Latin Teacher Training: Does it Have a Future Tense?\(^1\)

Kenneth Kitchell \(\text{kkitchel@umass.edu}\)

One of my favorite movies is the 1987 _Moonstruck_ starring Cher and Nicholas Cage. I recommend the movie, by the way, to be shown to students studying Latin Elegiac love poetry. There are many parallels.

Also in the film is a grandfather, played by Feodor Chaliapin Jr., a remarkable man whose real life included a mother who was a premier ballerina in Russia and a father who hung out with Rachmaninoff. The family fled to Paris in 1917 to avoid the Russian revolution, and Feodor moved to Hollywood where he began as a star in silent pictures. You may also know him from _The Name of the Rose_.

Near the end of the film, at a time of crisis, when the famiglia, seated around the kitchen table, seems to be crumbling, he feels he can no longer hold his tongue.

Rising, he says: “I am old. The Old are not wanted. And what they say has no weight.”

In the film, of course, his words do have weight and all ends well.

Well, I too am an old man. So I would like to thank ACL and CAMWS for giving me the honor of addressing the Classics family as a sort of patriarch. All I can hope is that, in the end, you do not think that my words have had no weight.

What preparation for Latin teachers existed early in our educational history? Frankly, none. In Colonial times many, if not most teachers were deemed qualified to teach after they had graduated high school. One year a senior, next year a teacher.

---

\(^1\) Slightly adapted from the ACL Centennial Lecture delivered at the annual meeting of CAMWS, Lincoln, NE April 4, 2019.
John Adams, had been admitted to Harvard at age 15 in 1751 largely on the basis of an unprepared Latin composition about what he did over his vacation. In 1755 he gave a commencement speech that so impressed the director of the Central School in Worcester, MA, that he was, aged 19, hired on the spot as the Latin master. He is very candid in his autobiography in saying that he only took the job because he did not have the money to give a lawyer who could train him and he did not want to enter the clergy. Thus it was, “those who couldn’t taught” -- and there was precious little by way of training available to them. What qualifications were sought? Most advertisements for teachers at the time said little if anything about training (licensure did not yet exist) but often stressed that the teacher should have “a sober and correct life and good character.”

One of the earliest set of written rules for American teachers that I know about is associated with the system invented by Joseph Lancaster. He began his system in England and opened a school in New York in 1806. He endeavored to offer affordable education and stressed the use of monitors, that is, older students who had grasped a subject or concept and who would in turn teach it to those who had not. His system was aimed at the lower classes of society, teaching students skills that would lead to trades and, as a result, Classics is not addressed.

Certainly there must have been some sporadic training given to teachers, most likely in a sort of apprenticeship arrangement, but formal and generally accepted norms of training had to

---

wait until the start of normal schools in Vermont (1823) and Massachusetts. In fact my sister, a career first grade teacher, attended Bridgewater State Teachers College, which began life as Bridgewater State Normal School in 1840.  

The term “Normal” confused me. Were other colleges abnormal? The term refers to teaching future teachers according to established norms of pedagogy and curricular content. By the early 1900s every state had a normal school and by the 1960s most had transitioned into being 4 year colleges or universities. I have not been able to ascertain the extent to which Latin pedagogy was addressed, however. I believe this would take a trip to college archives in search of course material such as syllabi.

It is interesting, and a bit unsettling, to note that in the 1924 ACL sponsored Classical Investigation, 40% of Latin teachers in small towns had not studied the language beyond high school, and that such schools comprised over 75% of high schools at the time.  

During the 1960s and 70s, as the baby boomers had increased the number of students of school age, higher education increased dramatically. Colleges and universities started adding departments of education to meet the need for more teachers, and as state and federal governmental influence over education grew, these departments commonly became colleges of education.

You will note that a lot of this change was motivated by external pressures. We will come back to this later in the talk, but for now let me focus on how external pressure led to the rise of accrediting agencies. As more and more proof was required that emerging teachers were
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3 One year earlier the Normal School in Lexington, MA, was founded. By 1865 it was called the Framingham Normal school and today is known as Framingham State University.

4 American Classical League. 1924, 22. Available online at the Hathi Trust, http://hdl.handle.net/2027/nnc1.cu01985949
compotent, a bevy of institutions arose that would endorse programs that produced sound teachers. A brief overview will have to suffice, but it is enlightening, if annoyingly filled with acronyms. I call the groups that follow the Alphabet Gang.

At first the NEA (National Education Association) was the dominating force. In 1917, in response to a sudden increase in the public school enrollment, the AATC (American Association of Teachers Colleges) was founded. Things were amicable for a while, but in 1960 the NEA merged with the ATA (American Teachers Association), which had originated as an organization for African American teachers. Broken hearted, the AATC soldiered on, eventually giving birth, in 1948, to the AACTE (AACTE (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education), formed out of the AATC and many smaller organizations. It remains active still today.

In 1954 NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) was created. I myself had to write two accrediting reports for NCATE, furthering my natural aversion to authority…..and forms…and reports.

Feeling that there was ample room for more acronyms, TEAC (Teacher Education Accreditation Council) threw its hat into the ring in 1997. Almost predictably, in 2016, NCATE and TEAC merged and gave birth to CAEP (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation).

Currently, the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) serves as an umbrella organization for 60 varied accreditation agencies. It has about 3,000 degree granting colleges and universities as members.

Actually, this entire history reminds me of the succession myths involving Uranus, Cronus, and Zeus. It could be a reality series called “Who Wants to Torment Teachers?” Let’s review. After a period of Chaos, NEA and his sister, AATC came to be.
NA dated his sister, AATC, but married ATA. Jilted, AATC gave birth to AACTE from her head. The next generation arose, first NCATE and then TEAC. They fell in love, married and produced CAEP. To bring order to all this, CHEA was created and set above them all, rather like the master ring from Lord of the Rings. Got all that? There will be a test.

What did all this mean for Latin teachers? Well, if you have lived through an accreditation visit, it means mountains of paperwork and Tums. More to the point, though, organizations like this control how we train our Latin teachers through a sort of alphabetic trickle down effect, starting at the national level and moving down to where it trickles over individual teachers one by one.

Allow me to bring up a few bogey men that have applied top down pressure on how we train our Latin teachers. Reagan’s initiative was called A Nation at Risk; Carter tried Back to Basics; Forty Two gave us No Child Left Behind and Obama Every Student Succeeds and Our Future, Our Teachers. I pass over in mournful silence what is trickling down today.

How do initiatives like this affect us? Let me just bring up two terms – Common Core and STEM. A former student of mine has recently created a middle school course in ancient technology in direct response to her school’s desire to satisfy STEM requirements.

Another downward pressure comes from educational innovation. This slide shows just a few of the movements that affected how I taught myself and how I needed to train future teachers during my time at UMass Amherst.

The hard truth is that college and university based teacher training programs cannot survive without accreditation if they are to stay in business and place their graduates in meaningful positions. So they constantly mold their curricula to meet the expectations of these
trends and organizations. If one of the Alphabet Gang is pushing outcomes based assessment, then that is what is taught to aspiring teachers.

But there are other sorts of external pressures. Social movements affect how Latin is taught and how teachers are taught to teach Latin. The Feminist Movement gave rise to an increased visibility for women in the narratives of textbooks. To give another example, sensitivity to multiculturalism caused plots in beginning textbooks to move out of Rome.

But, as the infomercials say, “Wait! There’s more!” State and national certification examinations constantly, and frequently, reflect the political or educational emphasis of the moment. I dare say all in the room tonight have had to alter the way their curricula are structured as a result of this. I have nothing but admiration for those in the field and those who train them who are forced constantly to adapt to ever changing demands.

Let me give a concrete example involving the two documents that pertain to teacher training.

It was a classic (pun accidental) case of the Trickle Down effect. In 1994 Congress passed Goals 2000: Educate America Act. In 1996 the National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project produced Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century. Seeing which way the wind blew, our profession produced the 1997 standards of learning. Both this document and the 2017 draft of the current revision of these standards can be found on the ACL webpage.

Our 1997 document stated (p. 2) that “It is clear that Standards for Classical Language Learning will have an impact upon curriculum development and instruction in those schools that choose to use the standards.” And it did. State curricula can be found online that are clearly based on these standards. Likewise, the current revision states (p. 2), “Twenty-first

5 1997 available here; 2017 here.
century language learners come from a variety of cultural backgrounds and possess a wide variety of learning styles.” Such words that clearly reflect current political, social, and educational trends.

Or consider the statement from the ACL/APA cooperative *Standards for Latin Teacher Preparation* (p. 3): “The audience for these Standards extends beyond academe. Through the Standards, state boards of education and foreign language supervisors, district curriculum supervisors, and others involved in certifying teachers will find it easier to know what is and is not relevant to a qualified Latin teacher’s training.” One should know that standards for teacher preparation were called for in 1967 at a national conference convened to study our field (Latimer, 1967) and that five years later teachers were complaining that the standards had not yet been produced. (Frechette, 1972). It took until 2010 for the field to create the standards.

So, what will the future training of Latin teachers look like? To answer that we must, as good classicists, look back before we can look ahead. In preparing this talk I read many, many studies and articles, a small selection of which is to be found in the appendix, below, where they are listed chronologically. These pieces all, in the absence of any national standards, offered recommendations concerning what training a good Latin teacher should receive. The same themes keep coming up. Almost every idea in the current standards has an earlier antecedent, because they are all based on good practice and common sense. They existed long before schools of education or certification.

First and foremost, we have been long complained about those of our field who make the study of Latin and Greek dull; who sacrifice reading at the altar of grammar or parsing and promote literal translation over the idiomatic. A professor at Union College has decried translations given in “the barbarous dialect of the school room,” translations that yield things
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6 Published in 2010, available [here](#).
like “He is in pain as to his head.” He calls for pre-reading texts for meaning and for use of oral Greek. How modern! The year was 1856, his name was Lewis and the article was part of an 1854 national evaluation of American education.

Likewise, the studies listed in the appendix, especially the report of the Committee of Ten (1894, 60, 64-65), the Report of the Committee of Twelve (1899, 10), the Classical Investigation (1924, 22) and the report by Foster (1913, 437), are fairly blunt in stating that teachers needed to be better trained if we were to preserve the teaching of our languages. Indeed it was the unavailability of qualified teachers and the poor quality of in-service teachers that led to the reports in the first place and ultimately to teacher training programs. When the ideas from all these articles are assembled, from the earliest to the latest, the following items were almost universally thought to be part of good teacher training.

First and foremost, all calls for teacher reform insist that the Latin teacher must know Latin very well. Today, in certification programs, these are called content courses. In the earlier articles, the thing mentioned first is normally that the teacher needs a solid grounding in the grammar. Pronunciation and the ability to read aloud, including reading in scansion, is usually stressed as well. As the field moved more to what was called “the natural” or “direct” method and away from the grammar first method, this insistence was toned down. The ability to compose Latin without error is strongly promoted.

Second, it was always stressed that the teacher needed a solid training in authors and these mostly from the Golden Age. As far back as I can go, however, there was a call to move away from the lockstep progression of Caesar, Cicero and Vergil, claiming that these authors were too difficult and, frankly, too boring for youngsters. Authors like Nepos and reading Eutropius or “made up” Latin like Fabulae Faciles or Viri Romanae were encouraged by such nay-sayers. Naturally, teacher training programs of the times either heeded such calls or did
not, affecting the content course they offered their charges and the same debate continues to this day as we will show below.

Other kinds of content courses remained fairly constant, usually including Linguistics, and Cultural courses like history or art. Greek was recommended, but for the most part the implied subtext is that it is not mandatory and that it often cannot be fitted into the curriculum.

The second group of recommended course were those we might today call Education Courses. These in turn were divided into Methods and Materials. Some commentators called for the Methods course to be taught out of the Classics Department, but admit that after the rise of the Normal Schools, most people sought certification through Departments of Education in the University.

Other commonly called upon Education courses were History of Education, Ed Law, and, increasingly over the years, child or adolescent psychology.

Let us consider “Materials.” While everyone seems to encourage Latin teachers to take advantage of modern technology, the actual items suggested vary over time. In 1919 Berthold Ullman says (p. 317) “We use pictures, reproductions, stereopticons, and now even moving pictures … The Latin of the future will profit by other inventions and devices which we cannot now foresee.” In 1931 Marie Deneen says (p. 177) “the new teacher needs to be familiar with “the new classroom procedures” like “auditory instruction through the radio and the phonograph, visual instruction through the moving picture and the daylight lantern.” She also encourages the use of mimeographed forms. Most recently the article by Sellers (2015) reminds us of the virtual Latin teacher depicted in Ernest Cline’s Ready Player One, a possibility in a
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7 Those who have used a View-Master hand held device know the basics of the stereopticon.
8 An earlier sort of slide projector.
virtual reality based future. The Latin teacher always has had to adapt to new technology. In my own career I have used the following: phonograph, 16 mm film projector, both the manual and the automatic filmstrip projector, opaque projector, mimeograph machines, Thermofax machines, transparency machines, and, with blessed relief, photocopiers. My first computer was a Kaypro, which is probably in the Smithsonian now and the last classroom I taught in at the University of Massachusetts Amherst was packed with computer based technology which allowed students to share group work with other groups via a complex set of monitors. It is daunting to think that so many of my former technologies are now available via one’s telephone.

After course work, everyone stressed the necessity for field experience. One can see parallels here to the apprentice model the colonists brought over from Europe. Not everyone I read has every idea, but when put together we see a composite of what is expected today. First, there should be observation of real situations, followed by a longer stint under the supervision of an experienced and talented teacher, with gradually increasing responsibility.

Finally, all experts stress that a teacher’s development does not cease when she or he leaves a structured program. That is, a teacher must engage in what is today commonly called “Continuing Development.” Most often mentioned are involvement with professional organizations and travel abroad. Interestingly, there is not much mention of regularly reading relevant journal articles because, I think, it was taken for granted. In the earliest days journals like *Classical Journal*, *Classical World*, and *Latin Notes*, the predecessor of *Classical Outlook*, routinely had tips contributed by active teachers. Today this is done on the internet in chat rooms, Facebook groups, and other electronic marvels that have passed me by.

So, where are we today? A student who wishes to teach Latin can, theoretically, do so with a BA and certification, but the number of today’s students who can do this is limited.
Fewer and fewer students come to college ready to begin upper level Latin right away and do not begin author courses until their junior or senior year. If the student decides during sophomore year that she or he wants to teach, there is precious little time left in a four year scenario to take the large number of author courses while at the same time do this pursuing appropriate Education courses and field work. The required education courses, plus the time for pre-practicum and practicum/practice teaching on top of, say, two upper division Latin courses a semester and maybe Greek, mean that few follow this route. If BA students begin to teach these days, it is often without certification.

We will come back to this fact below.

The SCS maintains a “Guide to Graduate Programs in North America” that shows programs in Classics and which degrees they offer. The posted version is undated, but can be

![Diagram showing distribution of degrees](https://classicalstudies.org/education/graduate-programs-north-america)
presumed to be the best data available. Of the 91 programs listed, 68 offer a terminal MA; 18 programs offer a MAT and 59 the PhD. 12 Post Baccalaureate degrees are listed.

Only the MAT guarantees certification upon completion. Thus, in the midst of a dire need for Latin teachers, 89% of our post BA programs do not automatically result in certification.

These data reflect the reality of preparing to become a Latin teacher today, namely that many begin teaching without certification or that certified teachers with limited Latin are gang pressed into teaching it. There are many, many ways for people “make up” what they need in order to become certified.

Some states offer fast track credentialing, especially for subjects with a critical need for teachers. These programs aim at those who have the content courses but need the educational credits for certification.

There are inevitable problems with such crash course approaches and one must imagine that a full time MAT program, where content and education courses are mingled in a single program, allow for more maturation of teachers in training. With luck the methods course in Latin is taught by a classicist, but often enough the student goes to the College of Education and takes a methods course in teaching foreign language, not entirely a bad thing. Some MAT programs can be pursued part time while the teacher continues in the classroom.

Some MA programs simply take care of the Classics instruction and encourage those wishing to obtain certification to do so through the Education Department on campus, often adding at least a year to the future teacher’s preparation.
Finally, most states of which I am aware have some requirement in place that teachers continue their professional development in order to achieve permanent certification. Some even require a Master’s degree. As we all know too well, teachers are busy people and we do not, as the public likes to believe, walk away at 3 PM with nothing to do. Our field has been especially creative in finding ways to serve such teachers. Some colleges offer weekend or summer institutes where in-service teachers can earn either college credit or professional development points. Others take this a bit further and offer certification programs that include summer work. I know of one program that occurs primarily online but includes a two week summer component. At least one program is set up so that its students actually fill the need for Latin teachers while they go through the program.

This, I think, gives us the best launching place for the final question – what will future training of Latin teachers look like? I could pontificate and pretend to have special knowledge of the future. But, truth be told, we all know, in general, what is going to happen. For example, technology is going to play a more dominant role in the classroom. I see fully interactive textbooks that save students time and tedium. Teachers will have to know how to use and, perhaps, program them. In my dreams I see a day when, through virtual reality, we could take our students on a walking tour through Pompeii just before the eruption and have unscripted conversations with Romans from all walks of life. I see 3D reenactments of Cicero giving a speech or Vergil reading to Augustus. As always, we will adapt and utilize these to the fullest.

Many, if not most, Latin teachers will probably be doing some of their teaching online and new skills will have to be developed here. And, Rodenbury willing, some day we can go on field trips through teleportation.
But a more honest truth is that no one really knows exactly what is going to happen. So much depends on the confluence of the external factors mentioned above. What mandates will come our way from the federal or state government? What social agendas will alter the arc of the curriculum? For this we will have to wait and see. And we will adapt. We are good at it.

But I want to take the final two pages of the talk and turn into an old man again. The sort who gives dire warnings of future catastrophes and swears it wasn’t this way in his day. Well, it wasn’t this way. It was worse when I learned Latin -- more boring; more rote; more passive, less active. We have come a long way with our textbooks and our techniques. We should be proud of this. But pride can lead to complacency, and against this we must be vigilant.

We sometimes read nowadays that Latin has stabilized after its disastrous collapse in the 70s. I think that was true for a while, but I see bumps in the road. Let me present some support for this concern.

First, every two months or so we hear via social media about this or that Classics program in this or that college or university being under attack. The most recent I have heard about is at the University of Vermont. We are in the crosshairs of administrators who work on a corporate model and parents who only see education as a way for their children to obtain fine salaries.

The following chart shows the Latin enrolment at post-secondary institutions collected by the MLA, pertaining to summer and fall, 2016 and with comparison to previous years (Looney and Lusin, 2018, Table 4, p. 16).

---

10 https://www.mla.org/content/download/83540/2197676/2016-Enrollments-Short-Report.pdf. Cf. Gregory Crane’s comments on the 2015 data at https://sites.tufts.edu/perseusupdates/2015/05/19/bad-news-for-latin-in-the-us-worse-for-greek/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2004/5</th>
<th>2007/8</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTFL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin enrolment</td>
<td>225,372</td>
<td>205,158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFLNSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td></td>
<td>-8.96%</td>
<td>-6.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High School Latin enrolments are given in the next chart, below. I have combined two sources to get more up to date data. The first source is the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages which has long gathered such data and contributed the data for 2004/5 and 2007/8 (ACTFL, 2015). The second line is a study from another alphabet gang banger, a division of the Defense Language and National Security Education (DLNSE, 2017). The two groups must have different methods of collecting data, but they are probably close enough and represent the most up to date data we have.\textsuperscript{11} The Latin data should be read against the fact that ACTFL reports that the percentage of high school students taking a foreign language rose from 18% in 2004/5 to 18.51% in 2007/8.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
| Source  | 2009, Fall | 2013, Fall | 2016 |
\hline
|         | 32,446     | 27,209     | 24,886 |
\hline
% Change | --         | -16.4%     | -23.3% |
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{11} Given this fact, the percent of change reflected between 2007/8 and 2017 may be inaccurate. The ACTFL data was also used in American Councils for International Education, 2017, Table 2, p. 8.
Given the fact that the data come from two sources, the percentage of change may be misleading, but the median level of change is -7.83%, a discouraging fact when more students are taking foreign languages these days.

There are other causes for concern. I am sure that many of you have heard about the racially charged incident that occurred at this year’s AIA/SCS conference. What happened was regrettable. But most online conversation has failed to stress one very important fact. The unpleasantness occurred at a panel on the Future of Classics. And at this panel, more than one classicist openly doubted the future of teaching the languages as a central focus in the business of the Classics. These were younger scholars and they will have influence for decades. Are they harbingers of things to come? I, personally, shudder at the thought.

The last example I’d like to bring up is the current difference of opinion on how best to teach beginning Latin. Several of you are better equipped to speak about the merits of things like Total Comprehensive Input than I am. But after some digging around, allow me to give a view from the bleachers. And the main thing I observe is almost a total lack of both data and communication.

First, the data. We are, in many ways, driving blind. Let us consider first current disagreements concerning the way to teach beginning Latin. What little I know centers around TCI, so let me use it as an example. First, let me say that I am not at all opposed to the basic ideas of controlled vocabulary or of having beginning students read simplified stories. I did these things regularly in the classroom and if I were still there I would be doing it more.

An internet search on the terms “Society for Classical Studies” and “incident” will lead readers to many versions of the affair.
Moreover, especially in light of the enrollment figures cited above, I am very much in favor of making Latin fun and filling our classroom seats and quotas.

But I’ve seen a situation like this before and I worry about trouble on the horizon. I am a survivor of the methodology wars that occurred when the reading method textbooks first emerged. Hard liners, often called the “grammar first” people, decried the reading method as pap, fearing the students would never be able to read “real” Latin if they started this way. It took a long time for the two sides to reach a mutual peace and I presume a compromise will eventually be reached between opposing factions in the current instance. But I wonder how much time we have this go around to find such a peace.

Let me cut to the chase with an anecdote. When I corresponded with an advocate of TCI, I asked how TCI students would fare when they got to college. Would they be able to transition to authors like Cicero and Vergil without difficulty or discouragement? I stated that most college faculty still saw this as the ultimate goal of their profession. How would this transition be handled? The answer was, “The professors will just have to change.”

So they may. But they will need data. How do these students do on standardized tests such as the AP? Ah, one says, the test is geared to the “old” way of teaching. So it is. And it too may have to change. Similarly, colleges use placement exams to decide which level Latin courses incoming students are suited for.

Finally, the field must decide what the purpose of learning Latin is. Is it still tenable to insist that the only goal for our students is that they read Golden Age authors? Is the only goal for Spanish students that they read Don Quixote or for German students to read Goethe? It may be that it is time to allow for different goals of Latin study. These may even be multiple goals as one size rarely fits all in the classroom. So this too may have to change.
But change takes time. And we may not have time. And once more we are driving blind. Anecdotally we know that college and high school programs are under attack. But we do not know how many or how often. Encouraging people to write letters in support of programs as each is threatened is well and good. But what is the big picture? Where do the data say we are heading? How many programs and students are we losing and at what rate? How much future do we realistically have left?

It is time for Classics groups to form yet another multi-organization committee to establish the facts concerning the health of our profession. The last thing we need is to let this creep up on us as more and more students decide not to take Latin in college and as more and more programs reduce their size or close their doors. It is time for our teachers, no matter at what level they teach, to get into the same room and thrash out once more the goals of having students take Latin. The conversation cannot continue as an “us vs. them” situation, with each side comfortably entrenched in its own silo. After all, one result of silo warfare is total mutual destruction.

Nor must we forget that the current situation is about the students as much as it is about the field in general. We need facts far more than heated opinions. We cannot afford to go the way of current politics.

How we train our future teachers depends on such things. We will train them in accordance with external pressures as I have said, but also internal ones. Which elementary methodology is the best? Why does it seem that college departments are moving more in the direction of Classical Studies in Translation or Mediterranean Cultural Studies at the expense of the languages, be it willingly or under administrative duress? What are our ultimate goals, both
for the field and for the teaching of Latin? Are they synchronized between pre-collegiate and college instructors?

I have never, in forty years of working with our teachers, K-16, been afraid that the enthusiasm and determination of our teachers will fall short. We will, as we have, adapt, and adapt well. Bring on the technology. Bring on the governmental interference. Bring on the latest educational rage. Our teachers and our teachers of teachers will adapt.

But we are driving blind. The last large scale and systematic study of the health of our field was undertaken in 1967 and it took over 50 years for some of its recommendations to be implemented. It is time for a new study and faster implementation. Let us be sure that twenty years from now there will not be so many people, even people in the field, saying, “Do we really need Latin?” If we do not, the training of Latin teachers may not have a future tense.
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