

A HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE TEACHING OF LATIN

Th, objectives, methods, and results of the teaching of Latin in Ignatius' schools were so vastly different from those pursued by teachers of Latin today that it is illuminating and profitable to sketch the history of their gradual alteration—even at the risk of some repetition through this effort to gather together isolated statements previously made in other contexts of this book. In fact, unless we are aware of this historical development in the teaching of Latin since Ignatius' time, we cannot truly understand what he has written about Latin and about the function which it had in his scheme of imparting liberal education to the youth in his universities.

Moreover, awareness of this historical development may well be helpful towards a needed rethinking of the function of Latin in modern Catholic liberal education. Such rethinking, accompanied by reformulation, is badly needed because Catholic liberal education is now operating in social, political, educational, and cultural circumstances so vastly different from those of 1556. If we do not have the perspective which this awareness can bring us, we shall be in danger of fumbling with means when we do not yet know clearly what are our ends. The position of Latin as a language in modern liberal education, particularly in that of lay youths, is admittedly a problem. Haphazard efforts can bring no constructive solution. They merely postpone the problem five or ten years at a time while it grows progressively worse.

The Position of Latin in the Thirteenth Century

Latin ceased to be a vernacular language sometime between 600 and 800 A.D. By the latter date, it had gradually and almost

imperceptibly become in various regions early dialects of Spanish, French, Roumanian, and Italian. But no literature of importance had yet been written in these dialects. In fact, until about 1100 practically no important writing was done in western Europe except in Latin. Since most of the books in which the cultural heritage of the past had been deposited were written in Latin, Latin long continued to be the language of the liturgy, diplomatic intercourse, learning, and education. The period when it flourished most as a flexible, easily usable medium of communication was that of the Christian humanism of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. During this era, its morphology and grammar were kept practically constant by the grammarians. But, in regard to its vocabulary, it was a living language which developed new words for newly discovered things or ideas. Consequently, it remained an adequate means to express the ideas of contemporary life.

In the schools, Latin comprised almost the whole curriculum of the boys from the time they were five or seven until they began their higher studies at the age of twelve, or fourteen, or sixteen. As we have seen,¹ it was taught chiefly by means of the direct method, in which the teacher makes Latin the medium as well as the end of his instruction. He trains the pupil instinctively to grasp the meaning directly from the Latin words rather than to translate them into words of his vernacular and then grasp the meaning from these. Furthermore, the pupils learned Latin so as to use it as an indispensable tool in their higher studies and then throughout life. Hence, the students studied Latin chiefly as a means of communication, that is, as a means of acquiring and expressing important ideas. They studied it to learn it as an art: the threefold art of speaking, reading, and writing it with fluency. By mastery of the art, they automatically acquired, as a by-product, considerable training of mind with transfer of training to other fields, and much cultural knowledge.

The educated men of the time could use Latin with ease, with their minds on their thought rather than on a distracting and difficult search for words or endings. Nor were they hampered by fear of snobbish criticism if they happened to slip into a non-Ciceronian word or phrase. Their psychological experience while speaking Latin was not far different from that

¹ Pages 121-123.

of conversing in the vernacular. It is true that some spoke or wrote Latin poorly. But in every age many do that with their vernaculars too. Latin was then an international language which men of all the nations of Europe used with ease. This fact had so many obvious advantages that the educated men of the day seem never to have suspected that it might cease to exist.

Latin in the First Half of the Sixteenth Century

The position of Latin in the schools of the first half of the sixteenth century was still substantially what it had been in the thirteenth century. However, some additions and improvements had been made by the humanists.

In the earliest Jesuit Schools, as in those of Sturm, or Vives, or Vinet, the study of Latin occupied almost all the curricular time and space of pupils from five or six to approximately fourteen. It did this because it was still useful and necessary for all the activities of life which required an education. Also, it had high monetary value because knowledge of it still opened the way to the choicest positions in state or commerce or Church. Hence, parents who desired their children to receive an education also wanted them to learn Latin; and the children themselves no more questioned its value than they challenge that of their vernaculars or of arithmetic today. The chief objective of teachers and pupils alike continued to be the simple one of earlier centuries: the threefold art of speaking, reading, and writing the language with fluency. Latin was regarded as a medium of communication rather than as a field for mental gymnastics. In a word, Latin then served approximately all the functions or purposes which the vernacular does today in elementary, secondary, and lower college education. The study of it, like that of the vernacular today, was simultaneously utilitarian and cultural.

The upshot was that the students had motives to study it well. Hence, they did truly master the threefold art of speaking, reading, and writing it with ease. And it was by that very fact of mastering it that they also automatically or accidentally acquired the training of mind and cultural knowledge. They began their speaking of Latin, and also their reading and writing it, through many years of easy material (often called "made

Latin today),² like the Colloquia of Heyden or Cordier or Father Van Torre with the vernacular translations arranged either in interlinear or parallel fashion, and like the Distichs of the unknown Cato. It was only after they had a control of the language, at least fair for their age, that they took up the classics with their complicated and difficult sentences. Also, it was only after they had acquired fluency in speaking the language through many years of practice and of use of the vernacular translations that they bestowed much attention on grammar as such. As in medieval times, the approach of the teacher in the earlier years was chiefly the direct method, though he brought in more and more of the analytical method as the years passed by. Use of the direct method brought the students a constantly growing sense of achievement, consisting in the pleasure felt in expressing themselves in a new language with ease. That experience of power has vastly more motivating force than abstract arguments about the training of mind which the student is gaining, particularly when he does not observe the achievement in himself, his fellow students, or his elders.

Evaluation of the Medieval and Renaissance Methods

From modern studies in the psychology of learning, we know that there are two indispensable steps in the process of learning a new language well enough to speak, read, and write it with ease. The first is establishing memory associations between the words of the new language and the ideas they express—or, second best, between the words of the new language and the corresponding words of one's native language which evoke the ideas. The second step is the frequent and steady repetition day after day which begets ready, spontaneous, automatic, and unconscious facility in using the words of the new language with complete ease. The easier, the more accurately, and the more pleasantly the memory associations are established, and the more frequent, pleasant, and steady the repetition, the more efficiently and completely will the new language be learned.

The medieval teaching of Latin, up to the middle of the fifteenth century, was weak in the first step, establishing memory

² Some modern teachers maintain that immediately after learning their elements the pupils should read only classical authors such as Caesar and Cicero. They fear that if the students take up such "made Latin," it may hinder them from developing a Ciceronian style in all its purity.

associations. Printing from movable metal type had not yet been invented, and the boys had no textbooks of grammar to which they could refer, or lists of words and their meanings, or exercise books. Even when they might glance upon or copy the *Ars Minor* of Donatus which belonged to the teacher, they found no semblance of helpful schematic arrangement of paradigms, or even any indication of where a sentence ended. What they saw looked something like the following, without any aid to the eye even to distinguish the statements from the questions.³

MUSA NOMEN APPELLATIVUM GENERIS FEMININI
 NUMERI SINGULARIS FIGURAE SIMPLICIS CASUS
 NOMINATIVI ET VOCATIVI QUOD DECLINABITUR SIC
 NOMINATIVO HAEC MUSA GENETIVO HUIUS MUSAE
 DATIVO HUIC MUSAE ACCUSATIVO HANC MUSAM
 VOCATIVO O MUSA ABLATIVO AB HAC MUSA
 CONIUGATTONES VERBORUM QUOT SUNT TRES QUAE
 PRIMA SECUNDA TERTIA PRIMA QUAE EST QUAE
 INDICATIVO MODO TEMPORE PRAESENTI NUMERO
 SINGULARI SECUNDA PERSONA VERBO ACTIVO ET
 NEUTRALI A PRODUCTAM HABET ANTE NOVISSIMAM
 LITTERAM PASSIVO COMMUNI ET DEONENTI ANTE
 NOVISSIMAM SYLLABAM UT AMO AMAS AMOR AMARIS
 ET FUTURUM TEMPUS EIUSDEM MODI IN BO ET IN
 BOR SYLLABAM MITTIT UT AMO AMABO AMOR
 AMABOR

But the second step, the constant practice which begets automatic recall, was provided exceedingly better than in our modern system of teaching Latin. The frequent repetition was afforded by the practice of Latin conversation, day after day for many years from the time when the pupil was five or seven through the rest of his years of schooling and then through the rest of his life.

By Ignatius' day the improvements which the humanists had added to the thirteenth-century practice were chiefly the following:

First, they had produced for beginners small grammars with the declensions and conjugations schematically arranged to aid the eye. A good example is that of which Robert Estienne (1503-1559) is the supposed author. The edition which I was able to consult is a duodecimo of 83 pages printed in Paris in 1581. It bore the long but informative title reproduced below in Figure 16.

This little book is an early step towards the legible typography

³ In Chase, *Ars Minor*, pp. 30, 38.

LES DECLI: N A I S O N S D E S N O M S

BT VERBBS, Q_V I DOIVINT | ^ A.
uoir caticremcntpirccrurles enfçns,auf-
quelsonreut baillcr entrée i la
langue Latine.

NSIUIt,

L^t MANIERE DE T O ^ R N E R
Iti Nomi.Prcnomi, yerba, tant afhfi <jue pafifi. Geron-
difi, Supini cr Participa : Ia verba Sum , Velo, Ñola
Malo, Fere, Edo a , Fio , PeJ'itm , MemMI, aufi, Ia Impa-
fonth.

BES HVICT P/R.TIBJ D'ORAIJoff.

LA MANIERE D'EXERCER LES
EnUns a declincr les Noms ác les Yerbes.

/s~<s3-/£TJ.

P A R I S I I S Í

Apud Gabnelem Buon.in claufo Brunello,
TubiignoD. Claudy.

i / 8 i,

Fig. 16. Title Page of a
Latin Grammar of 1581

of modern times, but not yet its rival. The pages are not overcrowded with print. The paradigms, accompanied by the meanings in the vernacular, were schematically arranged as in the sample reproduced below in Figure 17.

Second, the Latin teachers of the Renaissance had brought into general use, at least outside of Italy and Spain, the inter-linear or parallel translations in the Colloquia like those of Heyden or Cordier (or, a little after Ignatius' time, like those of the

la declina is on

des noms.

Noms s'appellent tens mts qttferuent a ntmmerles
chofer, comme Mcnia.Kne table.

Q^V ANTA DICLINER LES NOMS,
il enj ageneralementdectmjfortes.

EES NOMS DV PREMIER ORDRE,
fe termment.

^itt Nominatefen A, as, c, cs.
^f>Gentufen x, <<.

A V R I G A, chartier, ou chartiere: mafculin cr-
feminin ,ponrtant cjn'il appartient a vn homme, era
vnefemme.Etfe decline encejle maniere, Unt en Latin
tjiien Francois.

Singulariter,£s nomhredi'vn)ou cCvne.

In nominatiuo	Auriga, chartier, le chanter, vn thartter,
Geniciuo	auriga.*, Df Chartier, du chartter, d'vn chartur,
Datiuo	dungXy-sCchartter, an chartier, a vn chanter.
Accufatiuo	aurigam, tr chartier,
Vocatiuo	auriga, charuer,
Ablatiuo	auriga, De chartter, dn chanter. d'vn chartier.

a ij

Fig. 17. Sample Page of the
Latin Grammar of 1581

Jesuits Van Torre or the unknown author of the Flemish edition of the *Formulae Puerorum*). Both these innovations were notable improvements of the first step of the learning process, that of establishing the memory associations more pleasantly and efficiently. The second step of the learning process continued to be provided as efficiently as in medieval days, because the constant practice of speaking Latin from the ages of five or seven in the schools was continued, and because the pupils still learned Latin in order to use it afterwards throughout life. Latin remained the international language of learning and diplomacy.

Third, the humanists had added closer attention to grammatical usage. Some carried this praiseworthy practice so far into a purism that it militated against the use of Latin with ease as a living language. But by and large the attention was healthy.

Fourth, the humanistic teachers had enthusiasm for the outstanding classical authors—an enthusiasm which had been fanned by the recent discoveries of manuscripts containing works hitherto lost. But it is important to notice that the boys were given classics such as Cicero's Orations or Livy's History or Horace's Odes only after approximately the age of twelve, that is, only after they had thoroughly established and practiced the memory associations to the point of spontaneous recall, and had benefited from four to six years of constant practice in speaking Latin. Hence, when they took up these literary classics in Latin, their condition was similar to that of modern boys twelve to fourteen in elementary school, or fourteen to eighteen in secondary school, who are introduced to such classics of their vernacular as Stevenson, Irving, Webster, Shakespeare, Newman, or Milton. In other words, the boys in the schools of the Renaissance took up those classics as a literary study to gain the outlook on life of a cultured man, and not as the means of gaining their first ability to understand the language. They probably had only a little more difficulty in understanding the Latin classics than boys of similar age now have with Shakespeare, Edmund Burke, Milton, Browning.

Fifth, the humanists had espoused the Ciceronianism which was eventually to contribute so much towards strangling Latin as a living language. But they did not yet foresee or even remotely suspect the eventual result of their work.⁴

The Steady Decline of Latin in the Following Centuries

The time and space occupied by Latin in the curriculum of liberal education has been growing steadily less from about 1650

* The well-known medieval scholar, L. J. Paetow, has made some highly relevant observations in "Latin as an international language in the middle ages," Annual Report for 1920 of the American Historical Association, Washington, D.C., 1925, pp. 179-186.

On p. 183: ". . . Until about the twelfth century, however, there was practically no writing done in western Europe except in Latin." On p. 184: ". . . Apparently the question was never raised as to whether Latin should endure as the international language. Men simply took for granted that it always would endure, for its advantages were so obvious. Roger Bacon never dreamed that the day would come when university

to the present. This is true not only of America but also of Europe. In Europe, the decline has been less rapid but scarcely less steady. For there, Latin had a deep rooting in the centuries-old culture and in the school systems—a rooting which it never could acquire (except perhaps for New England) in the pioneer regions which were being opened up in the New World during the time Latin was declining in Europe. Although these regions of the Americas drew much indeed from Europe, they developed a new culture of their own. In it was a vigorous new spirit and content which arose from the work of pushing back frontiers. The pioneers felt no need or motive to compel their children to learn to speak Latin with fluency. But in time they did develop a new school system teaching new branches which met their needs roughly as Latin had done for the people of earlier centuries in Europe. Assuredly, American schools still have defects. But, marvelous in extent and influence, little by little they also have won outstanding achievements which have met needs of modern society, including the members of lower or laboring classes often neglected in educational systems of past ages. These achievements were previously unsurpassed in the history of the world. One who does not recognize this only betrays his smugness, or his ignorance of the system, or his own character as a *laudator temporis acti*.

But even in Europe there remains today nothing remotely similar to the fortunate condition which Latin enjoyed in the College of Guyenne or in the early Jesuit schools. Latin as a language has held its place best in the fields of philosophy and dogmatic theology within the seminaries, where the introductory manuals for use in the classrooms are still written in Latin. Yet even in the seminaries many of the subjects, such as Scripture and canon law, which were taught only in Latin in Ignatius' day, are now taught in the vernacular. And the learned works and the research by which the theological sciences are being kept abreast of the times are now almost all published in the vernaculars. Ex-

lectures would be delivered in Paris in French." (See, e.g., his *Compendium studii*, ed. Brewer, Rolls Series 15, 466; also his *Opus Majus*, ed. Bridges, I, 67). On p.185. "This curse of Valla and his followers [on Medieval Latin] darkened the Middle Ages for centuries; it utterly blighted Medieval Latin which had served so wonderfully as an international language. The humanists believed that they had awakened Latin to a new life. . . . But . . . they killed Latin as a living and international language. It was not long before the vernaculars encroached upon the old precincts of Latin and divided former Latin Christendom into many rival linguistic groups."

ampies are the *Dictionnaire de la Théologie Catholique*, Father J. A. Jungmann's great work on the Mass, *Missarum Sollemnia, eine genetische Erklärung der Römischen Messe*, and, in America, Father J. E. Steinmueller's *Companion to Scripture Studies*, or the important discussions on the relation of Church and state, or the treatment of the newest issues in morality and medicine, or the philosophical writings of Professors Jacques Maritain and Etienne Gilson. Works such as these are being read and admired not only by Catholics but also by scholars outside the Church who would neither know or read them if they were written in Latin.

Some Supposed Causes of the Decline of Latin

Many have thought that the causes of decline of Latin in American education are to be found in factors such as these: in the elective system, whereby college students eighteen to twenty-two years of age are allowed to choose their own courses and subjects, or whereby the parents are allowed to choose the subjects which their sons or daughters of fourteen to eighteen will study in high schools; in the decline of traditional methods of teaching Latin; in an increasing popularity of science and vocational arts or other subjects which have utilitarian values today such as Latin had in the sixteenth and earlier centuries; in declining interest in spiritual values through growing materialism or secularism; in the attack of the materialistic psychologists at the turn of the last century against mental discipline and transfer of training. But these factors, like Ciceronianism, are at best merely contributing causes. More properly, they are not causes but symptoms, although some of these symptoms became stimulants which increased the speed with which the true causes worked.

The True and Major Causes

The major and deeper causes of the decline in the use of Latin as a language, and consequently of its steady recession from the curriculum, lie in factors like the following: in the insuperable, tide-like propensity of intellectual nature to devise easier and more efficient procedures—in communicating its ideas just as surely as in other activities; in the unification and rise of the vernacular languages (for the decline in the use of Latin and the simultaneous rise of the importance of the vernaculars seem

to be but the concave and convex sides of a curve); in the development of the rich culture obtainable through the vernaculars, which in some aspects has in time equalled or surpassed the culture available to the early humanists through Latin and Greek alone; in the success of Protestantism, which was won to so great an extent by its appealing to the masses through the vernaculars, and which helped the vernaculars to supplant Latin as the medium of instruction in the non-Catholic universities which after a time became so vastly more numerous than the Catholic universities; in the loss of the economic and practical values which Latin had in Ignatius' day; and in the consequent popular demand for other subjects in the educational curriculum which did have those values. By making Latin difficult and pedantic, Ciceronianism merely contributed to the speed with which these deeper causes operated.

Men spontaneously discovered that they could express their thoughts more easily, and shade and qualify them more accurately, in their vernaculars than in Latin, especially in that of the Ciceronian type. Likewise, they found themselves mentally less fatigued in reading vernaculars than in decoding Ciceronian periods. The net result was that Latin ceased to be the language of treaties or diplomatic conferences, and of the study of law, medicine, and other subjects. Latin secretaries became less and less in demand. As the Latin language little by little ceased to have practical and economic values with the passing of the centuries, the populace increased its demand for other subjects which did have those values. To comply with the new needs, in country after country new types of schools and of universities were created in which the instruction was given in the vernacular. Then even in the older schools, the new subjects more and more pushed Latin out of the curriculum. In time, the new schools vastly outnumbered the older ones in which Latin retained an important place.

It was especially from about 1700 onward that the vernacular languages replaced Latin as the medium of instruction in the universities. The first lecture known to have been delivered in English within a Scottish university was that given by Sir Francis Hutcheson in 1729.⁵ Throughout Europe, lovers of Latin strove energetically to have their traditional practices maintained, but they could not succeed in the face of trends promoted especially

⁵ Smith, Norman Kemp, *The Philosophy of David Hume*, p. 23.

in the newly founded and modernized universities, such as Halle (1694), Gottingen (1737), and Erlangen (1743). Simultaneously, seminars displaced the Latin disputations, and a new type of systematic lecture took the place of the medieval lecture expounding some text such as one of Aristotle. The new methods were used to devise a new form of study of the whole field of Greek and Roman civilization, art, and literature. The emphasis of the later humanists on literary form gave way to an effort to reconstruct the history of antiquity and to study its best monuments as patterns of art and taste.⁶

The Gradual Change of Objectives

Almost like the scholastic philosophers of the period of decadence in the fifteenth century, the teachers of Latin, in their efforts to defend its place in the curriculum, pointed to it as an effective means of imparting mental training. Their effort greatly promoted the disciplinary theory of education previously mentioned,⁶⁷ which held that the important thing in education is not what is learned but the sharpening of the mind in the process of learning. The theory vaguely implies that the pupil will somehow acquire the wide knowledge or content of his education after his graduation. This theory found perhaps its clearest and most influential expression through John Locke (1632-1704) and Christian Wolff (1679-1754). Especially during the nineteenth century, Catholic educators in America drew heavily from this theory in formulating their philosophy of education, though perhaps they were little aware of the source from which their arguments so largely stemmed.

To attract students and to defend their position, the teachers pressed the contention that the study of Latin produces discipline of mind. They also advertised the fact that this language is the vehicle of a rich cultural content. All these arguments contain much truth, and it would be folly to discard them. But to play them for more than their true value is undesirable too. Furthermore, the fact remains that, true as they are, these arguments have merely retarded the tide of the waning study of Latin as a

⁶ Paulsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-50.

⁷ On page 77. On the disciplinary theory, see Kane, *op. cit.*, pp. 140-143; 243-246; 331-335, especially his balanced views on pp. 334, 335; Castiello, I., S.J., "The Psychology of Classical Training," *Thought*, Vol. 10, no. 4 (March, 1936), pp. 632-654. esp. pp. 647, 648; Monroe, *op. cit.*, pp. 505-517; Woody, *op. cit.*, pp. 193-221; also footnotes 46 and 47 of Ch. 5, above, p. 78.

language. From 636 to 1650 they alone were never the major causes which brought Latin to flourish as an important subject in the curriculum of liberal education, and there seems to be as yet no solid indication that they alone will ever stop or turn the trend of history which is bringing its decline. In spite of all that the defenders of Latin have said, the populace at large has remained convinced that the training of mind it wants can also be procured, with greater ease and efficiency, through other subjects such as mathematics, modern languages, or sciences. As we shall see, the most recent scientific experiments of the psychologists have confirmed this opinion of the people in general. The populace at large has also persisted in its opinion that cultural content, including literary form, can be obtained from subjects treated in the vernacular.

As Latin gradually lost its practical usefulness, economic value, and curricular space after 1650, and as the teachers of it were constrained more and more to appeal to mental discipline and cultural content in their efforts to preserve it, they gradually dropped the root objective which in Ignatius' day entailed all the rest: ability to speak Latin with fluency and ease. From the middle of the nineteenth century onwards, too, the training of mind was customarily being sought by traversing each semester several hundred "lines" of Latin which were dissected, analyzed, and parsed. Such an objective was far from promoting a study of the classics as literature or as a source of ideas which in any way remotely resembled the procedure in the liberal education of the earlier Renaissance. Since mental discipline had become the objective of teaching Latin rather than ease in comprehending and using the language, the use of the vernacular translations, whether interlinear or parallel, in the early stages of learning the language was abandoned, and even became an object of scorn. Also, the process in earlier centuries (that of mastering the Latin language through easy material, such as the "made Latin" of the Colloquia, before reading the difficult authors) was inverted. Classical writers, such as Caesar and Cicero, with long and difficult sentence structure were given to the students immediately after the rudiments; and they were used as the means of gaining the first ability to comprehend Latin. The result of all these changes was that the students, by thumbing dictionaries and grammars, laboriously decoded the Latin rather than read it. This procedure is criticized as being exercise of the thumb more

than of the mind, and as being an inefficient and distasteful method of establishing the strong and ready memory associations in which the learning of a language so largely consists.

Moreover, the second indispensable step in learning to use a new language with ease, that of the frequent repetition until "overlearning" brings automatic recall, completely dropped out, at least in practice, for most of the students. The direct method of teaching in medieval and Renaissance times automatically taught the students to draw the meanings directly from the Latin words. But during the Renaissance a new procedure arose and was merely added to the former without supplanting it. It was the practice of having the student produce in the classroom a vernacular translation of the Latin passage. Even by 1600 or 1650 this practice was not yet used very widely. But in subsequent years, as the objective of Latin teaching became more and more some variety of mental discipline rather than the art of speaking Latin, the new technique of requiring vernacular translations in the classrooms completely supplanted the practice of discussing the passage by means of Latin conversation. By the latter part of the nineteenth century, the production of a vernacular translation by a laborious process of analyzing and decoding the Latin came to be in practice the accepted objective of classroom procedure, and often almost the only objective. If it was attained even in a stumbling fashion teacher and pupils alike thought that their task had been accomplished.

In other words, by this time the direct method of teaching Latin which had been in use in medieval and Renaissance times, by which the teacher makes Latin the medium as well as the end of his teaching, had now been supplanted almost completely by some species of a grammar-translation method.⁸ In this the forms, words, and constructions are taught prior to their use in a meaningful context. Then when a passage (usually a few lines of a literary classic) is taken up, its single sentences are decoded into the vernacular, and its single words and constructions are analyzed and parsed. This is indeed valuable mental training in the use of language and of words, and in logic. But the method has not taught many of the students to read Latin with speed and

⁸ For a concise description of these and other methods of teaching Latin, see the excellent article of W. L. Carr, "Changing Emphases in the Teaching of Latin," *The Classical Outlook*, Vol. 28, no. 8 (May, 1951), pp. 88-90.

ease, or to continue to use it in any form after their graduation. They were being taught how to analyze and decode Latin, but not how to grasp the sense with ease and without the intermediate step of painful translation. Even if they studied Latin six or eight years in high school and college, they never obtained a psychological experience of mastery of the art of speaking or reading Latin similar to that acquired in one year by students of a modern foreign language in a school such as the Institute of Languages and Linguistics of Georgetown University. Consequently at graduation, almost all of them closed their Latin books forever. Yet this situation did not disturb the teachers. For their objective in teaching Latin was no longer to impart the art of reading Latin with facility, nor to communicate wide knowledge of the literature and an outlook on life or a pattern of living gained from reading the works of many authors as complete artistic units. Rather, their objective was to procure discipline of mind through some lines of Latin minutely analyzed. And when the boy was graduated they felt that the objective of disciplining had been attained.

The disciplinary objective in the teaching of Latin, with the consequent change of methods, also made the writing of Latin more difficult. Hence, composition in Latin was gradually dropped because it was not deemed worth the meager results which can be obtained in the time available.

As an upshot of the gradual change of objectives from 1600 to 1950, history taught once more through Latin the ever recurring lesson which she once had inculcated through the decadent scholastics. Liberal education is in constant danger of degenerating into a technique growing more and more irrelevant to its contemporaries, and then of becoming fossilized in a dead routine of teachers, or an educationalistic legalism of administrators, or both. The technique is maintained and defended in the name of tradition. But in reality what is thus defended is not the tradition in the days of its vigor when it was eagerly sought by students because it was efficiently preparing them to participate in the cultural and social life of their own day. Rather, that which is defended is only the devitalized practice of the immediate past which is only a remnant of the true and life-giving tradition. Once under way, the degeneration continues until liberal education is again adjusted to contemporary needs and interests by teachers who possess something of the spirit which Ignatius dis-

played when he replaced the Sentences of Peter Lombard by the *Summa Theologiae* of St. Thomas Aquinas, or adapted the teaching of Latin to the tastes of his own day. Genuine liberal education—that of the tradition of Plato, Aristotle, the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, Vittorino, Vergerius, and Ignatius—is locked in a vital, stimulating contact with the concerns of its contemporary individuals and society. It studies the past to gain light in solving the problems of the present.

The Jesuits and the Change of Objectives

The Society of Jesus, suppressed in 1773, was reestablished in 1814. For another twenty or forty or sixty years after its restoration its colleges were small institutions struggling for the physical means of existence, and not at all able to change the trend of the times, either in the teaching of Latin or of many other subjects. All they could do was to adapt themselves to the desires and needs of parents and prospective students of the times, or perish. By now the new system of teaching Latin, which aimed more at knowledge about Latin and at discipline of mind than at teaching the art of speaking and reading it with ease, had become dominant both in Europe and America. The Jesuits, too, naturally took up the new system of the era following Locke and Wolff, with most of them no doubt unaware of how different it was from that used in the time of St. Ignatius or of the framers of the *Ratio Studiorum* of 1599.

In about 1860 the Jesuit General Father Peter Beckx lamented the demise of the direct method of teaching Latin in Jesuit as well as other schools.⁹ But his words did not change the trend of development. In America in 1893, some Jesuits were still trying to retain something of the direct method by teaching Latin conversation to lay youths, in preparation for the study of philosophy which was still taught to them in Latin, or at least from Latin textbooks. But the attempt was abandoned amid the circumstances which were growing increasingly difficult, although a few Jesuits struggled to keep it up as late as 1910. From then on the Jesuits have followed substantially the same objectives and methods of teaching Latin as the teachers in the non-Catholic schools.¹⁰

⁹ His words are cited below, on p. 239

¹⁰ McGucken, *op. cit.*, pp. 188-208.

The Objectives of Modern Teachers of Latin

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, the new and laborious process of learning Latin was not only distasteful to the students, but it began to draw heavy criticism from educators and parents. Moreover, other subjects more useful for living in modern society, and sometimes for earning a living in it, were crowding Latin out of the curriculum. The teachers of Latin displayed truly outstanding zeal to re-examine their methods and objectives and adapt their subject to modern times. Their zeal, plus the criticism being levelled against Latin as an instrument in the liberal education of youth, resulted in the most extensive and scientific investigation of a subject of school study ever made, that carried out by the Advisory Committee of the American Classical League from 1920 to 1924.

The committee frankly recognized that a grave responsibility rests upon those who recommended a subject which takes the time and energy of so many pupils as were then studying Latin in the United States. In the hope of improving the teaching and the position of Latin in education, the committee by much discussion found nineteen objectives of Latin study which were deemed probably valuable in modern times. They were embodied in a questionnaire which was sent to the Latin teachers of the entire country, who were requested to rank these objectives, comment on them, and add to them if they wished.

The speaking of Latin was not even included among those nineteen objectives; it had been discarded long ago and was not now deemed to be something in which modern teachers, parents, or pupils have an interest. Also, ability to read previously unseen Latin after its study in school or college has ceased (the objective which was understood to be next to speaking Latin in the threefold objective of Ignatius' day) was ranked in the lowest place among the nineteen by the modern teachers.¹¹ The ultimate objectives which the modern teachers thought useful were listed under the headings of "instrumental objectives" (such as increased ability to understand Latin phrases or quotations which occur in English), disciplinary objectives, and cultural objectives. The report also showed that in 1924, of any 1,000 students who began to study Latin in secondary school, only six were likely in any one year after leaving school to read any new Latin

¹¹ General Report of the Classical Investigation, Part I, pp. 33-40.

at all, even if it were as little as a few paragraphs in the course of research work. Hence in practice, still less emphasis was put upon mastering Latin in the hope of using it after graduation; and one result which came from the excellent work of the Classical Investigation was that discipline of mind and especially cultural knowledge came to be stressed still more as the objectives or motives of the study of Latin in liberal education.

Then came the attacks of the materialistic psychologists, which for several decades after 1920 made discipline of mind with accompanying transfer of training widely unacceptable to teachers, counselors, and advisers as a serious motive for studying Latin. Consequently, the effectiveness of this motive in recruiting students of Latin was lost. Later the same psychological research which refuted the materialists on this subject showed that the mental training and its transfer in regard to methods of study and ideals of mastery can be obtained from subjects like mathematics, or modern languages, or science just as well as from Latin.¹²

The further discovery was made through experience that the students could obtain the cultural knowledge more easily, accurately, rapidly, and efficiently through courses in ancient cultural history and by reading the classics in translation than they could in an equal time by decoding a few hundred lines of Cicero or Vergil with questionable accuracy.

The upshot was that these objectives, mental discipline and culture, have been succeeding less and less in motivating students or those who influence them, such as their parents and counselors in schools, to take up the Latin language. How rapid the decline in enrollment has been can be seen from the following table,¹³

¹² See Carr, W. L., *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, 1941, pp. 655, 656; Kingsley, H. L., *The Nature and Conditions of Learning*, N.Y., 1948, pp. 543-548; Ganss, G. E., S.J., "Let's Talk Some More about Latin—for Catholic High Schools," *The Catholic School Journal*, Vol. 49, nos. 3, 4 (March, April, 1949), pp. 78-81; 116-119.

¹³ *Encyclopedia of Modern Education*, ed. H. N. Rivlin and H. Schueler, N.Y., Philosophical Library, 1943, p.1943, s.v.Latin. How the decline is continuing up till now can be seen from this case of the DeWitt Clinton High School in The Bronx, New York, reported by *Time* for September 15, 1952 (Vol. 60, no. 11), p.92. When M. Michael Solomon began to teach Latin there in 1908, almost every pupil in the school completed at least two years of Latin. Even as late as 1923 when he became head of the Department of Latin it had a staff of seventeen teachers. In 1951, out of 4,000 students, only 70 (17%) enrolled in Latin. The advanced and elementary classes had to be combined. If this is happening in the East in New York City itself, what can be conjectured to be the case in the high schools of the smaller cities and towns throughout the nation?

which gives the percentage of the pupils studying Latin in American high schools.

1910	49.05 %
1915	37.32 %
1922	27.52 %
1928	21.99 %
1934	16.04 %

Since 1934, and especially since 1941, the acceleration of decline has been steadily increasing, although complete statistics have not been published. From studies of limited regions or cross sections, it is quite certain that the percentage was below ten by 1942; and there were indications that it was below three in 1950. Moreover, 95% of these few drop Latin after their second year of high school. The percentage of college or university students who are studying the Latin language is even less. It is a little higher in Catholic than in non-Catholic colleges. But even in Catholic universities the percentage seems to be no higher than in the high schools.

Contemporary European and American Terminology

In discussing the value of the classics in education, the contemporary European classicists speak about the formative value of the ancient languages in developing logical power to analyze; the excellence of Greek and Latin literature for forming taste; and the educational benefits to be derived from comparing our own civilization and culture with that of Greece and Rome. Thus, their terminology sometimes differs slightly from the words so often used by Americans: training of mind and cultural knowledge. But their outlook on the function of Latin and Greek in imparting liberal education is in substance the same as ours. Both in Europe and America, the modern methods of teaching Latin aim chiefly to impart knowledge about the language and its literature. In contrast, the ancient methods in the thirteenth and in the sixteenth centuries aimed chiefly to develop an art—the art of speaking, reading, and writing the language. These are the chief and differentiating characteristics of the two methods. Nearly fifty years ago the able Jesuit historian Father Antonio Astrain showed acute and accurate observation of this fact when he wrote the following passage:

The modern teacher of languages and literature . . .

teaches knowledge about language and not the practice of language. In contrast to this, the teacher of past eras taught languages as an art. . . . Hence have arisen diverse results. . . . The pupil in past eras departed from school as one who wrote the language of Latium correctly in prose or in verse. The modern pupil graduates with more or less of a stock of notes and linguistics and historical data, but he will never be able to use with ease the language he has learned. The modern procedure is almost entirely the learning of a science; the procedure of past eras was chiefly the learning of an art.¹⁴

in those remarks Father Astrain was thinking chiefly of the classical education in his contemporary Europe, and specifically in Spain; but his statements apply with equal truth to that in the Americas.

The Appeal of Pope Pius XI for a Restoration of the Former Methods

Training of mind and cultural knowledge, but without the ability or intention of speaking or reading Latin with facility when its study in school will have ceased—how different indeed these modern objectives of the study of the Latin language are from those envisaged by Ignatius! In his day the study of this language had an important function in the liberal education of youth, and this function was evident and satisfying to everyone interested in education: administrators, teachers, students, and their parents. In our day with its changed circumstances, the former function has passed away, and the new function of Latin in the modern curriculum has not yet been very clearly thought out. At least, it has not been expressed convincingly enough to win general agreement. When we try to explain this function to educators, parents, or students in terms of training of mind and cultural knowledge, our arguments have but little success. They often seem too subtle, and they leave our hearers sceptical and cold, or even opining that we are bound too tightly to an effete traditionalism. Yet we have not devised a more convincing presentation. In Ignatius' day the study of the Latin language was carried to mastery of the threefold art of speaking, reading, and writing with ease. Therefore not only was it automatically (but accidentally) imparting training of mind and cultural knowledge,

¹⁴ *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España*, Vol. 4, pp. 16. 17. The Spanish is cited in McGucken, *op. cit.*, p. 214.

but it was also preparing the student the better to pursue some career or vocation among the more influential classes by which he would earn or gain a living. If Latin had not been doing this, it would not have been studied so widely and well; nor would it have functioned so efficiently in preparing the pupils to live intelligently and influentially on earth.

The gradual altering of the objectives of the study of Latin with the passing of the centuries naturally entailed the altering of the methods of teaching the language. Hence, it is with truth that in our own days our Holy Father Pope Pius XI lamented in his encyclical on the Christian Education of Youth (December 31, 1929):

Hence in accepting the new, he [the Christian teacher] will not hastily abandon the old, which the experience of centuries has found expedient and profitable. This is particularly true in the teaching of Latin, which in our days is falling more and more into disuse, because of the unreasonable rejection of methods so successfully used by that sane humanism, whose highest development was reached in the schools of the Church.¹⁵

The thirteenth century, and the sixteenth century in which Ignatius lived, are two eras which certainly deserve to be classified among the periods of sane Christian humanism. Certainly, too, the methods of teaching Latin then in use were successful ones. But, unfortunately, those are the methods which the modern teachers have abandoned in their teaching of Latin, to the Holy Father's regret.

Methods of teaching are obviously means to educational objectives. The methods of teaching Latin in the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries were gradually abandoned because the objectives of those centuries were abandoned: ability to speak, read, and write Latin with ease, coupled with the desire to use it to acquire and communicate ideas after its study in school would have ceased. To restore the former methods without restoring the former objectives would be an anomalous procedure doomed to failure. Even to restore the objectives and the methods is little likely to succeed unless the students have motives to learn Latin as a language, motives about as equally strong and enticing as those which the students had in the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries. If such motives which spring

¹⁵ The Christian Education of Youth, America Press edition, p. 29.

spontaneously from the heart of the student, and which are coupled with a well founded hope that he personally will succeed in obtaining a reasonable mastery of Latin in the time at his disposal, are lacking, their place cannot be taken by any arguments, or any methods, or any educational equipment.

The Use of the Former Methods with Modern Languages

In point of fact, the medieval and Renaissance methods have not been abandoned, but only their application in the teaching of Latin. The methods themselves have received modern improvements and are being used in the teaching of modern languages in the Institute of Languages and Linguistics of Georgetown University in Washington, D.C. They have been bringing great success with the mature students who have a strong desire to use the language being studied—that is, to speak, read, and write it with accuracy and ease after its study in school will have ceased. A typical procedure is the following. In the early stages of learning a language the direct method is used, along with conversation books similar to the *Colloquia* of Heyden, Cordier, or Father Van Torre. After the student can converse fairly well he thoroughly studies the formal grammar of the language. All this is usually accomplished by the end of his first year of study. Then, that is, only after he has acquired a fair facility in using the language, he studies its literary classics as works of literature, by means of lectures and discussions in the language itself. Normally the final step is a year spent, under direction, in the country where the language is spoken.

Among the modern improvements in the methods, the outstanding one is the provision of unlimited hours of drill by giving the student tape recordings of the language as enunciated by a native speaker. This makes readily available what we have so frequently called the second step of the learning process, the step which dropped out in the grammar-translation method of teaching Latin: frequent repetition which alone can bring facility and automatic recall in the use of the memory associations. These methods can be employed just as successfully in the teaching of Latin with mature and truly interested students who have a strong desire to learn the language well and to use it in later life after the completion of schooling. If, in place of that strong desire, the student has merely the desire to fulfill a requirement

for a degree, no unusual success can well be expected even from these improved methods, either with Latin or the modern languages.

The Rapidly Growing American Interest in Classical Culture

Paradoxically, the rapid decline in the study of the Latin language has been accompanied in America by an even more rapid and unprecedented increase of interest in the classical culture of Greece and Rome. This growth is especially evident in non-Catholic circles on the levels of college, university, and adult education. Its slower development in Catholic schools is probably because of their devoting their curricular time to efforts to save the Latin language. Evidences of the growth are numerous. Examples are: the steadily growing popularity of college and university courses in Greek and Latin literature in translation; the important place being given to classical literature and culture in the strong programs of general education in such well-known universities as Chicago, Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Notre Dame, Princeton, Wisconsin, and Yale; the "Great Books Movement" in adult education; the organization of an entire curriculum around a core of "Great Books" at St. John's College in Annapolis, Maryland; the steadily growing recognition of the value of the humanities in education.¹⁶

All these are measures by which American educators who esteem the classics are adapting the traditional liberal education of the medieval and Renaissance times to the needs and circumstances of modern life.¹⁷ Faced with the present impossibility of

¹⁶ See, e.g., Haveman and West, *They Went to College*, pp. 153-156, and index s.v. humanities; *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 1952, the proceedings of the seventh annual convention of the Association for Higher Education, a department of the National Education Association of the U.S., pp. 7, 16-19; "The New Liberal Arts College Ideal is the 'Rounded Man,' an editorial in *Life*, Nov. 28, 1949, p. 28, which states—"A revolution in education is just now gathering its full momentum in the U.S. colleges. . . . On campus after campus the trend is toward giving the freshman and sophomore student an intimate speaking acquaintance with the full sweep of Western culture, from its Hebrew Greek and Roman origins to the present. . . . The famous Harvard report on General Education in a Free Society, published in 1945, gave a terrific impetus to the revolution. But the Harvard report merely summed up what was in the air." See also "Should a Businessman Be Educated" *Fortune*, April 1953, pp. 113-114. This article uses the terms liberal education and general education" as synonyms. (See Appendix 3, pp. 261-270, especially pp. 262-265.)

¹⁷ A significant example of this adaptation at Princeton University is described by Professor W. J. Oates, "The Classics Department in the

restoring the Latin language to its former importance in imparting liberal education, the more progressive among the classicists have not wasted their energies in futile wailing about the supposedly good old times which cannot be brought back. Rather they have courageously and realistically set themselves to the task of adaptation to the modern situation. They are giving the curricular time in which the students formerly studied a comparatively few lines of Latin authors to a study of the significant ideas and movements enshrined in Greek and Latin literature. They find the interest of the students steadily increasing.

An indication of the rapidity with which this movement is growing can be found in some statistics published¹⁸ in 1948 by Professor Walter Agard, Chairman of the Department of Classics at the University of Wisconsin. He is also the President of the nationwide American Classical League, to which office he was elected in 1947, and annually reelected five times. During the ten years from 1938 to 1948, the number of students taking the Latin language at the University of Wisconsin fell from 400 to 90, while the number of those studying Greek and Latin literature in translation rose from 50 to 500. This last number, 500, has greatly increased since 1948. For in that year, the University inaugurated its plan of general education entitled: A Program of Integrated Liberal Studies. This program has received nearly 300 freshmen each year, and has proved highly successful. In it most of the teaching is done by the professors of highest rank who are either chairmen of their departments or have national or international reputations because of their publications and skill in teaching. The morale is unusually high among both professors and students. Classical and medieval culture comprise a substantial portion of the program, along with some carefully selected topics on American culture and world culture, (including the oriental, since it is growing more and more important for Americans to know the culture and outlook of the peoples of the Far East with whom they are increasingly dealing).

Thus, large numbers of students gain training in classical and other humanistic studies under the most eminent professors in the university. Generally, these professors would prefer smaller

Liberal Arts College Today," *The Classical Weekly*, Vol. 42, no. 8 (Jan., 1949), pp. 117-121. See also professor Walter A. Agard, "Classical Scholarship," especially pp. 160-167, in *American Scholarship in the Twentieth Century*, edited by Merle Curti.

¹⁸ In the *Milwaukee Journal*, May 30, 1948.

classes if they could be had without the sacrifice of what seems to be a greater good. However, they find the disadvantages of these large classes more than compensated for by other benefits. Hundreds of capable students who otherwise would have no classical or other humanism in their programs truly learn much; and they are better off with this knowledge than with none. While the large class brings some diminution of personal contact of the individual student with his teacher, that benefit can be obtained, at least to a considerable extent, by other means such as arrangements for proper counselling. And the economic saving with the large class makes it easier for a university to provide more of the personal contact when it is most important, that is, when the student is in his field of concentration during junior and senior years. With the rapidly increasing number of students capable of profiting from higher education now actually seeking it in America, keeping all the classes small ones is becoming an undertaking too expensive to be met by available funds, even in the tax-supported universities. And after all, as we shall see below in Appendix 2, these professors are merely reviving and adapting in America the practice which has long been common in European universities, especially in the ecclesiastical universities of Rome. There it has been and is the ordinary procedure to have in the classes of philosophy 600 to 800 students of about the same age and ability as the American college students in programs similar to the Program of Integrated Liberal Studies.

Adaptation of Liberal Education to Modern Circumstances

By means of these efforts at adaptation, the more alert American classicists have arrived once more at substantially the same objective in the study of the classics as that of Vergerius, Vittorino, Aeneas Silvius, and the other liberal educators of the early Renaissance. The fourteenth-century humanists who revived Plato's and Aristotle's ideals of liberal education had their pupils study the literatures of Greece and Rome in search of a pattern of living. That is, they desired their students to gain from reading many complete ideas by which they could become intelligent and capable citizens and benefit their fellow men. The Greek and Latin languages were then the only means available by which the literature could be read. But this was not too great a barrier because the humanists had curricular time and methods of teaching the languages so that their students did become able

to read the literature as literature rather than as a few selected paragraphs to be decoded. Under the influence of Ciceronianism in the more narrow humanistic education of the later Renaissance, and later on under the disciplinary theory of education, the study of the classics was largely turned into a struggle with language and an interest in form. It gave all the curricular time allotted to the classics to these pursuits rather than to the efficient assimilation of the significant ideas; and consequently in many schools the study of Latin and Greek ceased to impart a pattern of living. But now, after the more alert classicists have recognized the magnitude of the forces against their efforts to teach the ancient languages, by devising the courses in cultural history and in the literature in translation they have come back once more to the objectives of the liberal education of the earlier Renaissance. Through a different medium, the vernacular, they are teaching classical literature, civilization, and culture, with methods devised to induce the students to discover the significant ideas they contain. And their purpose is to produce intelligent and good citizens capable of benefiting American society—and that of the world—in the modern circumstances in which our country finds herself. They are manifestly aware that these circumstances require world-mindedness in our leaders, that is, a sympathetic understanding of the histories and cultures of other nations and races besides our own. Many of these teachers fain would teach the Latin language if they could. But they realistically acknowledge that in the curricular time available (often only six to fifteen semester hours), they cannot impart both skill in the Latin language and an adequate knowledge of classical literature and culture.

Omission of the Latin Language from Plans of Modernized Liberal Education

Another development should be considered which has militated against the wide use of the Latin language as an instrument in imparting liberal education to youth. After it ceased to be studied for practical use, its efficiency as a means of mental training and of culture also declined. A large percentage of the pupils lacked spontaneous and strong motivation; consequently, they did not study it well, that is, unto mastery. Their study became chiefly a wrestling with language rather than an absorbing of important ideas. While language is the instrument by which

ideas are communicated, its study does not necessarily entail the communication of such ideas in any noteworthy quantity, or in a quantity sufficiently great to furnish a pattern of living; and it is the ideas themselves which are the important constituents of liberal education. The result is that the philosophers, writers, and educators both Catholic and non-Catholic who are bringing liberal education abreast of the modern era with its world-wide needs are omitting the Latin language from their plans for the secondary curriculum and for the undergraduate curriculum in college. Examples in point are most of the programs of general education mentioned above (pages 230, 231), the members of the Harvard Committee on General Education, and Professor Jacques Maritain.¹⁹ In place of the Latin language they are substituting much ancient literature in translation, because the ideas of the ancients can thus be acquired with greater ease, interest, quantity, and accuracy in the time available in the curriculum.

The Necessity of Latin for Catholic Scholars

However, in the Catholic Church a truly great quantity of our doctrine and our culture has been deposited in Latin. Therefore, there will always be need of capable Latin scholars in the

¹⁹ See Maritain, J., *Education at the Crossroads*, Ch. 3, especially pp. 68-70. Some might think that his remarks apply only to American education. But the teachers of Latin in France are in a situation very similar to that in America, or will be so within a few decades. This can be readily seen through a perusal of J. Perret's *Latin et Culture*, Paris, Desclee de Brouwer, after 1945, especially pp. 61-67, "La déplorable situation présente." More recently Father François de Dainville, S.J., has written in his excellent article "Culture, Technique et Spécialisation," *Etudes*, 86e année, Sept., 1953, pp. 158-171, Oct., 1953, pp. 45-54, on p. 47. "At the same time that the adolescent is gaining the progressive mastery of the art of thinking, he will acquire this understanding of man without which there is no culture. The vision of man which classical humanism offers is without doubt incomplete, not only from the Christian viewpoint, but even, from the human, and consequently it ought to be enlarged! Yet it is incontrovertible that the classical humanities excel in awakening this understanding of human nature, and for that very reason retain a permanent value. Nevertheless, it is a fact that today the majority of youths who aspire to culture, as a result of their not knowing the Latin and Greek languages, or of knowing them insufficiently, are unable to gain the riches of classical antiquity through them.

Therefore, is there not reason to be resigned to having recourse to translations in order to assure these youths at least the partial benefit of this contact? Furthermore, did not our own teachers supplement their necessarily limited explanations of text by means of copious readings from translations? A humanist like Father Louis Laurand, S.T., went so far as to recommend to his students the reading of Homer in the translation of Leconte de Lisle. He said that it contained abundant contradictions, but made it possible, better than any other, to enter into the spirit of Homer's poetry." (Translation and italics mine).

Church, just as there will always be need of such scholars of Greek and of Hebrew. The branches which are related to this heritage must be kept abreast of ever developing science. One can scarcely become a competent scholar of the doctrine and cultural tradition of Catholicism unless he has some knowledge of Latin.

Hence, it seems important that the Latin language retain a place at least somewhere in the curriculum of Catholic education. If Latin is to succeed in doing this, the philosophy of its function in a modern curriculum of liberal education must be completely and profoundly rethought, on a thoroughly realistic basis which takes full account of modern needs, modern circumstances, and the trend of development in the fortunes of Latin for the past three centuries. That rethinking must take full account of the true causes of the decline in the study of Latin as a language. To mistake symptoms for causes, or to fumble with means while we are neither clear about our ends nor convinced of their values in the modern world, cannot lead to remedial procedures of lasting success.

Much discussion indeed will be necessary before a workable plan can be devised. Scarcely a start has been made even in recognizing the true problem, and much less in devising a solution. It even seems probable that if Latin is to be kept in use with any practicality and efficiency as the universal language of the Church, it will have to be made once more an easy, living language. It will have to be taught chiefly as a facile medium of communication, somewhat as it was in the thirteenth century.

Among the populace thirteen or fourteen centuries ago, ancient Latin developed into the Romance languages. Among the educated, it developed into the facile Latin used by most of the medieval writers in their works of theology, philosophy, literature, diplomacy, correspondence, and accentual verse. Among both groups, this development was a natural growth in the direction of greater ease both in expression and comprehension of thought and emotion. What the Ciceronians have been doing for the past 500 years is an attempt to reverse this natural growth by returning to a studied, difficult, and rather artificial style which turned both expression and comprehension into studied, laborious processes. By their virtuosity, which required such long years to acquire, they sometimes won the admiration of a small group of kindred-minded savants. But with the populace

at large and the practical-minded administrators in government or education, the Ciceronian Latinists were fighting against the natural tendencies of intellectual beings to devise more efficient procedures. Consequently, they have had no more chance of success in the long run than those who attempt to reverse the tides of the seas.

In the 1920's a movement grew strong to set up an international language which would serve the same purposes which Latin served in the thirteenth century. The scholarly professor Roland G. Kent pleaded the case that Latin be chosen as this language. He wrote a practical monograph, *Latin as the International Auxiliary Language*,²⁰ in which he wisely pointed out that if there was to be hope of Latin being chosen, it would have to be simplified and taught quite as it was during its employment as a living language in the Middle Ages. He gave some wise suggestions for accomplishing this. He visited many Catholic seminaries because he knew that Latin was still used there as the language of the classroom in philosophy and theology. He thought that he might find cases where the old methods or some modern improvements of them were used with success, and that he could set these up as models. But to his surprise and disappointment, he found that the seminaries, too, were using the modern methods which aim more at imparting scientific knowledge about language rather than skill in its use.

Efforts of Classical Teachers to Adjust to Modern Times

It can well be admitted that in their objectives and methods some teachers of the classics have been unimaginative traditionalists who have tried to maintain what was growing obsolete. Every branch of knowledge has some devotees of this type. But it can also be said that in general no group of teachers has displayed greater zeal, ingenuity, and energy in trying to adapt their branch to modern circumstances than the teachers of the classics. They have practiced without fear a voluntary self-criticism of the most searching kind. The *Classical Investigation* of 1923, and numerous articles in periodicals since then, are evidence of the fact. They have willingly accepted criticism and suggestions from outside their group, and reduced what they

²⁰ It first appeared as an article in the *Classical Journal*, Vol. 18, no. 1 (Oct., 1922), pp. 38-44, and was spread widely in reprint form by the American Classical League.

could of these to practice. Not infrequently they devised ingenious measures, but these were blocked because in many American schools the decisions of moment are made by educationalists administrators while the professors of long experience who do the actual teaching in an academic field are allowed little or no voice in the formulation of policies or the revising of the curriculum.²¹ Administrators of this type are as much to be blamed as teachers too complacent in comfortable routine for the fact that liberal education is constantly in danger of degenerating into a technique, and then of becoming fossilized in an educational legalism.

Despite all their efforts, the teachers of the classics have not succeeded in making an adaptation to modern times in such a way that they have saved the Latin language as an instrument of widespread importance in the education of youth. Why? The reason must be that in the trend of history these teachers have had and still have against them forces too great to overcome. They cannot reverse the river of history and make it flow uphill. During the past few decades, when at least the more progressive among them realized how great these forces are, they devised means of obtaining the important ideas from classical times through courses in cultural history and in classical literature in translation. Throughout its history, the Western World has been content to rely on the Latin translation of the Hebrew or Greek originals to obtain its knowledge of Scripture; and in more recent centuries it has turned to vernacular translations. In every generation only a handful of men could or would learn the Hebrew and Greek well enough to read the original texts with accuracy and ease. In the field of secular literature, to obtain its knowledge of Greek and Roman culture the Western World is now adopting this same procedure of employing translations.

Are the true and major causes which have brought the decline of the Latin language in the imparting of liberal education forces so great that they cannot be controlled even by the decrees or appeals of educational administrators, or kings, or a

²¹ In *Educational Wastelands*, Professor Arthur E. Bestor ably presents the origin of this unfortunate situation which arose in the early twentieth century, its history, its present prevalence, and its bad effect upon true education. Especially important is Chapter 7, "Interlocking Directorate of Professional Educationists," pp. 101-121.

For a concrete illustration of the process of degeneration, see Kane, *op. cit.*, pp. 140-142, cited below in footnote 7 of Appendix 3, on p. 264.

General of the Society of Jesus, or the Holy Father himself? There are some who think that they are, since many of these persons in high authority have tried,²² but have succeeded scarcely better than the teachers. Even when administrators are convinced of some cause, they can hold out only for a time against a strong trend of the people at large.

The American Jesuit high schools have striven valiantly and with noteworthy success to preserve the teaching of the Latin language. While so many other high schools have followed John Dewey and the prophets of progressive education who drained so much of the discipline of mind out of American secondary education, the Jesuit high schools have continued to impart a vigorous mental training through English, Latin, Greek, modern languages, religion, mathematics, and sciences. Despite the general decline, Latin has held its own fairly well in these Jesuit high schools. And their graduates are fortunate to have had the the training in Latin which they received there. For even when taught—but thoroughly taught—according to the modern methods, Latin does bring to the student a knowledge of word-meanings, grammar, and of the structure and use of language which helps him to use English well. This knowledge could indeed be imparted in classes of English itself. But all too frequently in modern American education, English is not taught with such objectives in view, and Latin supplies for this defect. In any case, the knowledge of a pupil's vernacular is improved through study of the grammar of another language.

Yet Jesuit high schools are only a small minority, and valiant as their effort has been, it has not changed the trend in the decline of Latin as a language in American secondary education. Hence, the Jesuit high schools too must expect that their struggle to preserve Latin will become more difficult as it continues to vanish from the other non-Catholic and even Catholic high schools. As the generations pass the number of parents who have had and appreciate a training in Latin will grow less, and it may

²² Springhetti, A., S.J., in "Lingua Latina Gloria Sacerdotum," *Monitor Ecclesiasticus*, Vol. 76, n. 4 (1951), pp. 662-664, refers to or cites these popes and councils who have tried to bolster Latin during the past century and a half: Leo XII, August 28, 1824; Pius IX, March 21 1853; Leo XIII, May 20, 1885 and September 8, 1899; Pius X, July 1908-Benedict XV, October 9, 1921; Pius XI, August 1, 1922 and October 20, 1924; Pius XII, September 23, 1951; also, the provincial councils of Tours (1849), Avignon (1849), Bordeaux (1850), Sicily (1850), Westminster (1859), and thirty other provincial councils of various nations held between 1849 and 1868.

become harder to persuade students or their parents of the value of studying Latin.

In the hope of maintaining the falling enrollment in Latin, some administrators in the colleges which still required it for the degree of Bachelor of Arts devised new species of the degree of Bachelor. The desire to obtain a Bachelor of Arts rather than a supposedly inferior degree called the Bachelor of Philosophy was expected to attract students to take Latin. But after a few decades, almost all the students were found to be taking the new degree.

It was almost a century ago that, as was mentioned on page 223, Father Peter Beckx, General of the Society of Jesus from 1853 to 1883, deplored the passing of the direct method of teaching Latin from Jesuit schools in these words:

The neglect of this method has brought about this result. Nowadays small indeed is the number of those who after completing their studies in the secondary school possess any facility, not merely in expressing their thoughts by writing or speaking Latin, but even in comprehending Latin authors.²³

However, his words have brought no change in the objectives or methods of teaching Latin. Neither have they changed the trend of history. Since then, whether from external constraint or their own volition, Jesuit schools in Europe as well as in America have followed the trend of the times in the methods of teaching Latin.

Similarly, almost a quarter of a century has passed since Pope Pius XI wrote his strong words on the teaching of Latin in his encyclical, which was addressed to the universal Church. Yet

²³ Cited by McGucken, *op. cit.*, on p. 199, with the Latin on p. 214, taken from Passard, F. X., S.J., *La Pratique du Ratio Studiorum pour les Colleges*, Paris, 1896: "Hac methodo neglecta, factum est ut exiguus nunc temporis sit numerus eorum qui absolutis gymnasii studiis, non dicam cogitata sua scripto vel voce latine exprimendi, sed etiam latinis auctores intelligendi aliqua facilitate polleant."

However, attention should be called here to the fact that the direct method of teaching Latin, to be successful, must be carried through in a well planned syllabus for at least four semesters under truly capable teachers, so that the student will finish with both ready skill in using Latin and with thorough, accurate knowledge of its grammar. For mature students, the syllabi of the courses in modern Indo-European languages at the Institute of Languages and Linguistics of Georgetown University would be apt models. Unskilled use of the direct method results in a fiasco in which the students gain neither skill in the language nor discipline. A very sage treatment of this subject is that in *The Classical Investigation, Part One, General Report*, pp. 233-235.

there seem to be only a few instances in America where experimental effort is under way towards restoring to the classroom the methods which he praised so highly.

Only time can tell whether or not the true and major causes of the decline in the use of the Latin language, and of its function as an instrument of liberal education, are too great to be controlled. If they are, the only wise procedure is to devise ways and means of adjusting ourselves to them. To continue to play the ostrich which thinks itself safe because it ignores the real problems and dangers is probably the surest procedure to hasten the demise of the Latin language in the curriculum of Catholic liberal education. If history shows that under the pattern of Latin teaching in use since the latter half of the nineteenth century Latin has been continually dying, then it is imperative at least to experiment with another pattern. To strive with might and main to accomplish something which is worthy though difficult is noble. But to exhaust one's energies in a hopeless attempt to do what history shows to be impossible is to fail in the virtue of prudence.

Trends of Catholic Thought Which Will Affect Latin

There are also several other factors which require consideration. What does the fairly near future hold for Latin as the language of the Church? We can observe at least five trends of thought which exist in various groups or administrative offices of the Church. We must be aware of them if we are to have the perspective necessary to guard ourselves against serious mistakes in efforts to adjust to the times.

One trend is that found among the professors of philosophy and theology in many seminaries. Regarding Latin chiefly as a means of communicating thought, they are writing and teaching in a simple, clear, easily intelligible style. Their attention and that of their hearers or readers is on what they have to communicate, rather than on form or diction. Their practice is similar to that of medieval Latinists like St. Thomas Aquinas. There seems to be no group of men on earth among whom Latin is surviving better, or has better prospects for the future.

Another trend is that existing in a group of Italian Latinists in Rome who are associated with His Excellency Bishop Antonio Bacci, Papal Secretary of Latin Letters to Important Persons.

Many of these are engaged in the work of translating documents composed in the vernacular into Latin of the curial style which we find in the encyclicals or other documents which appear in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*. Observing that the fortunes of Latin have fallen very low in modern times,²⁴ these Latinists are bending every effort to restore its use in that elegant style of the Renaissance which they highly admire. Towards this end Bishop Bacci has published two Books,²⁵ and inaugurated *Latinitas*, a quarterly review written in Ciceronian Latin. The ideals of this group of scholars are so lofty that if they are to be realized, well over half the curricular time of students for at least ten years will have to be devoted to Latin, and many subjects introduced within the past century or two will have to be eliminated.²⁶ As far as I know, these Latinists have not as yet proposed any practical plans for this, or, at least, any which educational administrators have begun to put into practice. Also—as these Latinists seem to be aware²⁷—most bishops and other administrators of the Church in various countries find the time and effort required to read

24 “*Latinitatis commentaries conficere qui hac eadem lingua compositi, certis temporibus in lucem prodeant, res videri potest non modo perardua, sed nostrae etiam aetati non consentanea, cum pauci hodie sint inter doctos quoque viros, qui eos digne scribendi facultate polleant; non multi vero, qui eos legendi studio ac voluntate sint praediti.*” Bacci, A., in “*De Horum Commentariorum Ratione ac Proposito,*” *Latinitas*, Vol. 1, no. 1 (Jan. 1953), p.3.

25 Bacci, A., *Varia Latinitatis Scripta*; Vol. 1, *Inscriptiones, Orationes, Epistolae*; Romae, Typis Vaticanis, 1944; Vol. 2, *Lexicon Eorum Vocabulorum Quae Difficilius Latine Redduntur*.

26 Springhetti, A., S.J., “*Lingua Latina Gloria Sacerdotum.*” *Monitor Ecclesiasticus*, Vol. 76, no. 4, pp. 659-676, esp. p. 660: “*Quibus de causis latina amandetur, contemnatur. . . . Prima igitur ratio cur latina lingua negligatur ac iaceat, ponenda est in ipsius ignorantia. Mutata est ratio studendi latinitati: non usus habetur sermonis latini in scholis, . . . Tot insuper aliis obruitur ac pene suffocatur disciplinis tenera auditorum mens, ut non iam tempus sufficiens inveniant ad ea quae audiverint ruminanda, memoria figenda, degustanda. . . .*” See also pp. 665, 667: “*Quomodo latina lingua est instauranda? . . . Videndum igitur est quomodo in litterarum scholis potiores partes sint latinae graecaeque linguis tribuendae, aliaeque res contrahendae vel ita disponendae ut illis non officiant.*” Father Springhetti has also published a very helpful book: *Selecta Latinitatis Scripta Auctorum Recentium* (Saec. XV-XX), Romae, Gregorian University Press, 1951.

27 For example, one writer of this group, Father Springhetti, laments (in *Monitor Ecclesiasticus*, Vol. 76, no. 4, p. 661) that when an encyclical or other document appears in its customary elegant Ciceronian Latin, many priests exclaim: “*Epistolae Summi Pontificis, oh quant difficilis Latinitatis sunt, quant impeditae! Attendenda est in actis diurnis interpretatio vernacula.*” If this holds true of the priests of Italy, it applies even more in countries where the language is not a direct descendant of Latin. I have learned of one Bishop who referred to Latin of the curial style as “*corkscrew Latin.*”

documents written in this elegant Latin so great that to do it requires the sacrifice of hours and even days which they feel should be devoted to their ministry and other work which they deem more important. The difficulties to be overcome by Bishop Bacci and his associates are indeed formidable, but they are showing an undaunted zeal to overcome them.

A third trend of thought, which probably reflects the opinions of papal consultors from the Sacred Congregation on Seminaries, appears in the encyclical of His Holiness Pope Pius XII *On Promoting the Sanctity of the Priestly Life*.

When young men, especially those who have been received into a seminary at an early age, are educated in an environment too isolated from contact with the world, they may find it difficult on leaving the seminary to deal with ordinary people as well as with the educated laity, and it often happens that they treat the faithful inconsiderately or judge their own training unfavorably. Therefore, care should be taken that the students gradually and prudently come to understand the inmost thoughts and interests of the people, lest they do not know how to act when they have been ordained and assigned to their duties. . . .

We desire that the literary and scientific education of future priests should at least not be inferior to that of laymen who take similar courses of study. If this is provided for, a better intellectual training of the students will be assured, and the choice of subjects for the priesthood at the proper time will be facilitated. Under these circumstances, when a student comes to deliberate about his future state of life he would be entirely free from all restraint. There would be no danger at all that he would not have sufficient education for secular occupations. He would not be forced to enter upon a life for which he is not prepared.

In training seminarians, thorough knowledge of many branches is required, and among them social studies are of great importance today, yet most stress is to be laid upon philosophical and theological courses according to the method of the Angelic Doctor.²⁸

If these directives are to be put into practice, it is difficult to see how the modern subjects can be eliminated from the curric-

²⁸*Menti Nostrae*. in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Vol. 42 (1950), pp. 657-702) esp. pp. 687, 688; tr. by Puhl, L. T., S.T., in *On Promoting the Sanctity of the Priestly Life*, St. Meinrad, Indiana, Grail Press, 1951, pp. 43-44.

ulum even of seminarians. Hence, this trend of thought forms one more difficulty militating against the success of the hopes of Bishop Bacci and his associates. For obviously the additional curricular time cannot be given to Latin and Greek unless something else is displaced.

Fourth, in the Church today, there is a steadily growing trend of opinion in favor of the use of the vernacular languages in the liturgy, in order that the faithful may take a more active and intelligent part in the sacred ceremonies.²⁹ Those who write in favor of such a practice are well aware that it would not be an innovation, but rather a return to the ancient practice of the Church when she won her greatest missionary successes. St. Paul was a Hebrew. Yet, when he carried the faith to the Greek-speaking world, he spoke and wrote in Greek, and celebrated the liturgy in it. His other companions in preaching the Gospel did the same. When the Church was establishing herself in Borne, for a century or more she retained Greek as her language because she was working chiefly with the Greek-speaking groups in Borne. But when she found herself occupied more and more with those whose mother-tongue was Latin she made their vernacular the language of the Mass and the Sacraments. Today, the Holy See, recognizing the value of the vernacular in the liturgy, has rightfully stated that she alone is empowered to grant permission to use it, but she has done nothing to check the prevalent discussion of this question by Catholic writers.

The use of the Latin language, customary in a considerable portion of the Church, is a manifest and beautiful sign of unity, as well as an effective antidote for any corruption of doctrinal truth. In spite of this, the use of the mother tongue in connection with several of the rites may be of much advantage to the people. But the Apostolic See alone is empowered to grant this permission.³⁰

The fifth trend of thought now important to us emanates from those interested in the missionary activities of the Church. It is a new insistence on the ancient truth: the mission of the Church is to spread the Faith rather than a culture. In other words, she

²⁹ For an objective presentation of arguments for and against such use of the vernacular in the liturgy, see Schmidt, H. A. P., S.J., "The Problem of Languages in Liturgy," *Worship*, Vol. 26, no. 6 (May, 1952), pp. 276-292; no. 7 (June, 1952), pp. 342-349; also for other samples of such discussion see *Worship*, Vol. 26, index, s.v. vernacular.

³⁰ *The Encyclical Mediator Dei* (Nov. 20, 1947), English tr. in *The Catholic Mind*, Vol. 46, no. 1026 (June, 1948), p.343.

does not desire the acceptance of the Gospel to be conditioned by a previous or simultaneous acceptance of a cultural pattern. St. Paul, a Hebrew, did not try to make his Greek-speaking groups of neophytes give up their ways of living and thinking for those of the Hebrews, nor did the Church require any such substitution from her converts in the Roman Empire. Rather, St. Paul adapted himself to their ways by making himself all things to all men, and the early Church followed³¹ the principles which he so clearly expressed. The Jesuit missionaries of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, true to Ignatius' spirit of adaptation of circumstances of time and place, made great efforts to put St. Paul's principles into practice. Amid the controversies about the Chinese rites in the sixteenth century, the Church stated anew the ancient truth that the task of the Church is to spread the Faith rather than a culture,³² but it long remained a dead letter. However, it is receiving repeated and clarifying affirmation in pronouncements of our modern Popes about the missions.³³

Even though the United States is no longer officially classified as a missionary country, this principle has its application here. The vast majority of educated Americans are practical persons who regard the chief purpose of prose to be the clear, accurate, and readily intelligible expression of thought. Except for occasional isolated instances, it will be impossible to bring them in numbers to revert to the cultural tastes of the Renaissance, with its exaltation of form at the expense of content, and of complicated Ciceronian sentences at the expense of ease of understanding. If those in the United States interested in adapting Catholic liberal education to our circumstances of time and place should devote much of their curricular space to such an effort, by that very fact they would have to sacrifice matters of far greater importance; and even so, in the long run their efforts would fail to evoke in the students the spontaneous interest without which liberal education will not be effective.

³¹ I Cor. 9, 19-23.

³² *Collectanea Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide*, 1907 I p 42 N. 135, quoted in *Civiltà Cattolica*, quad. 2066, 2067, 2068 (Aug. 15' 1936) pp. 279-291. The principle is reaffirmed and developed by Pope Pius XII in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Vol. 31, no. 13 (Oct 1939), pp. 210; Vol. 36, no. 7 (July, 1944), pp. 210; Vol. 43 no. 11 (July 1951), pp. 521-524.

³³ See D'Elia P. M. S.J. "Gli Araldi del Vangelo," in *Civiltà Cattolica*, quaderno 2433 (Nov. 3, 1951), pp. 241-252, esp. pp. 247-250.

The Function of Latin in the Modern Catholic College

In the light of the history of Latin teaching through the past six centuries, of those five trends of thought in the modern Church, and of the trend of the growing interest in classical culture on the part of the professors and students in the non-Catholic colleges and universities, what should be the place and function of Latin in the curriculum of a Catholic college in America today?

Probably no one person now knows a complete answer to that question. The chief hope in writing this appendix has been to point up problems which must be realistically faced and which will require abundant discussion—and also experimentation—before solutions can be found which will have a chance to work out successfully in practice. Hence, I do not pretend to answer that question, but I can venture some statements which I think should receive serious consideration in such discussion.

First, the major objective of teaching the classics on the college level should be what Father Castiello has aptly called complete cultural contact with the classics.³⁴ By that, he means vital contact, not with one or another lone feature of Greek or Latin, such as its grammar, or its literary form, or its philosophy, but rather with the whole culture of the Greeks and Romans—their life, history, law, politics, art, literature, philosophy, rhetoric, scientific ideas, plus contact with the methods of study required to learn the chief developments in all these fields. If collegians are enabled to gain a good introductory knowledge of the movements which arose in these areas and of their interplay, they will by that very fact be acquiring skill to grapple intelligently with similar problems of the present—and to do that with proper perspective. They will be studying the past not for the sake of the past or of mere erudition (which is barren), but for the sake of the present, that is, to deal capably with the vital problems of today.

Second, if such complete cultural contact is set up as our goal, we must be realistic in our thinking and must devise adequate means to attain the goal within the curricular time available. Consider the example of a graduate of an ordinary American high

³⁴ Castiello, J., S.J., "The Psychology of Classical Training," *Thought*, Vol. 10, no. 4 (March, 1936), pp. 632-654, esp. 640-645; also, Castiello, J., *ST, A Humane Psychology of Education*, pp. 167-194.

school who has fifteen semester hours of college work to devote to classics. His program consists of something like this. He studies grammar, and decodes one speech of Cicero, several books of Vergil, and an equivalent number of "lines" in other authors for three or four semesters. Can that student be said to have a program adequate to give him a complete cultural contact with the classics? An affirmative answer would be absurd.

Suppose that because of exigencies of curricular time some portions of this complete cultural contact must be omitted. (Father Castiello's apt example of the pyramids of knowledge³⁵ should not be overlooked.) Which should be sacrificed, the grammar or the literature? That is, in the case of collegians, should everything else be sacrificed in favor of the elements of language and grammar which should have been learned in high school, and which were learned by the eleven-year-old boys in Ignatius' day? If this is done, are we not reducing the quality of college training to that of the secondary or even elementary level? Or, should we attempt to provide the complete cultural contact even at the sacrifice of the elements of Latin grammar?

It is possible and practical to set up complete cultural contact with the classics as the goal for truly large numbers of the students of a Catholic college of liberal arts—perhaps even for the majority of them, and not alone the tiny minority who study the Latin language in college. For many years now such programs have been in operation in reputable non-Catholic (and some Catholic) American universities and colleges, with satisfying results. We Catholics have even more reason than the non-Catholics to love the literature and art of Greece and Rome, since they form the cultural framework of our Faith.

Third, we must provide suitably for the minority of students who truly desire to learn the Latin language in college. What of them? There is a tendency now to give them the impression that with their preparation in high school they are attaining in six to fifteen semester hours of college Latin almost all the "applicative, disciplinary, and cultural" objectives listed in the Report of the Classical Investigation of 1924. But one who aims simultaneously at twenty or thirty targets is not likely to hit any one effectively. It seems that it would be better to simplify the objectives to one goal which is attainable within the time available:

³⁵ Castiello, "The Psychology of Classical Training," *Thought* Vol. 10 pp. 645, 646.

mastery of the Latin language to such an extent that the student can use it with ease as a tool when his courses have ceased, in such matters as comprehending with ease the Latin Missal, or St. Thomas' *Summa Theologiae*, or modern Latin reference books in philosophy, theology, or Scripture, or in verifying in the original language statements which books or professors make about an author or his meaning.

In the case of seminarians, a set of apt objectives has recently been set by Pope Pius XII: every priest should know how to speak and read Latin with ease; and those who can may well learn elegance of style. His remarks to the delegates to the Carmelite Congress in Rome on Sept. 23, 1951, should be far better known:

Alas, the Latin language, the glory of priests, now has rather few devotees, and even they are constantly languishing. . . . Let there be no priest who does not know how to speak and read it easily and quickly. Beyond this, may there arise among you some neither mediocre nor few who can write it even in a compressed and elegant style of speech.³⁶

This appeal of Pope Pius XII that all seminarians should learn how to speak and read Latin with facility squares perfectly with the appeal of Pope Pius XI for a restoration of the teaching methods of medieval or Renaissance times. A great opportunity is here opened to the teachers of Latin in the seminaries. For there the students have the same motives as medieval pupils to learn how to speak, read, and write Latin in order to use it after its study in school is completed.

Conclusion

In discussion such as that outlined above, those who love Latin for whatever cause may well find a guiding star in Ignatius' outlook on Latin and its function in a curriculum of liberal education. The evidence to be found in his writings shows that the chief value which he saw in Latin was its use as a means to learn and to disseminate Catholic truth. He also saw its value to train the intellectual powers, and the value of Ciceronian literary graces, especially for complying with the tastes of the men of his era; but he would not sacrifice higher values for these which were secondary. In other words, he regarded Latin

³⁶ *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Vol. 43 (Oct. 1951, pp. 734-738, esp. 737.

chiefly as a medium of communication for obtaining and diffusing the important ideas which make up an educated Catholic's outlook on life.³⁷ That outlook was the end of Ignatius' system of liberal education, and the Latin language was a means—indeed, in his day an indispensable means. But he was not likely to become so confused as to put the means in place of the end, or to sacrifice the end for the sake of the means. Such a procedure seems foreign to his character.

³⁷ See *Cons.*, p.4, c.12, n.2, along with his statements found in *MHSI*, *Mon Ignat.*, ser. 1, *Epist.*, tom. 1, pp. 519-526, and cited above, pp. 154-156.