n.d. "Success and Failure: W.H.D. Rouse and Direct-Method Classics Teaching in Edwardian England," 5–7.

Swain, Merrill. 1995. "Three Functions of Output in Second Language Learning." In *Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics: Studies in Honour of H. G. Widdowson*, edited by Guy Cook and Barbara Seidlhofer, 125–44. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Swain, Merril. 2005. "The Output Hypothesis: Theory and Research." In *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*, edited by Eli Hinkel, 471–83. Routledge.

Treharne, Elaine. 2003. "The Form and Function of the Twelfth-Century Old English 'Dicts of Cato.'" *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 102 (4): 465–85. http://www.jstor.org/stable/27712374.

Tunberg, Terence. 2011. "The Use of Latin as a Spoken Language in the Humanist Age." *Journal of Classics Teaching*, 8–9.

Tunberg, Terence. 2020. "Spoken Latin in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance Revisited." *Journal of Classics Teaching* 21 (42): 66–71. https://doi.org/10.1017/s2058631020000446.

Tunberg, Terence. 2022. Spoken Latin and Latin in the Renaissance Interview by Nicholas Lawson.

Tunberg, Terence, and Milena Minkova. 2005. "Oral Latin: Loquimur Quo Melius Legamus – We Speak to Read Better." *A Publication of the American Philological Association* 4 (2): 8–9. https://classicalstudies.org/sites/default/files/documents/amphora4.2.pdf.

Versteegh, Kees Versteegh. 2021. "The Ghost of Vulgar Latin History of a Misnomer." *Historiographia Linguistica,* 48 (2-3).

Waquet, François. 2001. *Latin or the Empire of a Sign*. London: Verso.

Chase, Wayland Johnson. 1922. *The Distichs of Cato; a Famous Medieval Textbook*. Madison.

Woodward, William Harrison, and Erasmus, Desiderius. 1904. *Desiderius Erasmus Concerning the Aim and Method of Education*. London: Cambridge: at the University Press.