Ad Astra Per Magistras: The Need for Critical Pedagogy in Secondary Latin Textbooks and Classrooms

By:
Carina Leung

Advised By:
Professor Curtis Dozier

A thesis submitted to the Department of Greek and Roman Studies in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of

Bachelor of Arts
Vassar College
April 27, 2022

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my deepest gratitude for everyone who has supported me in the process of writing this thesis.

First, I would like to thank my thesis advisor Professor Curtis Dozier for his advice and support throughout the completion of this senior project and for his mentorship throughout my years at Vassar College. I have learned and grown in innumerable ways under your guidance, and working with you has been a highlight of my college career. Thank you for your kindness and for your tireless efforts to advance the field of classics in the direction of social justice.

My heartfelt thanks to Grace Curcio and Lana Sum for eight years of love, care, and guidance, for introducing me to Latin, and for sharing your teaching practices with me for this thesis. You both saw potential in me before I saw it in myself and fostered growth within me even after I finished my time in your classrooms. Thank you for constantly inspiring me to become a loving educator in all ways.

I would also like to thank Evan Armacost and Alexander Paras for their time and willingness to share their work of critical pedagogical practices in their own Latin classrooms. Your work gives me hope for the future of classics.

In addition, thank you to the Vassar College Department of Greek and Roman Studies for fostering a critical, socially just approach to studying Greco-Roman antiquity and the Vassar College Department of Education for their boundless commitment to teaching critical pedagogical practices. My time under your tutelage has inspired me to write this thesis.

Finally, I would like to thank my family, friends, and partner for their endless love, support, and encouragement in all that I do. This thesis and my education at Vassar College would not have been possible without you. I am forever grateful for all of you in my life.

maximas gratias vobis ago

Introduction

A recent headline in *The Telegraph*, a British Conservative news publication, bids farewell to a well known character in the Latin-learning world—"Vale, Caecilius: Cambridge Latin textbook rewritten because Roman banker had a slave." Nodding nostalgically to the end of an era for "generations of Latin scholars," the article expresses disdain and outrage for recent calls from progressive educators to transform the Latin storyline of the *Cambridge Latin Course* textbooks because of its problematic depiction of enslavement and women in the ancient world (Simpson 2022). It references Steven Hunt, a Latin professor at Cambridge University who has been calling for the textbook, which has been largely unedited for decades, to abandon the plot that centers wealthy, elite Roman men and update it to fit modern student needs.

I was introduced to Caecilius and his family during my first year as a Latin student in high school. Many of us grew attached to the storyline of this family in ancient Pompeii, and I was especially fond of Quintus, Caecilius's son. The stories of Cambridge Latin Course accompanied my Latin journey all the way into my third year of high school. But as much as the storyline entertained my Latin classmates and me, it failed to portray the ancient world in a critical light. Though I did not piece it together at the time, *Cambridge Latin Course* reinforces a myopic image of the ancient world as one of white, wealthy, elitist men. They glorified Rome and the western legacy they left behind, leaving little to no room for anyone outside those categories. For 21st century Latin classrooms, these textbooks do not reflect their audiences, and they uphold a problematic perspective of the ancient world: one that sanitizes violence, silences marginalized voices, minimizes the brutality of enslavement, and glorifies imperialism.

I thoroughly enjoyed Latin throughout my secondary education. However, as time went on and I developed my sense of identity as a young Asian American woman, I felt a deep sense of cognitive dissonance while studying and loving this supposed foundation of western civilization–a message that was widely pushed by *Cambridge* in its discussion of Rome and its enduring legacy. My Latin teachers were two caring and inspiring Asian women, and under their guidance and support, I started to see the ways in which the study of Latin could and should be critical, especially as they inspired me to have a classroom of my own.

When I was looking to study classics at the collegiate level, I admired how Vassar's Greek and Roman Studies Department emphasized the importance of a critical study of Greco-Roman antiquity. Over the last four years, I've come to develop a deeper understanding of Greece and Rome, as well as its reception throughout history. I've come to learn about the historical connections between classics and white supremacy and elitism, and more importantly, how current classical scholars can and should confront, combat, and refuse to perpetuate it even further.

As I formulated potential routes for my senior Greek and Roman Studies thesis, I found myself turning back to the place where my Latin journey started: secondary textbooks meant for middle and high school Latin classrooms. These books accompany thousands of students for the initial years of their Latin education; they are often the primary access they have to the ancient world. And though some characters may be memorable parts of their Latin education, the books do not teach about the ancient world with justice. The issues go deeper than representation of enslaved people within the plot of the textbook; the sections that teach about Roman culture and history grossly misrepresent

the lives of ancient marginalized groups. Though some of the publications have recently promised updates, it will be years before any new editions of these textbooks come out, and even then, they may not end up being as critical and progressive as we may have hoped. Therefore, I decided to use my senior thesis to imagine what current Latin teachers who utilize these textbooks could do to combat all of its issues.

This thesis has two aims. First, it addresses the issues of representation found within the *Cambridge Latin Course* and *Ecce Romani* secondary Latin textbooks, particularly surrounding enslavement and Roman imperialism. Second, it highlights and recommends ways in which current and future Latin educators who utilize these textbooks in their teaching can incorporate critical pedagogical practices to create a more inclusive, equitable, and critical Latin classroom.

Grounded in the work of Kelly Dugan on representations of enslavement in Latin textbooks, the first chapter surveys both *Cambridge Latin Course* and *Ecce Romani* for its problematic representation and sanitization of ancient slavery. The second chapter of this thesis analyzes both textbooks' treatment of Roman imperialism and representations of conquered Indigenous groups through Nyström's colonial masterplot theory. These two chapters trace the issues within coverage of ancient slavery and Roman imperialism in contemporary Latin textbooks and illustrate the great need to revise them. The third chapter proposes key components of critical pedagogical practices and ideas to incorporate into a critical Latin classroom, including examples from several contemporary Latin teachers who strive for equitable education and my own ideas informed by my educational training at the adolescent level. I conclude the thesis with two examples of lesson plans that

illustrate what a class period that incorporates the critical, marginalized voices centered approach detailed in the third chapter may look like.

The goal of this thesis is to address one aspect of the current state of secondary education—problematic and uncritical textbook portrayals and coverage—and to suggest potential avenues for Latin teachers to consider. This work is for the Latin students who deserve and crave a critical and social justice oriented approach to Greco-Roman antiquity but rarely get it from traditional Latin classroom practices. My study of Latin would have been much more fruitful and fulfilling if these were incorporated into every aspect from the very beginning. Perhaps I would not have had the levels of cognitive dissonance and identity struggle, which arose from the whitewashed narratives of classics and the erasure of diverse perspectives, if I had felt included and that what I studied mattered in bettering the world for marginalized people. Despite my adolescent enjoyment of the *Cambridge* storyline, I would gladly say goodbye to Caecilius and close the pages on this chapter of exclusivity and inaccessibility in Latin textbooks if it means Latin students would feel a better sense of purpose and belonging in the Latin classroom through more critical and inclusive representation.

Finally, this thesis is the culmination of my years as a Latin student, my training in critical pedagogical theory and practices at Vassar College, and my desires and hopes for a Latin classroom as a teacher in training. The world is changing and evolving, and our field must adapt and progress with it. This thesis is a love letter to those who work tirelessly to transform classics into a more equitable and inclusive field and for every marginalized classics scholar who has and continues to fight their way to make it far.

Chapter 1: Representations of Slavery in Latin Textbooks

Background

When teaching Latin and history of the ancient world, Latin teachers are confronted with the complex task of handling of the subject of ancient slavery. As Parodi notes in her article that examines student perceptions of slavery in relation to the *Cambridge Latin Course*, the topic often arises on the very first day of teaching, when students are asked to translate *servus* as "slave" rather than servant (Parodi 2020, 52). *Cambridge Latin Course* and *Ecce Romani* have both received backlash for their coverage of ancient slavery, and this chapter will examine how both fail to represent the horrors of ancient enslavement accurately, critically, and justly. This chapter will analyze the textbooks' misrepresentation in the following ways: the sanitization ancient slavery by rationalizing slavery as normalized in the ancient world, shifting responsibility from the institution to interpersonal relationships between the enslaved and enslavers, comparisons to American chattel slavery, an emphasis on manumission, common stereotypes of enslaved peoples, the reinforcement of the dehumanization and commodification of enslaved characters, and the sexualization of enslaved women. The combination of these different dimensions of inaccurate or unjust portrayal work together to produce an image of ancient slavery that normalizes leniency as the treatment of ancient enslaved people, absolves responsbility from enslavers, and further dehumanizes the voices of those who had been enslaved even thousands of years later.

Kelly Dugan's dissertation, "Antiracism and Restorative Justice in Classics Pedagogy: Race, Slavery, and the Function of Language in Beginning Greek and Latin Textbooks," has

many useful elements to supplement my thesis, namely that it focuses on the language used to describe slavery in Latin textbooks and dissects the implications that diction and wording can have. Dugan's methodology is more narrow than mine, marking up the passages from the books with "appraisal analysis of the data set using systemic functional linguistics methodology" (Dugan 2020, 79). In other words, Dugan takes the text of the slavery narratives and analyzes them for judgment, affect, graduation, and appreciation imposed onto the slavery narratives by textbook authors. Though I will not follow Dugan's exact methodology, my analysis is similar. In this chapter, I examine the implications and judgments imposed upon narratives of marginalized groups by Latin textbook authors to suggest what kind of message they send to young students about those groups.

The edition of *Cambridge Latin Course* analyzed in this chapter is Unit 1 of the Fifth Edition, which is the most current one published in 2015. For citation purposes, it will be abbreviated to "*CLC I.*" Each unit is broken up into "stages" or chapters. Each stage starts with introductory practice sentences in Latin, usually detailing actions that match the plots of the stories to follow. Then, students are given a short story or two in Latin to read surrounding the events of a Pompeiian household. A section titled "About the Language" follows, in which the grammar concepts are introduced and examples are given. Next comes "Practicing the Language," with a mix of fill in the blank, complete the sentences, and translation questions and exercises. Finally, the culture and history section gives a lesson on an aspect of the Roman world that corresponds with the plot of the story. Caecilius, a wealthy Roman banker, is the main character of the stories of Book 1. Caecilius enslaves several other primary characters, including Grumio, the house cook, and Clemens. Though not a primary character, we are also introduced to Melissa, an enslaved young woman, later

on. These are the characters of the plot whom I will analyze, along with the culture sections on slavery.

The edition of *Ecce Romani* analyzed in this thesis is Book I of the Fourth Edition, which is the most current one published in 2009. Each *Ecce Romani* chapter begins with a story in Latin about the Cornelius family and follows with vocabulary and reading comprehension questions. Next, grammar concepts and explanations are introduced, along with accompanying grammar exercises. The chapter closes with a reading in English about Roman culture, history, or daily life. The primary enslaved character is Davus, a British man enslaved by the Roman Cornelius family. Analysis in this chapter will focus on Davus and the various culture and history sections surrounding ancient enslavement.

The Normalization of Slavery in the Ancient World

From the onset of the story, *Cambridge Latin Course* justifies the normalization of slavery in the ancient world. In the very first stage, Caecilius's life as a wealthy banker and tradesman is attributed to him "[inheriting] some of his money, but he probably made most of it through shrewd and energetic business activities. He dealt in slaves, cloth, timber, and property" (*CLC I* 2015, 8). No further critical engagements are mentioned about his "shrewd and energetic" dealing of enslaved people, who are merely reduced as a way for him to get rich. The passage also fails to mention how free labor itself aided Caecilius and Rome's ability to accumulate wealth, as it both provided an unpaid workforce and allowed humans to be sold as commodities. Later in the reading, the authors briefly mention the practice of slavery in the ancient world: "The slaves who lived and worked in this house

and in his businesses had no rights of their own. They were his property and he could treat them well or badly as he wished. There was one important exception to the rule. The law did not allow him to put a slave to death without showing good reason" (*CLC I* 2015, 9). The statement that slaves could have been "treat[ed]...well or badly as [the master] wished" implies that if an enslaved person suffered abuse and violence, it was due to the personality of individual enslavers they were owned by and not characteristic of the institution and practice of ancient slavery that allows it. It also suggests that not all slaves were treated badly, presenting violent and abusive experiences as the exception. The sentence about the exception of illegal killing of slaves also works to justify the Roman practice of slavery as more rational or lenient than the rest.

Though ancient sources have written about laws that supposedly protected enslavers from killing their enslaved people "without good reason," there are few descriptions of who had the power to decide whether reasons were good or how much these laws actually protected enslaved peoples. Several ancient authors mention these laws, as recalled in the *Cambridge World History of Slavery: Volume I*: "Suetonius further alleged, perhaps inaccurately, that the edict also made an owner who killed his own slave liable to a charge of murder. Hadrian went only so far as to forbid an owner to kill his slave without the judgement of a court, or to sell a slave to a pimp or a *lanista* (gladiator-trainer) without justification…" (Bradley and Cartledge 2011, 433). However, these laws only prohibited acts of murder that could somehow be proven as intentional on the part of the enslavers. Bradley and Cartledge also note that, "In a law that threatens masters with a charge of murder if they kill their slaves intentionally, it is conceded that the former need have no fear if the latter died accidentally as a result of a beating administered with light

rods or lashes…" (Bradley and Cartledge 2011, 488). Murders of enslaved people that resulted from other forms of horrificly violent punishments were accepted under Roman law. How a murder would otherwise be deemed intentional or not or by whom is uncertain, but under such practices, enslavers could easily murder their enslaved people with little to no consequences if they made it seem accidental.

Roman law also decided when enslaved people should be put to death under the *Senatus Consultum Silanianum*, which stated that any enslaved person who fails to protect their enslaver with their own lives would be executed. In Book 4 of *Annals*, Tacitus tells of the case of Pedanius Secundus's murder by an enslaved person of his household upon Pedanius's refusal to grant him a previously agreed upon manumission. The enactment of *Senatus Consultum Silanianum* then required all 400 other enslaved people of the Pedanius household to be tortured and executed because they failed to stop the murder from happening. Though many Roman citizens protested this decision by the Roman Senate, the executions were nevertheless carried out (Hunt 2017, 153). The *Cambridge Latin Course*'s description of enslavement and legal "protection" of enslaved lives fails to mention these crucial details. A Roman enslaver could easily murder the people they enslave and stage it as an accident. Furthermore, under Roman Law, all enslaved people must lay down their own lives for their enslavers—or have it taken away as a consequence.

The culture section dedicated specifically to slavery is divided into an overview of slavery as an institution in the Roman empire, the work and treatment of enslaved people, and the practice and process of freeing an enslaved person. In the first section, the authors do little to condemn the institution. Instead, they paint slavery in the ancient world as

inevitable and unstoppable, writing that, "The Romans and others who lived around the Mediterranean in classical times regarded slavery as a normal and necessary part of life. Even those who realized that it was not a natural state of affairs made no serious attempt to abolish it" (*CLC I* 2015, 78). By suggesting that most people "regarded slavery as a normal and necessary part of life," the authors normalize the practice and encourage students to consider it with neutral judgment—The Romans were not particularly bad for enslaving people or particularly good for freeing them; slavery simply existed as a fact with no judgment value. The closest part of this section to condemning the institution lies in the description of slavery as "not a natural state of affairs," which simply regards the enslavement of human beings as unnatural rather than unjust, dehumanizing, or immoral.

Shifting of Responsibility from Institution to Enslaving Individuals

Rather than discussing ancient slavery as an institution as a whole that allows for the treatment of human beings as property, *Cambridge Latin Course* and *Ecce Romani* portray enslavement as an interpersonal relationship between the enslaved and the enslaver. The textbooks fail to examine the deeply embedded societal institution that commodifies human bodies and instead shifts responsibility to the individual. Such a portrayal ignores the systemic oppression and dehumanization of enslaved peoples that benefits an entire empire, regardless of if a free person enslaved any people or if they treated them with particular kindness. Through this shift, they are able to absolve responsibility from enslavers and blame any cruel treatment on the misfortune of enslaved peoples or the wickedness of individual enslavers.

The authors of *Cambridge Latin Course* sanitize ancient slavery through minimizing the violence and abuse faced by enslaved people at the hands of their enslavers. Both of

these textbooks tend to mention the possibility of physical abuse within enslavement, but they present it as the exception rather than the rule. *Cambridge* authors even attempt to defend why physical abuse would only be faced by a minority of the enslaved population, arguing, "Some masters were cruel and brutal to their slaves, but others were kind and humane. Common sense usually prevented a master from treating his slaves too harshly, since only fit, well-cared-for slaves were likely to work efficiently...A sensible master would not waste an expensive possession through carelessness" (*CLC I* 2015, 79). Not only do the authors selectively exclude examples of cruelty and physical abuse that were common in ancient slavery, they also leave the readers with a sanitized image of enslavers. Enslavers are given the benefit of the doubt and described as "kind and humane" for not subjecting the people they consider property to violence, when in reality, dehumanizing a person by reducing them to physical property is already violence in and of itself. Such justifications defend enslavers rather than humanize the enslaved—the enslaved were not spared from violence and abuse because they were people who should not be harmed, but because harm would have prevented the very purpose of their enslavement. Furthermore, the authors perpetuate the language of dehumanization by referring to them as "expensive possession[s]" to maintain, uncritically reinforcing the perspective of the enslaver and further reducing ancient enslaved people.

Though there were no records kept of how often enslaved people were physically punished, the dehumanization and commodification of human bodies as a result of enslavement meant that their bodies were brutalized however their enslavers saw fit, not just as a consequence for certain actions. In his book, *Ancient Greek and Roman Slavery*, Peter Hunt reminds modern day readers that physical punishments for misdeeds were not

the only form of violence that enslaved people face; enslavement meant that they were treated as outlets for their enslavers' anger, aggression, and even drunkenness for no reason:

> …Masters also punished their slaves on the spur of the moment with whatever was handy: characters in Greek comedy threaten their slaves with all sorts of violence and sometimes just hit them…The emperor Hadrian put a slave's eye out with a stylus; other masters injured their own hands when, in a rage, they punched their slaves in the mouth…We have been considering violence against slaves as part of a rational system of rewards and punishments; these stories remind us not to forget that people are often emotional and irrational. Slaves were always at the mercy of ill-tempered or drunken masters or overseers, who need not have gained anything concrete by abusing them. (Hunt 2017, 146)

The treatment of enslaved people did not simply depend on the individual choices of the enslaver. The very act of considering humans as property grants enslavers the right to abuse enslaved people however they wished, and the culture and attitudes surrounding enslavement made such violence an everyday occurrence. By highlighting that some enslavers abused the people they enslave less than others, *Cambridge Latin Course* absolves responsibility from all people who uphold the institution of slavery and shifts it to the individual enslaver.

Turning to *Ecce Romani*'s section on the treatment of slaves in ancient Rome, the section pairs passages from ancient Roman writers about slavery with commentary from the *Ecce Romani* writers. The juxtaposition of the brutal details in the ancient passages with the authors' commentary that attempts to make them palatable for young readers especially highlights their failure to accurately portray and condemn slavery. Take for instance the following passage:

> Davus enjoys a high position among Cornelius's slaves and takes pride in his responsibilities. Of course he has the good fortune to work for a master who is quite humane by Roman standards...Notice that [in Cato's passage] he feels no sympathy for his slaves who have grown ill or old in his service; they are "things" just like

> cattle and tools that a farmer should get rid of when they are no longer of use. (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 75)

The tone and diction of the passage implies that Davus is employed rather than enslaved. The language of him "enjoy[ing] a high position" and "[taking] pride in his work" paints an image of slavery as a happy experience, reinforcing the trope of enslaved people being happy that Dugan points out (Dugan 2020, vii). In addition, the next sentences lay the cause of violence towards enslaved people with the luck of the enslaved rather than the institution that commodifies human bodies. Thus, the treatment of enslaved people as property is conditional and at the fault of the enslaved people: if an enslaver was violent, it is suggested that it was the misfortune of the enslaved person to be placed with such a enslaver rather than the dehumanization of the enslaved that allowed any violence to happen. The language of the authors also reinforces such ideology. By describing how enslaved peoples "are 'things' just like cattle and tools," the authors further perpetuate such dehumanization rather than highlighting and condemning it. An anti-slavery language might have described the treatment of dehumanization by enslavers and centered the experience of the enslaved.

The authors continue to misrepresent and minimize slavery when they write about the perception that enslaved people have of their status: "Even when conditions were good, slaves were keenly aware of their inferior position and by way of protest sometimes rebelled or tried to run away" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 75). The status of being enslaved is not merely an "inferior position." It is a whole institution of commodifying humans and capitalizing on their bodies. "Inferior position" does not highlight the lack of rights that enslaved people had or the horrific violence they were subjected to. Such language reduces

the violence that enslaved people faced to a relationship of disrespect for enslaved people rather than a social hierarchy that dehumanized them into property.

Throughout *Ecce Romani*'s section, the authors also present the experience of enslaving and being enslaved in terms of a reward system. They highlight how "[s]ome masters treated their slaves well and were rewarded by loyalty and good service" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 75). Likewise, they describe how "...some masters gave their slaves their freedom in a process called manumission, as a reward for long service" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 77). By framing the first experience as a reward, praise is assigned to the enslavers for treating the people they enslave with human decency while they participate in the very institution that commodifies humans. The enslaved people were not "rewarding" their enslavers with loyalty and good service; loyalty and good service was required of them in order to avoid physical punishment and abuse. Similarly, "long service" from an enslaved person was not a choice to be rewarded for; they were forced to stay with enslavers unless they were sold.

Perhaps the most obvious misrepresentation of slavery in this section lies in the stark contrast between the preface to the ancient passages about the violence endured by enslaved people and the passages themselves. Juvenal describes how an enslaver does not "believe that the body and soul of slaves are made the same as their masters," how "[n]othing pleases him more than a noisy flogging," and how "[t]o his trembling slaves he's a monster, happiest when some poor wretch is being branded with red-hot irons for stealing a pair of towels" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 76). In contrast, the introduction to this passage simply states that "[s]ome owners treated their slaves very badly...slaves were liable to be severely punished, often at the whim of their masters" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 76).

Though the ancient passage itself depicts the physical brutality that enslaved peoples faced, the preface to this passage urges the readers to think that such brutality was the result of personal choices of enslavers rather than an institution that granted enslaved people no protection or human rights. The language that "some owners" could conduct such physical torment "often at the whim" of themselves suggests that the violence was conditional and dependent on the enslaver rather than condemning the entire institution, implying that some enslaved people, such as Davus, did not face it. Through such a minimization of the horrific violence, young students are encouraged to interpret slavery as more palatable.

The most horrific aspect of this section is the discussion question for students that it ends with, asking them, "If you were a Roman slave owner, would you use strict discipline or relative kindness to manage your slaves? Why?" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 77). The authors even ask students to humanize enslavers and place themselves in their shoes, encouraging them to imagine and visualize what it might be like to own other human beings as property. Nor do they condemn the violence enacted upon enslaved people at the hands of enslavers—they actually offer an avenue for students to present justifications of such violence. The authors once again sanitize and justify the institution of slavery while further marginalizing the experience of enslaved peoples. Beyond sanitization, however, the authors do not even question the institution of slavery itself. Students are simply asked to put themselves in the shoes of Roman enslavers as if it were a natural and just occurrence.

Comparisons to American Chattel Slavery

Cambridge Latin Course in particular takes steps to distance ancient Roman slavery from American chattel slavery, which futher illustrates their desire to present ancient

slavery in a more positive light. Ancient slavery has often been used within arguments for both sides of abolition and enslavement, yet the authors push an agenda that the two were very different, and that ancient enslavement was more acceptable. Secondary students using this textbook in America will most likely have had lessons about American chattel slavery and some conversation about the roots of racism in America that stem from it. Therefore, the authors found it important to highlight a key distinction between ancient and chattel slavery:

> In the Roman empire, slavery was not based on racial prejudice, and color itself did not signify slavery or obstruct advancement. People usually became slaves as a result either of being taken prisoner in war or of being captured by pirates; the children of slaves were automatically born into slavery. They came from many different tribes and countries, Gaul and Britain, Spain and North Africa, Egypt, different parts of Greece and Asia Minor. (*CLC I* 2015, 78)

By highlighting how "color itself did not signify slavery or obstruct advancement," the authors are attempting to imply a moral basis of slavery different from, and even better than, American chattel slavery. For students who may have just learned from history classes that chattel slavery resulted in modern sytemic racism, such a differentiation of ancient and American chattel slavery attempts to absolve the Roman institution of lasting and impactful systems of hatred and oppression. They continue to place the blame of enslavement on enslaved peoples by suggesting that they have the misfortune to be enslaved through capture. The authors then proceed to describe the diversity of enslaved peoples but say nothing about the Roman imperialism that caused the diversity in enslavement. Both practices of ancient and American chattel slavery were the results of systems of imperialism, and the concept of race was invented to support the practice. Contrary to the portrayal of *Cambridge Latin Course*, some Greeks and Romans believed that slavery was inherent to certain groups, such as Aristotle's description of Asians in

Politics as accustomed to "a perpetual state of subjection and enslavement" (Aristotle, Politics 7.5.6, 1327b, one of the passages included in Kennedy, Roy, and Goldman 2013). By relieving the Roman institution of slavery from notions of prejudice or xenophobia, the authors suggest justifications for ancient slavery and attempt to depict it as morally better than the American chattel slavery students have learned about.

Emphasis on Manumission

The authors of both textbooks emphasize the possibility of freedom for enslaved people in ancient Rome and inaccurately portray it as the majority rather than the exception. A common argument among people who sanitize ancient Roman slavery is that it was less brutal than American chattel slavery because of the possibility of social mobility through manumission. Just like *Ecce Romani*, *Cambridge Latin Course* describes *manumissio* in terms of a reward system: "Freedom was sometimes given as a reward for particularly good service, sometimes as a sign of friendship and respect...Freedom was also very commonly given after the owner's death by a statement in the will" (*CLC I* 2015, 80). Manumission is one of the key differences between ancient Roman slavery and American chattel slavery commonly highlighted by ancient slavery apologists, who claim that the prospect of social mobility suggests that enslaved people in the ancient world were not considered inherently inferior. By positing freedom as a possibility for ancient Roman enslaved people and suggesting that it was a common occurrence, the authors once again distance ancient slavery from American chattel slavery in an attempt to present a more palatable version.

Historians do not know the true manumission rates of ancient Rome. Though there is much surviving evidence surrounding the practice and a number of freedmen in Roman

cities, Peter Hunt describes the discrepancies that may prevent modern historians from truly knowing ancient manumission rates. Though urban manumission rates may have been high, he reminds us to consider two factors, namely that "[m]any slaves did not survive to gain their freedom; even those who died free had often spent the vast majority of their lives in slavery…[and] Most historians suspect it was only urban slaves who enjoyed the high manumission rate that produced such a large and conspicuous class" (Hunt 2017, 120). There exists little evidence of manumission in rural areas for enslaved people who worked in mines or agriculture like *Ecce Romani'*s Davus. Though a certain urban population of domestic enslaved people may have seen manumission as an attainable process, that reality might not have been the case for many others. Furthermore, the numbers of those who were killed while still in enslavement will never be accounted for in manumission rates. Manumission in the ancient world was possible for some, but *Cambridge Latin Course* and *Ecce Romani* suggest that it was within the reach of all enslaved people.

The rest of the passage in *Cambridge* attempts to minimize the difference between enslaved people and freed people in terms of mobility: "They moved without restriction about the streets of the towns, went shopping, visited temples, and were also quite often present in the theater and at shows in the Amphitheater. Foreign visitors to Rome and Italy were sometimes surprised that there was so little visible difference between a slave and a poor free man" (*CLC I* 2015, 79). Such a description of mobility suggests that enslaved people had the freedom to travel around, but the motivation behind such mobility is more about servitude than rights. Enslaved peoples did not travel for leisure, but to serve those to whom they were enslaved. By misrepresenting such mobility and stressing the "little

visible difference between a slave and a poor free man," the authors minimize the status of enslavement and attempt to sanitize its reality. Though the physical appearance of enslaved people may not have differed much from the lower class, they were considered property of their enslavers and had no rights or protection under the law.

Common Tropes of Enslaved Characters

Kelly Dugan's dissertation lays the groundwork for common tropes and representations of enslaved peoples throughout history, many of which the textbooks follow. Her common tropes are the ones through which I will trace the *Cambridge Latin Course* and *Ecce Romani* fictional characters. Such tropes include:

1. Enslaved people as property and goods
2. Enslaved people as lazy and sluggish
3. Enslaved people as happy and lucky
4. Enslaved people as oppressed and suffering (Dugan 2020, vii)

I will utilize Dugan's categories and assign my own analysis to them as applicable.

Stage 6 of *Cambridge Latin Course* depicts slavery in depth and includes stories and a culture section surrounding enslaved people and freedmen. The opening sentences for Stage 6 depict Grumio and Clemens being attacked by a dog, and Quintus, the Roman son of Caecilius, saves them by beating the dog off. Then, *servi erant laeti. Servi Quintum laudaverunt* ("[t]he enslaved people are happy. The enslaved people praise Quintus") (*CLC I* 2015, 71). Dugan notes how this is another instance of enslaved people being portrayed as happy and lucky (Dugan 2020, 116). In addition, Grumio and Clemens are depicted as being grateful for the son of their enslavers. It also seems that most instances of physical violence and verbal abuse, however, fall onto the characters that are enslaved, such as Grumio's

contentions with the family dog and rebukes toward him from Caecilius and Metella, the matron of the household. Such depictions, however, are played off as a comedic component of the lessons rather than criticism of the violence within the institution. Students are meant to laugh at Grumio, not sympathize with him.

The main stories in Stage 6 are about Felix, a formerly enslaved member of the Caecilius household who was freed after he had saved an infant Quintus from a thief. Felix is presented as a well-liked and respected character by all members of the household for his bravery and loyalty to Caecilius. He is portrayed as happy and has a great love for the family, especially Quintus. When he sees the young man he had saved while he was enslaved, *libertus erat valde commotus. Paene lacrimabat; sed ridebat (*"[t]he freed man was very moved. He was almost crying; but he was laughing") (*CLC I* 2015, 72). The stories read as if Felix is rewarded for his service and loyalty to Caecilius and is grateful to the family for all they have done for him. Thus, the authors are once again falling into the trope of portraying enslaved people as lucky. They suggest to students that the enslaved people in the Caecilius household view their enslavers as family, and if they are loyal, they may receive the good fortune that Felix had to be freed.

Pivoting to *Ecce Romani*, the primary enslaved character working under Cornelius is Davus, who is introduced in Chapter 3. In the chapter, two Roman boys of the Cornelius family, Marcus and Sextus, play a trick on Davus by pushing a statue into the fish pond where Davus is working, causing him trouble and angering him. The textbook makes clear the distinction of statuses between Davus and the Cornelius family: *In Italia sunt multi servi qui in agris et in villis rusticus laborant. Pueri sunt Romani, sed Davus non est Romanus. Est vir Britannicus qui iam in Italia laborat. Sextus et Marcus, quod sunt pueri Romani, non*

laborant. Davus solus laborat…("In Italy there are many enslaved people who work in the rustic fields and in the villas. The boys are Roman, but Davus is not Roman. He is a British man who now works in Italy. Sextus and Marcus, because they are Roman boys, do not work. Davus works alone…") (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 13). The roles of people within the household are made clear. Romans, like Sextus and Marcus, did not have to work because of their Roman citizenship. Enslaved foreign people, like Davus, are the people who are meant to work, as if their foreign status is a justification of their enslavement. *Ecce Romani* presents the reader with an essentializing hierarchy, in which Romans are at the top and foreign people are inherently inferior. Like the enslaved people in the stories of *Cambridge Latin Course*, Davus is often the comic relief and the brunt of the joke for the enslaving family, especially for the youth. Not only are enslaved people property of the family, but playing practical jokes on them is also a form of entertainment for the family at the expense of jeopardizing the work, and therefore safety, of the enslaved. Students are asked to identify with the Roman youths in their views of Davus as an enslaved person rather than question the institution of slavery in place.

Dehumanization and Commodification of Enslaved Characters

In parts of *Ecce Romani*, the language, tone, and diction of the authors further reinforce the dehumanization and commodification of enslaved characters. Kelly Dugan's dissertation on the treatment of slavery in Latin textbooks confronts the issue and has been integral in informing my analysis. *Ecce Romani* dedicates two Roman culture sections to slavery in Rome: "The Slave Market" and "The Treatment of Slaves." Dugan includes thorough analysis of how the language of "The Slave Market" passage normalizes enslavement and the treatment of enslaved peoples as property to be bought and sold.

Dugan highlights how the description of Davus "[feeling] pretty uncomfortable standing there like an exhibit at the cattle-market" dehumanizes Davus and reduces him to an animal (Dugan 2020, 85-86). In addition, Dugan emphasizes how the description of Davus feeling "uncomfortable" and attempting to look his best for the bidders reduces his identity as a person, as well as misrepresents the true, brutal experiences of slavery auctions as captured in American chattel slavery (Dugan 2020, 86). Though the authors may have been attempting to illustrate the dehumanization of slavery auctions through a description of how Davus felt, their execution of the material perpetuates many of the same messages of dehumanization and commodification of human bodies. The sanitization of Davus's feelings to a mere adjective of "uncomfortable" may attempt to humanize Davus, but it reduces enslavement to discomfort.

Beyond the description mentioned by Dugan, the passage further normalizes the practice of slavery by explaining what traits and characteristics were valuable to Roman enslavers and even names the prices that are paid for each enslaved person. The textbook authors assign the monetary worth of enslaved people based on their characteristics, such as "5,000 sesterces" for Davus because of his "fine physique, fair hair, and blue eyes" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 37).

Davus even starts to make judgments on the worth of a fellow enslaved person when Titus pays 35,000 sesterces for a man named Eucleides, who he describes as "a pale, half starved individual who looked as if a hard day's work would kill him" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 37). He even says to Titus, "'He's not worth half that, master!'" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 37) Yet the passage explains that "[t]he odd qualifications on the placard, 'skilled in geometry and rhetoric,' must...have had something to do with the record price!" (*Ecce*

Romani 2009, 37). Mere minutes after Davus is sold into slavery, he already accepts his role by addressing Titus as "master" and making judgments on the monetary value of a fellow enslaved person. Thus, the textbook writers further perpetuate the dehumanization of enslaved people by presenting and justifying the monetary values placed on human beings. In addition, by representing Davus as not only accepting of the institution of slavery but reinforcing it by judging the worth of another person, the authors strip agency from Davus as an individual. Through such a depiction of Davus perpetuating the commodification mindset of enslavement and placing an antagonistic attitude between him and another enslaved person, the authors perpetuate a tactic of control and maintenance of the institution of slavery by dividing enslaved people against each other.

The end of the passage assures the reader that the enslaver, Titus, "proved to be the kindest of masters, and now, thirty years later, Davus, himself a grizzled fifty-five, was overseer of the farm. On some of the neighboring estates, he knew, things were not so good" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 37). By doing so, the authors present the trope that Dugan identifies in which enslaved peoples are lucky and happy. Furthermore, the authors attempt to convey that Davus has thrived within the institution of slavery by rising in rank, rather than condeming it as a whole. Davus is enslaved for three decades of his life, but the authors portray this duration of time as a point of pride for him, as if he is looking back on a satisfying career. Davus is then stripped of agency as he is portrayed as happily conforming to the institution and repeating the cycle of violence as an overseer. Paired with Davus's previous judgments on the monetary worth of a fellow enslaved person, the authors perpetuate the divisive tactic of control that enslavers use to ensure they maintain power. By pitting enslaved people against each other, they cannot plot any acts of revolt, and the

authors purposefully choose not to portray any resistance to enslavement on the part of the enslaved. In addition, when the authors present an oxymoron by describing Titus as "the kindest of masters," and by saying that other enslavers "on some of the neighboring estates" are not, they once again suggest that cruelty the hands of enslavers as the exception, not the rule. Overall, the passage not only justifies and normalizes the dehumanization and commodification of human bodies, but it also presents the institution of slavery as one with positive outcomes for the enslaved characters in the book.

Ecce Romani also portrays the repeated cycle of violence through the perspective of the enslavers, as they present the Roman daughter Cornelia learning how to manage the enslaved members of her household from her mother. Chapter 6 details how enslaved people are up early and working at dawn. Cornelius finds Davus sitting and resting under the tree and scolds him, and Davus suddenly rises to prepare work (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 33). The rest of the story tells how Aurelia, the matron of the household, supervises the work of the enslaved people and yells at them if they are not completing their tasks well enough. The authors then mention the daughter, Cornelia, learning to run the household from her mother. The text states that, *Matrem adiuvare vult, sed ipsa neque servum neque ancillam reprehendit. Servi et ancillae nunc strenue laborant. Necesse est neque servum neque ancillam reprehendere* ("She wants to help mother, but she herself neither reprimands the enslaved men or enslaved women. The enslaved men and enslaved women are now working strenuously. It is necessary to reprimand neither the enslaved men or enslaved women") (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 33). Similar to the treatment of Grumio in *Cambridge Latin Course*, the plot of the Latin text often portrays an enslaved person as lazy, and thus needing to be reprimanded by the enslavers. Imagining alternate representation, however,

the passage already highlights how many of the enslaved people start working before dawn, and their inability to "work strenuously" could be portrayed by authors as exhaustion rather than laziness. Cornelia, even as a young girl, is learning from her mother and father that enslaved people deserve harsh treatment for their lack of work, describing it as "necessary." Cornelia would "help her mother" by renewing this cycle of violence.

The Sexualization of Enslaved Women

Beyond the portrayal of Grumio and Clemens, *Cambridge Latin Course* codes the only enslaved woman, Melissa, as sexual and promiscuious. In her introduction in Stage 2, the authors do not even grant Melissa an identity other than being an enslaved woman, while two other enslaved men are named, further perpetuating the legacy of silencing women and enslaved people in the ancient world. In the story, Melissa sings for Caecilius and his friend during the *cena*, and she *delectat* ("pleases") Caecilius, his friend, and Grumio, the *coquus* (*CLC I* 2015, 20). By associating Melissa with the word *delectat* and emphasizing Melissa's role as giving pleasure to her male enslavers and counterpart, the authors are suggesting her sexualization within the household, which in turn suggests the sexual harassment, assault, and abuse that enslaved women faced. Her existence in the stories only serves to quite literally please the male characters.

Melissa's name is only given in Stage 3, when the story describes the act of purchasing enslaved people at the market. The short story, titled *venalicius*, details Caecilius's experience with the "slave dealer," Syphax, who is implied to be Syrian by his *navem Syriam*. In this story, we are introduced to Melissa by name when Syphax calls over

to serve wine to Caecilius after he seemed hesitant about purchasing from him. The story goes as follows:

Caecilius ancillam spectat. Ancilla est pulchra. Ancilla ridet. Ancilla Caecilium delectat. venalicius quoque ridet.
"Melissa cenam optimum coquit," inquit venalicius. "Melissa linguam Latinam discit. Melissa est docta et pulchra. Melissa…"
"satis! satis!" clamat Caecilius. Caecilius Melissam emit et ad villam revenit. Melissa Grumionem delectat. Melissa Quintum delectat. Eheu! Ancilla Metellam non delectat.

Caecilius sees the enslaved woman. The enslaved woman is beautiful. The enslaved woman laughs. The enslaved woman pleases Caecilius. The human trafficker also laughs.
"Melissa cooks the best dinner," said the human trafficker. "Melissa speaks the Latin language. Melissa is skilled and beautiful. Melissa…"
"Enough enough!" shouts Caecilius. Caecilius buys Melissa and returns to the villa. Melissa pleases Grumio. Melissa pleases Quintus. Oh no! The enslaved woman does not please Metella. (*CLC I* 2015, 31)

Melissa as a character is consistently coded with the word *delectat*. Her beauty is emphasized in this passage first and foremost, followed by her cooking skills, capacity to communicate in Latin, and then her beauty yet again. The authors imply a physical attraction towards Melissa from the male characters, which leads to animosity from Metella, the matron of the household. Her anger at Melissa removes any ambiguity about the sexualization of the girl by the enslavers, as she is the new person of desire within the household. Such a depiction reinforces suggestions of the sexual exploitation, assault, and rape of enslaved people at the hands of enslavers, but does little to accurately portray or condemn the sexual violence faced by enslaved peoples. Instead, Melissa is presented as happy and even flirtatious towards her enslavers in her enslaved status, as represented by the way she *ridet* towards Caecilius. However, as an enslaved woman, she likely laughs as a survival strategy because of fear of her enslavers. The authors not only reduce Melissa to her physicality by emphasizing her beauty, but they further perpetuate the narratives of sexual violence within enslavement by coding her with the verb that means "pleases" and

present her as happy about her situation. Furthermore, the uncritical depiction of her flirtation sanitizes enslavement by suggesting that Melissa likes how she is treated by her enslavers.

The Dangers of Misrepresentation

All of the sanitization, misrepresentations, and reinforcements of ancient slavery raise the question of the purpose of doing so for Latin textbook authors. Some may consider accurate portrayals of the topic too graphic or gruesome for younger students, many of whom start taking Latin in the fifth or sixth grade. Perhaps the authors are attempting to minimize the number of reasons against taking Latin or learning about the Romans, as the study has been on the decline for the last few decades. In an increasingly progressive world that calls for decolonized learning and marginalized perspectives, it hardly seems like the Roman imperial project fits within that agenda. Perhaps the authors wish to maintain the idea of Rome as the "founders of western civilization" and to protect its legacy by minimizing the controversial aspects of their society.

In the introduction for *Ecce Romani*, the authors emphasize the importance of learning Latin by addressing students directly:

> [Latin] gave birth to a number of languages that are still used today…In learning the Latin language, in becoming acquainted with the cultural life of the ancient Romans, and in constantly making connections and drawing comparisons between their language and life and yours, you will develop a deeper understanding of your own world, and you will find many ways in which you can use your knowledge of Latin and the ancient Romans to lead a more successful and enjoyable life in your own world. (*Ecce Romani* 2009, xiii-xiv)

The authors hail Latin as a mother language for modern Romance languages and urge students to draw parallels between ancient Rome and their own world. In highlighting the ways that 21st century students can relate and find value in a civilization that existed over 2000 years ago, sanitizing and misrepresenting ancient slavery may be an attempt to bridge the gap. In order to make an empire that built its wealth and vastness on the backs of enslaved people palatable, certain sanitization and censorship is required to mold the narrative into revisionist history. The authors consciously assert an image of slavery and enslavement in the ancient world as more positive than its reality: Enslaved people were treated well more often than they were treated badly, they were happy in their roles, and that freedom was often attainable.

And such an image has consequences within the way students interpret and adopt them, as education does not live in a vacuum. Ella Parodi researches the impressions of slavery in the *Cambridge Latin Course* on young British students in her article, "A critical investigation of Y7 students' perceptions of Roman slavery as evidenced in the stories of the *Cambridge Latin Course*." Parodi interviews the British Year 7 Latin students (equivalent to American 6th Graders) about their perceptions of Grumio, Clemens, and Roman slavery. Overall, the students did not blindly accept the positive portrayals presented by the authors, yet they did not completely reject them either. Parodi writes that:

> Through these interviews these students showed awareness of some of the cruelties that "other slaves" may have suffered from cruel masters or from working in coal mines or in agriculture. They tended to have a simplistic view of Grumio and Clemens having a happy life. To them the biggest problem that they perceived about Roman slavery was dependent on who your master was or what your job/role was, not the inherent evil of slavery itself. (Parodi 2020, 51)

For some of the students interviewed, the authors of *Cambridge Latin Course* had successfully refashioned the institution of slavery into individual experiences. Thus, such experiences can be more easily justified and accepted, as evident when a student replied that the stories of Grumio and Clemens "'has made [them] see why there was a point of slaves, and now [they] can come to the grip with that it is acceptable for some reasons'" (Parodi 2020, 51). Without direct condemnation of the institution and a critical approach to Roman slavery, the authors leave room for, and even suggest, interpretations that justify the dehumanization and commodification of human beings for young students. They perpetuate the violence and rhetoric of ancient slavery even centuries after it.

Chapter 2: Representations of Foreign Peoples and Imperialism

The previous chapter explores the sanitization of ancient slavery in popular Latin textbooks, but in their efforts to glorify ancient Rome for the modern classroom, *Ecce Romani* and *Cambridge Latin Course* also erase the violence of Roman imperialism. Throughout the culture readings on Roman expansion and conquest, there are plenty of messages that glorify the Roman Empire and its legacy. Authors of the *Ecce Romani* state that their fictional story about a Roman soldier at *Ara Uborium* demonstrates "how a common foot soldier peaceably helped spread Roman civilization and its benefits. Not all of Rome's conquests were military! The most enduring aspects of its civilization—its laws, its customs, and its architectural and engineering accomplishments—are still embodied in our present-day civilization" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 221). The passage separates "civilization" from military conquest when annexation of land and violence by the military was how they spread their "civilizing" force. The language of the "enduring" effect that Rome has and continues to make is common rhetoric found in Latin classrooms and classics associations across America, such as the National Junior Classical League's creed that states how our world is "indebted to the ancient civilization in its government and laws, literature, language and arts" (American Classical League 2020, 4). Such glorification raises the dangers of withholding accountability from Roman civilization for its violent and dehumanizing practices and impacts on many people. And this stance can ultimately lead to arguments on the part of right wing-extremists that use Greece and Rome as a justification for white supremacy.

In analyzing how Latin textbooks teach about foreign peoples and imperialism to students, I will primarily be assessing the texts for how they approach attitudes of Roman

imperialism and xenophobia. Namely, I will analyze the passages about Rome's relationship with the larger world in antiquity for sanitization of violence, language and rhetoric that promotes Roman imperialism, and criticisms of the Indigenous peoples or cultures that were present before the Romans. Such passages sanitize and glorify imperialism, promote ideas of Rome as the "founders of Western Civilization," perpetuate common colonial narratives, and discourage students from thinking critically about systems of power, oppression, and genocide. In addition, such suggestions promote white supremacist ideas and further marginalize and silence the stories of conquered peoples.

While the first chapter of this thesis had comparable sanitization of slavery within both *Cambridge Latin Course* and *Ecce Romani* textbooks, the two books cover the topics of Roman imperialism quite differently. Therefore, this chapter is divided into a section of background on Nyström's theory of colonial masterplots, which will be used to analyze the texts, followed by two sections that separately analyze *Ecce Romani*'s Book I of the Fourth Edition, published in 2009, and *Cambridge Latin Course*'s Unit 2 of the Fourth Edition, published in 2012. Note that the first chapter analyzes the Fifth Edition of *Cambridge Latin Course* while this one analyzes the Fourth. This is simply because these were the editions of the units I had access to. At times, *Cambridge Latin Course* seems to have improved representations of Indigenous groups and complex approaches to Roman imperialism. However, this may be a result of an intended message of nationalism for British publishers, as it asserts British consent in adopting Roman culture and becoming successors of Roman legacy. My analysis will also recognize when such passages succeed in inclusive portrayals in light of this goal, as well as attempts for more nuanced descriptions of Roman imperialism and its effects.

Background

In parts of my analysis, I turn to Nyström's theory of colonial masterplots as a basis for tracing violent pro-colonial narratives or rhetorics. I extend these masterplots to pro-imperialist messages about the Roman empire found in textbook sections of *Ecce Romani* and *Cambridge Latin Course*. Throughout these sections, the authors of the textbooks perpetuate common "colonial masterplots" as described by Markus Nyström in "Narratives of Truth: An Exploration of Narrative Theory as a Tool in Decolonising Research." In this piece, Nyström builds on Narrative Theory to explain the common masterplots in colonial spaces. Nyström defines a colonial masterplot as:

> ...a plot that is easily recognised by members of a culture and oft-repeated in various forms. Sometimes referred to as master narratives or story skeletons, masterplots are plots that we hear and see over and over again within a specific culture's narrative tradition...Colonial masterplots are "mental maps" which people repeatedly put to use in order to interpret and describe the world around them. (Nyström 2018, 35-36)

Colonial masterplots continuously perpetuate colonial mindsets and narratives as they are reproduced and revitalized. Though Roman imperialism differs from colonialism in a few ways, much of the pro-imperialist rhetoric in Latin textbooks reproduces the various colonial masterplots that Nyström categorizes and illustrates. These masterplots include "The Robinson Crusoe masterplot," in which an individual settler encounters and westernizes Indigenous peoples, and "The Development/Industrial Production/White Man's Burden masterplot," in which Indigenous culture is in need of "civilizing" from settler-colonists (Nyström 2018, 38-39).

Ecce Romani

Book I of *Ecce Romani* has three sections titled "Frontier Life" that describe Roman expansion into Northern Europe and North Africa. All of the information about these places is told through a fictional story made up by the *Ecce Romani* authors centering characters in these locations.

The first section about Rome and Northern Europe starts with an overview of famous Roman conquests, such as "Julius Caesar and his army subjugating what is now France" and "Agricola…[leading] Roman troops as far as the Scottish Highlands, where the Caledonii lived" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 193). The categorization of Caesar's Gallic Wars as subjugation is perhaps the most critical sentence towards Roman imperialism in all of these sections. Yet the authors do not mention the specific events that happened in Gaul or even name any of the groups that had faced Caesar's violence, subjugation, and genocide. They make no mention of the destruction of homes and villages, the enslavement of prisoners of war, or the sexual assault and rape at the hands of Roman soldeirs. In addition, they do not describe the diverse groups of Gallic peoples who lived there, their life and culture before Roman conquest, or include accounts of any of their efforts against the Romans, further silencing the victims. With a mere mention of the leaders conquering and invading these places, the section admits that "these images of the northward expansion of Roman power and control are quite correct" but then immediately turns to other men "who brought about the Romanization of the native peoples in these areas" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 193).

The authors are referring to Roman foot soldiers, and they suggest that "[p]erhaps these men had greater influence than their commanders because they had closer contact

with the ordinary people" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 193-194). They proceed to describe a story about a soldier named Lucius at *Ara Ubiorum*. The passage describes the German Ubii tribe that had lived in the region and the need for a legion to be transferred there "to help defend the Roman frontier shortly after the destruction of three Roman legions by the Germans in the Teutoburg Forest in A.D. 9" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 194). *Ara Ubiorum*, though the name of the town states that it belongs to the Ubii, is painted as "the Roman frontier" rather than stolen land. Likewise the efforts of the German people to reclaim their town is described as "destruction" that should be defended against rather than anti-imperialist efforts.

In contrast, the authors actually present a more accurate version of uprisings from the Nasamones tribes in the North Africa section of "Frontier Life." They describe them as "one of the fierce nomadic tribes of Africa" who "has made several attacks on two of the colonies lately established in the province of Africa. The agricultural territory given to those colonies was seized from the Nasamones, who were consequently restricted to pasturing their flocks on poorer ground" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 221). This is perhaps the most accurate description of the treatment and violence faced by conquered peoples in the entire textbook, detailing how the land was stolen and Indigenous people suffered and starved as a result. It also highlights an anti-colonial effort, though not labeled that way in the text, on the part of the Nasamones rather than painting them as colonial supporters. However, this is all we learn about the tribe and its history, as the passage returns to discussions of consulship and the political path of Romans running for office.

Returning to Northern Europe, the fictional story that accompanies the history passage is about the marriage of Lucius and Helge, an Ubian girl, and the authors describe how her family "had been given land by Marcus Vispanius Agrippa, when he moved the Ubii

at their request from the eastern to the western bank of the Rhine in 38 B.C." (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 195). The passage provides no context for this historical event, and the language here implies that the Ubii owed Marcus Vispanius Agrippa for his aid and grants of land. It paints a positive image of Roman imperialism for Native peoples, as if being conquered was to their advantage, and completely ignores the violence and subjugation that causes the need for the Ubii people to ask to be relocated on their own land. According to Michael Gechter's chapter on Ubian settlements in *The Early Roman Empire in the West*, the Ubii tribe had a long history of supporting Roman conquest due to hostility between them and other tribes. It is notable that the *Ecce Romani* authors choose to write about one of the pro-Roman tribes to further praise Roman imperialism rather than any of the tribes that resisted Rome. Gechter states that the tribe was moved due to "consolidation of Roman control on the Rhine," which "included a restructuring of native settlement" (Gechter 1990, 97). Though the authors selectively leave it out, the resettlement of the Ubii also served as a tactical move for the Romans in order to maintain control of their empire in the midst of Germanic rebellions.

The passage indicates that Lucius "falls in love with Helge" and marries her after he "learns that [she] is carrying his child" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 194-195). Though the writers may have had a younger audience in mind and therefore attributed the marriage to love, the mention of Helge's pregnancy is rooted in the historical background of sexual assault and rape of Native women by Roman soldiers as a result of Roman conquest. In an attempt to write a non-violent narrative with historical accuracy, the result continues to suggest historical violent backgrounds without addressing or condemning it. A romanticization of a relationship between a Roman soldier and a Native Ubian woman fails to address the

sexual violence that occured wherever the Romans had plundered and pillaged. They go on to describe the traditional Roman marriage practices that they hold, including Helge speaking the traditional vow in Latin when she was "prompted by Lucius" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 195). The authors write that, "Although the girl knew only a few words of Latin, she understood that this stocky and swarthy man was now her 'husband'" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 195). The passage reads as if Helge is forced into the marriage, not mentioning any love that she may have towards Lucius, but merely that she "understands" their status now. Helge is swept into Roman practices and customs as a result of her impregnation.

The last paragraph of the section describes the town, including the difference between Germanic practices of "building [huts] in any open space that suited them" and the Roman practices of "carefully [selecting] a location in accordance with the plan of streets established by surveyors" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 195). The passage continues to include the buildings of the town, highlighting the temples "with altars not only to the Roman gods but also to Helge's gods such as the Three Mothers" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 195). It ends with the note that "[t]his foresight and planning were very different from the haphazard way Helge's people built their settlements, and the girl felt new respect and admiration for her husband's people, the Romans" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 195). Though this passage does include descriptions of Germanic religion and practices, it highlights Germanic culture as the negative, "uncivilized" opposite of the Romans. The authors condescendingly describe Germanic ways of building and arranging their villages, calling it "haphazard" and suggesting that the people gave little thought or regard to infrastructure. In addition, the authors glorify Roman building and infrastructure from the point of view of a Native person, adding to the representation that conquered peoples enjoyed and welcomed

Roman imperialism. Rather than anger and contempt for the violence and subjugation, their Ubian character had "respect and admiration" for the people who inflicted that violence and subjugation on them. Such characterization not only takes away agency from Helge, but paints her as a supporter of the imperial project.

This story of Lucius falls in line with Nyström's categorization of "The Robinson Crusoe masterplot" in colonial narratives. Nyström describes the masterplot as one in which:

> A lone survivor, an adventurer, a settler or entrepreneur leads the way in this "empty" land. The focus is on toil and hardships, (western) ingenuity to solve problems and discovery of "strange lands". The protagonist (most often a man) can get to know the Indigenous people, but if he does, it is the Indigenous who are changed most dramatically by the encounter. (Nyström 2018, 38)

Lucius, the Roman soldier, changes Helge's life, for the better as the authors imply, through assimilation to Roman life. Roman infrastructure is praised while Ubian infrastructure is portrayed as disorderly and unadvanced. Helge begins to adopt the colonial masterplot in her mind and internalize the Roman xenophobic attitudes towards her people and culture. Thus, as Nyström argues, the colonial masterplot is internalized by the colonized peoples. By depicting Helge as a supporter of Roman imperialism, the authors of *Ecce Romani* "[force]…[the colonised] to see the world and themselves in the same way as the colonisers do" (Nyström 2018, 32).

The next section that follows Lucius and Helge's story is titled "Cultural Assimilation," and it discusses their life after marriage. The section poses assimilation to Roman ways as a positive process rather than one that contributed to the erasure of Germanic cultures. The passage opens with a description of Helge and her friends weaving tartan cloth for the legion's tunics and cloaks at the request of an officer of the legion. The

authors note that they felt proud that the legion was wearing their work, and this is the only mention of Germanic culture and influence on Romans in a positive way.

The rest of the passage selectively highlights the "advantages of Romanization" that Helge comes to know (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 221). In regard to her infant son becoming a Roman citizen in the future after 25 years of military service, the authors write that "Helge knew that Roman citizenship brought certain privileges: exemption from taxation, the right to run for public office, and rights of appeal in cases of litigation in the Roman court" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 220). The authors fail to highlight how Helge and her people are only subjected to second-class citizenship and taxation because of Roman conquest, in addition to being displaced from their lands.

Similar to the contrast of Germanic and Roman villages and towns in the first "Frontier Life" section, this passage also poses other aspects of Germanic culture as the inferior, "uncivilized" opposite of Roman practices through the eyes of Helge. The authors write that "Helge learned that while the customs of her people allowed only the priests to know how to read and write, the Romans permitted literacy to everyone" (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 220). Such a comparison places colonial value and significance on literacy and written tradition and reinforces colonial assertions of Indigenous orality as more primitive and less valid than literacy.

Other examples of this dichotomy presented by the authors include a comparison of dispute resolution practices and currency in the two cultures. The authors write that:

> Although years earlier Helge had been reluctant to accept Roman ways, she now had grown to appreciate the advantages of Roman civilization, especially after she and a merchant were involved in a dispute over a price and the matter was settled in the court before a Roman magistrate with both sides satisfied, instead of by a fight in which someone might have been killed. When she went shopping she used Roman coin, which was acceptable to all the tradesmen instead of the complicated system

> of barter used by her own people and the clans on the other side of the Rhine. (*Ecce Romani* 2009, 220-221)

The authors highlight the lack of infrastructure and institutions in Germanic tribes compared to the Roman empire, which sounds very similar to many justifications of colonization throughout history in which colonial powers argue that they bring civilization to Indigenous peoples. By selectively highlighting Germanic fighting and "the complicated system of barter," they paint the tribes and cultures as undeveloped and lawless compared to Roman practices, and they perpetuate many of the stereotypes that Romans had about foreigners in their own time. In addition, they fail to mention that such uniform systems were used as a tool of control and regulation of the vast empire acquired through imperialism.

This section illustrates Nyström's categorization of "The Development/Industrial Production/White Man's Burden masterplot," in which settler-colonial narratives paint Indigenous land and culture as needing "civilization." Nystrom describes how the masterplot depicts Indigenous land as "developed by colonial forces into a better state, and into a finished product. Obviously, the word 'development' is central here, involving change supposedly inherently for the better. This development is good, something everyone ought to want, but it is also exclusively defined as westernisation" (Nyström 2018, 39). In the case of the Indigenous Ubii tribe, *Ecce Romani* authors regard the assimilation of their towns and practices to Roman ways as this "development," and the perspective of Helge as written by these authors further reinforces the erasure of Indigenous ways as a positive process. The language and rhetoric in which the authors use to set up Ubian and Roman ways as opposing sides of a "civilized" spectrum praises assimilation and cultural erasure.

Ecce Romani's decision to center their lessons on Roman imperialism through the eyes of a Roman Soldier and his Indigenous wife who praises Roman conquest destructively sanitizes the experiences of conquered peoples and glorifies Rome through colonial masterplots. By doing so, the authors are reenacting and perpetuating the violence that conquered tribes were subjected to under Roman power. They further silence the voices of the conquered and strip them of agency through the portrayal of Helge's disdain for her own Indigenous practices and gratitude towards Roman conquest. As a result, students are irresponsibly encouraged to uncritically admire Romans as powerful saviors towards Indigenous peoples.

Cambridge Latin Course

Cambridge Latin Course's Unit 2 is primarily focused on ancient Britain and the Roman conquest of British land. Unit 1 has little information or representation of foreigners, as it depicts Caecilius's family leading up to the eruption of Pompeii. Unit 2 picks up the story in Roman Britain with the villa of Salvius, a Roman senator sent to help Agricola manage the province. The main plot surrounds Quintus, the son of Caecilius and sole survivor of the eruption within his family, arriving in Britain and befriending King Cogidubnus. The main characters in the plots of the Latin stories, however, with the exception of British King Cogidubnus and a few enslaved members of Salvius's household, are Romans. British people are at times part of the plot, though they are rarely named. The Fourth Edition of Unit 2 used for this analysis was published in 2012. As I am pivoting to using individual digital *Cambridge* chapters in for Unit 2, it will be abbreviated to "*CLC* Stage" followed by the stage number for citation purposes.

Unit 2 seems to pivot away from the sanitization of slavery analyzed in Chapter 1 in its plot, as Salvius is portrayed as a truly cruel and horrific enslaver who vehemently hates all Britons and believes in Roman superiority. For instance, Stage 13, the first chapter of the book, details a story of Salvius visiting a mine that he owns and killing an elderly enslaved man for being sick (*CLC* Stage 13 2012, 5). Similarly, when asked for help for repair, he orders the broken cart of two British youths to be thrown into a ditch for blocking his way to King Cogidubnus's palace, remarking that *Britannī sunt molestissimī. semper nōs Rōmānōs vexant* ("[t]he British are the most annoying. They always vex us Romans") (*CLC* Stage 15 2012, 4). The Roman senator is actively portrayed as villainous and violent, eventually planning to poison and kill King Cogidubnus. His attitudes towards the British are ones of supremacy and elitism, which is indicative of imperial intentions. Likewise, his violent and dehumanizing treatment and murder of enslaved people paints ancient slavery much more accurately than the first unit. However, since the Latin plot of Unit 2 does not portray the context of Roman conquest of the British much and focuses on the storyline of Quintus's life in Britain, the focus of the analysis will center the culture sections rather than the characters and stories of the Latin plot.

Published by a British press and intended for use in British classrooms, Cambridge Latin Course's Unit 2 particularly improved in its culture sections, in which there is increased representation for British tribes both within and outside of the context of Roman imperialism. The culture sections include descriptions of British life and culture both before and during Roman conquest in Stages 13-15. In addition, the majority of the descriptions of British culture lacks the white savior and civilizing rhetoric that Nyström maps out as colonial masterplots. However, this improved representation may be a result

of an attempt to embody messages of British nationalism. By portraying Britons and pre-Roman British civilization positively, the authors paint a proud image of British ancestry and encourage modern British readers to trace their lineage back to ancient Britons.

In "'This Frantic Woman': Boadicea and English Neo-classical Embarrassment," Carolyn Williams explains the conflicting duality of representations of ancient Britons in relation to the Roman empire. She writes of this cognitive dissonance for British historians and readers:

> Classical historians paint a double-layered picture of Britons and other barbarians: inferior outsiders to be tamed or destroyed, and potential successors, whose courage and temperance recall primitive Roman virtue. Complexities proliferate when these texts are confronted by British readers, especially between the Renaissance and the middle of the eighteenth century, when history, like other forms of learning, is regarded as a legacy of classical civilization. (Williams 1999, 19)

In their attempts to paint a positive image of their British ancestors and legacy, *Cambridge Latin Course* authors have opted to present the second image of Britons. It includes more positive descriptions of ancient Britons compared to other Latin textbook portrayals of peoples conquered by the Romans, which refreshingly gives agency and affirmation to a historically silenced group and respects anti-colonial efforts. However, complicated messages of nationalism arise when such a positive portrayal paints them as William's description of "potential successors, whose courage and temperance recall primitive Roman virtue." Such messages of modern white Europeans as inheritors or descendants of Greece and Rome have often aided white supremacist rhetoric and ideas. The result is a complex image of imperialism within *Cambridge Latin Course*—one that both breaks Nyström's colonial masterplots and reinforces them.

In a complicated struggle to reconcile their ancient conquered identity with their modern imperialist power, *Cambridge* authors push a continuous image of British strength

and established civilization before, during, and after Roman influence through validation of Indigenous Celtic culture and centering Britain as the inheritors of Roman legacy. In order to establish a narrative of pride in their British ancestry, the authors include more positive portrayals of Indigenous Celtic tribes compared to other textbooks' coverage of conquered peoples. Though a great improvement for ancient Indigenous representation, they also use it to suggest their place as "worthy" successors of Rome.

Portrayals of Roman imperialism are complicated even more as some sections describe the brutality of Roman conquerors while others sanitize the imperial legacy. The authors seem to move back and forth between illustrating Roman violence to valorize the noble suffering of the Celts and portraying Celts as partners in accepting Roman imperialism. One angle of the nationalist approach portrays the suffering of Britain under Roman rule in an effort to highlight their persistence, strength, or endurance. The other angle presented in other parts of the textbook, however, sanitizes Roman imperialism and violence in order to refrain from a victimizing narrative towards their own conquered history. Instead, Britons are portrayed as willing adopters of Roman culture and lifestyle in an attempt to reestablish their agency and reinforce a nationalist message. The duality of this representation correlates with Williams' commentary on ancient historians' images of Britain—they both suffer under Rome and eventually inherit their ways.

Unlike *Ecce Romani*, the very first passage of Stage 13's culture section asserts Britain as an established civilization before Roman influence and even suggests that the Romans were incorrect for discrediting their culture. The passage describes how:

> Although the Romans thought of Britannia as a strange and distant land at the very edge of the known world, the island had its own highly developed civilization before the Romans arrived. We know from archaeological evidence that the Britons or Celts were very good metalworkers, carpenters, weavers, and farmers. They exported

> grain, cattle, gold, silver, iron, hides, hunting dogs, and slaves. The Roman concept of civilization was essentially urban-centered. The Celts were tribal, agricultural peoples and Britannia primarily a rural province. Therefore Romans, writing about the Britons, did not usually recognize the Celtic achievements. (*CLC* Stage 13 2012, 15)

Here the authors actively contrast the Roman views of "uncivilized" or "savage" Britons with descriptions of their "highly developed civilization before the Romans arrived." They mention the artistry and skills of pre-Romanized Britain and describe their systems of trade and Celtic life. The section is accompanied with a gallery of intricate Celtic metalwork and descriptions for students to scroll through. The authors then describe the differences between both civilizations without any judgments on their values. By questioning the "Roman concept of civilization," the authors highlight that civilization is merely a standard held by different groups of people and suggest that the Roman specific concept was not inherently correct in its judgments of Britain. Since Romans only saw "urban" infrastructure as civilized, *Cambridge* is emphasizing how other Indigenous building practices and lifestyles are civilized as well. Through this perspective, the authors immediately dispel portrayals of Britons as "uncivilized barbarians" that needed Rome as their savior. Compared to *Ecce Romani*'s condescending tone towards German civilization, *Cambridge Latin Course* fares well in recognizing Celtic culture and advancements because it serves as a message of nationalism. Though this passage seems to illustrate a sort of anti-colonial attitude, it may also serve the purpose of establishing ancient Britons as worthy heirs to Roman legacy by asserting their strength and validity even prior to Roman imperialism.

The stages also include other descriptions of British Life prior to Roman conquest and without any rhetoric of inferiority or "barbarism." The next part of Stage 13's culture section, titled "The British Tribes," summarizes major points about British culture and

ways of life, starting with British ruling systems of monarchy, their advisors, and chieftains. They highlight the commonalities between the many tribes, including language and resources, and give a very brief overview of British tribal artistic style, as well as a general description of Druids and British religious practices. Most notably, the description on British religion highlights its central role in resistance of Roman conquest, noting how Druids "encouraged fierce British resistance to the Roman invasion" and how "[t]he Britons may have sacrificed [a human victim] to their gods, perhaps in an effort to keep the Romans away" (*CLC* Stage 13 2012, 15-16). British resistance and power is mentioned early in the unit and establishes a more accurate sense that many Britons rejected Roman conquest rather than passively accepting it or even welcoming it. Thus, *Cambridge Latin Course* restores some agency to the conquered groups and recognition of their resistance efforts in order to instill a sense of British pride. However, this approach also complicates their desire to portray Britons as the successor of Roman virtues.

Perhaps one of the most inclusive and socially just aspects of *Cambridge Latin Course*'s coverage of British tribes is the section on Celtic resistance to Roman rule, namely surrounding the story of Queen Boudica of the Iceni Tribe. Surprisingly, the authors do not sanitize the brutal treatment of Queen Boudica under the hands of the Romans and describe the agency of Queen Boudica and the Iceni, stating, "When Boudica protested, she was flogged and her daughters raped. Boudica and the Iceni would not let these unprovoked insults go unavenged and, joining with other discontented tribes, they raised a rebellion (A.D. 60)" (*CLC* Stage 15 2012, 15). Even in previous stages, *Cambridge* has not described such physical violence and sexual assault in accurate terms. Yet they also do not merely paint Queen Boudica and her people as victims, but as agents in resistance and

rebellion against the injustices of the Roman imperial system. They continue to describe the successes of Queen Boudica in plundering and destroying several Roman towns before her rebellion was quelled by Suetonius Paulinus.

The section continues on to describe the rights of British women in British culture compared to Roman ways, as well as Roman views of such cultural differences. The authors write:

> In Roman eyes, Boudica was a remarkable and fearsome figure, not only because she brought them to the brink of disaster, but also because she was a woman who wielded real power. In this she was not alone among British women. From the little we know of their lives, some of the more wealthy had equal rights with men. They could own property in their own right within marriage, divorce their husbands, and be buried with precious possessions and the same funeral rites as their menfolk. Although some Roman women enjoyed these same rights, no Roman woman ever ruled her people and led them into battle. It is not surprising therefore that Boudica was regarded by the Romans as an unnatural, dangerous, but fascinating woman. (*CLC* Stage 15 2012, 15)

The authors credit British tribes with more progressive women's rights compared to Rome. Queen Boudica was an exceptional woman on all accounts, but the authors emphasize that powerful female leaders and women's rights were a central part of Celtic culture. They also point out where Romans had failed in this aspect of gender equality, and it once again centers British ancestry as a source of pride. In addition, the passage also interestingly discusses the Roman perspective of such differences in rights and dissects where fear of Queen Boudica may have come from. Such reception is perhaps the most critical and analytical passage in the entire unit, as it discusses the intersection of gender equity and cultural differences, as well as gives agency to a notable woman in history.

When considered in terms of the textbook conveying a nationalist message, however, the Queen Boudica passage in *Cambridge Latin Course* perpetuates how British

historians have used the historical figure as a means of national identity formation in their struggle with their colonized history. Williams writes that:

> …The perceived imperfections of her sex paradoxically enabled many early modern Britons to reconcile patriotism with respect for the martial and political ideals which they often associated with the example of the Greeks and Romans. Various attempts to achieve British self-definition are reflected in the changing face of Boadicea. (Williams 1999, 20)

For the British authors of *Cambridge*, Queen Boudica's power and legacy are a way of illustrating British power in the struggle of confronting British identity under Roman imperialism. The authors push Queen Boudica as a point of pride for their British readers because her leadership and military skills were on par with the Romans, at least before she was defeated. This allows the authors to paint a continuous image of power and cultural significance for Britons before, during, and even after Roman imperialism; Britons were strong before Romans, and therefore, they were fit to inherit their legacy after them.

Stage 14's culture passage, titled "Life in Roman Britain," continues to detail how the culture and environment changed for Britons after Roman conquest. The beginning describes British systems of building and infrastructure, with detailed images of recreated British roundhouses and different components both inside and outside the home. They describe the hearth that was central to the home, quern-stones for grinding grains, weaving looms, and design choices to maximize utility, such as sloped roofs for repelling precipitation and short buildings for heat preservation. Unlike *Ecce Romani*, there are once again no judgments on the houses compared to Roman buildings. The descriptions are straightforward and factual and suggest that British roundhouses were uniquely and skillfully crafted to fit their environmental needs. The Romans are not portrayed as a "civilizing" force because *Cambridge* asserts that the Britons were a well-established civilization before their arrival.

In these areas, *Cambridge Latin Course Latin Course* is successful at respectfully portraying an Indigenous group and their culture prior to Roman imperialism. They continuously assert native Britons as civilized despite Roman perceptions and describe Celtic culture without value judgments, unlike *Ecce Romani*. However, as they fail to do this for any other group or conquered area within their textbooks, such positive representation does not stem from a decolonizing perspective but from a nationalist approach. Britons are established as civilized and cultured in their own right and strong and brave in the face of Roman violence. Yet such values are uplifted as the perfect signifiers of Britain being fitting carriers of Rome's legacy.

As the culture reading pivots to describe Roman changes and influence, the authors begin to slip into habits of glorification of Roman aesthetics in its tone and weave in suggestions of Britain inheriting Roman legacy. The authors describe the transition from British roundhouses to Roman villas:

> One of the signs of Roman influence is the replacement of round huts by rectangular buildings, erected using the new Roman tools, the new building methods, and the new materials such as brick and tile…Some of these early villas are found on the sites of earlier British roundhouses. It is likely that the Britons were attempting to imitate the lifestyle of their Roman conquerors. (*CLC* Stage 14 2012, 17)

Though not as explicit as *Ecce Romani*'s discussion of the German desire to reject tribal building and conform to Roman infrastructure, the passage here still retains hints of glorification. The emphasis on the various "new" Roman introductions to British life suggest that British tools, building methods, and materials were primitive and antiquated in comparison. However, the authors then pivot to how "Britons were attempting to imitate the lifestyle of their Roman conquerors," suggesting that they voluntarily wished to adopt Roman lifestyle rather than being forced to. Therefore, the authors attempt to erase a

victim narrative towards Britons as conquered peoples and instead suggest their agency and cooperation in adopting Roman customs.

Likewise, the culture passage in Stage 14 surrounding enslavement in Britain fails to acknowledge the imperialist aspect of Roman enslavement of Native Britons, which may serve as another attempt to blur lines of Britons as the conquered. Authors compare pre-Roman conquest British enslavement of other British tribes to Roman enslavement of Indigenous peoples, saying, "The Celtic chieftains used and traded slaves taken in raids and inter-tribal warfare. Most of Salvius' farm slaves would also be British, whereas many of his skilled house slaves would be imported from abroad" (*CLC* Stage 14 2012, 20). By mentioning the enslavement of opposing tribes by Celtic chieftains, the authors use practices of enslavement in British communities to justify or sanitize Roman enslavement of native Britons. Through Roman conquest, Britons were subjugated on nearly all levels, from land seizure, to cultural erasure, to loss of bodily autonomy through enslavement. Enslaved peoples were then often exported to other parts of the Roman empire and forced to support the Roman imperial project. Comparing Celtic tribal enslavement to Roman enslavement of Britons suggests that Roman imperialism brought minimal change to their systems because Britons had also previously been enslaved by other Britons. Ignoring the imperial aspect allows the authors to reinforce their image of pride.

In other parts of Unit 2, however, *Cambridge Latin Course* does describe the brutal realities of life under Roman occupation, though not in much detail. From the British perspective, the authors detail what being a Roman province meant, noting how, "From then on, Roman officials would enforce Roman law and collect Roman taxes. Romans would be able to buy land in Britain or use it for agriculture or mining. The Roman army, fed by an

annual tribute in grain and hogs, would be present to keep the peace in the province, firmly and sometimes brutally" (*CLC* Stage 13 2012, 17). The passage emphasizes the amount of control and power that Romans had over Britons, and it is implied that the Britons were subjected to foreign laws that they had no voice in crafting. They mention the seizure of land and the forced payment of tribute that would support the imperial army, which "firmly and sometimes brutally" keeps Celtic tribes under Roman control. With direction under their teachers, such a passage could potentially encourage students to think critically about Roman imperialism. However, the description of the army "keep[ing] the peace in the province" could have been more critically worded, as it sanitizes subjugation through brutal physical force into protection. Perhaps such wording was chosen because of the legacy of British imperialism and the authors' desires to suggest that British armies have "[kept] the peace" in their colonies, just as the Romans did.

The treatment of imperialism throughout *Cambridge*'s Unit 2 continues to be complicated as the book progresses, since content about the violence of imperialism is at times sanitized to ensure a positive view of Rome. In a passage about the destruction of Indigenous lands as a result of Roman occupation, titled "The Celts: Friend or Foe?," the authors reduce violent content to insensitivity, inconvenience, and annoyance:

> The Romans, as with most conquerors in the ancient world, exhibited a certain arrogance and insensitivity when dealing with conquered subjects. The Celts must have found Roman imperial arrogance exasperating. In their belief that only their culture was significant, the Romans thoughtlessly drove one of their major roads, the Fosse Way, straight through lands sacred to Sulis, one of the most revered of the Celtic gods. Once an area had been pacified and the army moved on, it left behind a colōnia, or town with farm allotments for its veterans. This also annoyed the Celts. (*CLC* Stage 15 2012, 13-14)

Though the authors attempt to disrupt the narrative that Roman imperialism was wonderful and justified on all accounts, the execution of the language in the passage still

remains uncritical and even sanitizing. Roman attitudes of inherent superiority are reduced to "a certain arrogance and insensitivity when dealing with conquered subjects," and they are absolved from responsibility because the case was similar "with most conquerors in the ancient world." By highlighting their acts as mere "insensitivity," they suggest that imperial conquest would have been acceptable if the Romans had taken control of Britain more consultatively and respectfully. This sanitized image is crucial, however, if the authors still wanted to keep a positive image of Britons as Roman successors. If the Romans are portrayed as cruel, a classical legacy for Britain would not be a point of pride. In addition, Celtic desires for independence and hatred of the imperial system is reduced to an "exasperat[ed]" attitude towards Roman arrogance. There is an attempt to express Roman attitudes of superiority, but their efforts of Indigenous cultural destruction was anything but "thoughtless"—it was a carefully crafted plan to establish dominance and forced assimilation. The destruction of sacred Celtic lands would not have simply "annoyed the Celts." It was a devastating example of their subjugation under the Romans. The inclusion of such a passage describing the effects of Roman imperialism is an improvement compared to other textbooks, yet the sanitization still fails to accurately and critically portray the level of devastation and destruction. In order for the authors to assert Britain as inheritors of Greco-Roman antiquity and still recognize their history of subjection to Rome, they try to sanitize Roman cruelty to diminish any victimizing narratives.

As the passage continues, forced assimilation of Britons is also sanitized into a positive message of integration in order to protect British dignity and attempt to reconcile their conquered history. The Romans are even praised for their "tolerance" of Celtic tribes. The passage describes how, "In general, however, the Romans treated the Celtic tribes

tolerantly provided that they fit into the Roman system of law, order, and profitable trade. In fact, the Romans actively encouraged the Britons to take over civil administration in their own regions" (*CLC* Stage 15 2012, 14). The process described here is forced assimilation to the Roman way of life, and the tolerance that the Romans had for Celtic tribes was dependent on their submission and willingness to assimilate by rejecting their traditional cultures. Britons were forced to adopt Roman ways in order to ensure their basic safety, though previous passages, such as the one about Britons "[imitating] the lifestyle of their Roman conquerors," suggest that they did so willingly. The encouragement of Romans for Britons to be involved in Roman government was a method to have Britons relinquish their pre-Roman systems of government and rule and Indigenous sovereignty. These tactics worked to ensure Roman control and influence; they were not a sign of Roman acceptance of fair treatment of British tribes. Yet the authors repackage assimilation an image of mutual respect and tolerance, as if the conquered history of the Britons was one of their own volition.

Other attempts of *Cambridge Latin Course* to present Roman imperialism in a nuanced, unbiased light also fall short of capturing the brutalities and destruction involved. In order to present an image of British agency under Roman conquest, the authors suggest the majority of Britons were either neutral, happy about, or benefited from Roman occupation in the "Romanization" section of Stage 13:

> Some Britons became very wealthy from trade and welcomed the Romans enthusiastically; many of the leading families responded to Agricola's encouragement to adopt a Roman lifestyle. Other Britons suffered severely from the arrival of the Romans; others again were hardly affected at all. Many no doubt had mixed feelings about becoming part of the Roman empire. It gave them a share in Roman prosperity and the Roman way of life, but it also meant Roman taxes and a Roman governor backed by Roman troops. (*CLC Stage* 13 2012, 19)

Through such a portrayal, *Cambridge* authors suggest that life did not differ for Britons much before and after Roman occupation and therefore minimize victimization of the British. From their description, Britons who "suffered severely from the arrival of the Romans" were a mere fraction of the population, and most of the others were either neutral or even desired Roman occupation. This description fails to mention the thousands of Britons killed in battle during Roman invasions and conquest and the enslavement of thousands more afterwards. Those who "adopt[ed] a Roman lifestyle" became "leading families" because of their assimilation, and the general majority would not have had the wealth or means to integrate themselves into Roman society. These families were used as a tool of the colonizers in order to demonstrate the "benefits" of submitting to Roman rule. In addition, the claim that "others again were hardly affected at all" fails to acknowledge the imposition of Roman officials, military, and laws, which all now had to obey, as well as the amounts of taxes and tribute they were forced to pay. The authors also assert that the "Roman way of life" is an indisputable benefit of Roman imperialism, which would typically suggest the inferiority of British life and ignores the violence of cultural erasure and assimilation. However, under an image of British inheritance of Roman legacy, such an assertion could be analyzed as a continuation of British civilization in an adapted Roman form.

Ultimately, the glorified image of Roman legacy asserted by *Cambridge Latin Course* authors causes them to perpetuate Nyström's "The Development/Industrial Production/White Man's Burden" masterplot, which illustrates the notion that colonial forces "civilize" and improve Indigenous ways. Scattered throughout the culture section, the authors still interject assertions of Roman superiority and glorification, which in turn

grants Britain prestige if they assert themselves as successors of that legacy. However, in their attempts to reconcile British pride with Britain's history as a conquered state, they fail to recognize that such masterplots highlight the ways in which Roman imperialism strips conquered peoples of true agency. Under the "Romanization" section in Stage 13, authors write of how "Roman peace and security promoted the interchange of ideas, material wealth, and new elegance and comfort" (*CLC* Stage 13 2012, 19). "Roman peace and security" is another way of describing Roman control and subjugation. Likewise, the assertion that Roman peace allowed such things to thrive completely ignores the Roman violence inflicted upon Celtic tribes both before and during Roman occupation. In addition, the passage suggests that "interchange of ideas" and "material wealth" did not exist in pre-Roman Britain, when in reality, other passages detail the rich mineral mines and intricate metalwork made by Celtic tribes prior to Roman arrival. Finally, the "new elegance and comfort" that is claimed to be introduced by the Romans suggests Roman civilization or improvement of Celtic culture and ways of life, illustrating Nyström's colonial masterplot.

In an effort to contrast the section on Queen Boudica and the resistance of Britons, Stage 15 also includes examples of Celtic tribes and rulers who cooperated with Romans over the interest of their people. Such passages reinforce the image of Britain as a collaborative and willing partner in adopting Roman customs and directly contrast their previous goal of portraying pre-Roman Britain as powerful and "civilized" in their own right. They particularly point out Queen Cartimandua of the Brigantes as a Roman ally and describe how she handed over a wanted Welsh leader to the Romans. The language surrounding the story heavily favors the Romans as benevolent and merciful:

> The Romans were glad to have a buffer between them and the wilder tribes of the far north. Caratacus, a Welsh leader who had been fighting the Romans for seven

> years, fled to her for refuge. Cartimandua showed her loyalty to Rome by handing Caratacus over to them. In spite of the trouble Caratacus had caused, Claudius, after parading Caratacus and his family in his triumph at Rome, allowed him to live in honorable retirement. For supporting Rome, Cartimandua twice received Roman help in quelling rebellions in her own tribe. (CLC Stage 15 2012, 15)

The authors now describe Celtic tribes who would not submit to Roman rule as "wilder," a common trope and stereotype of Indigenous groups. This stereotype feeds into Nyström's "Developmental/Industrial Production/White Man's Burden" masterplot, as certain tribes who were favorable to the Romans are deemed more "civilized" for accepting Roman ways. The authors continue to praise the Romans for their treatment of Caratacus, reducing his rebellion and fight for independence to "trouble…caused" for Rome. Yet the parade of triumph was a symbol of submission to Rome and a public demonstration of imperial power. The authors portray the Romans as merciful by suggesting that Caratacus deserved even crueler punishment than what the Romans allowed, as if they support the execution of those who rebelled against the Romans. They also stress the benefits that Queen Cartimandua received for displaying Roman "loyalty," when in reality she supported Rome out of fear, to obtain favor, or even both. For conquered peoples, "loyalty" to conquerors is not a virtue but a survival tactic. Furthermore, the rebellions against Queen Cartimandua may have been based on dissatisfaction with her support of Rome. By extending help to quell those rebellions, Rome is simply working to keep their power within her tribe.

Further implications that Britain was a willing accomplice in adopting Roman lifestyles are included in a section about the historical context of King Cogidubnus, in which the authors stress the importance of his loyalty to Rome for the maintenance of control in the empire. King Cogidubnus publicly supported Rome and adopted Roman customs and culture, especially with the construction of a Roman temple:

> By dedicating the new temple to Neptune and Minerva rather than British gods, Cogidubnus publicly declared his loyalty to Rome. The temple was a reminder of Roman power. Its priests may well have been selected from the local British chieftains, many of whom were quick to see the advantages of supporting the new government. And when the inscription goes on to say that the temple was intended "for the welfare of the Divine House," Cogidubnus is suggesting that the emperor himself is related to the gods and should be worshiped. The Romans encouraged the people of their empire to respect and worship the emperor in this way, because it helped to ensure obedience and to build up a sense of unity in a large empire that contained many tribes, many languages, and many religions. (*CLC* Stage 15 2012, 17)

King Cogidubnus completely and publicly submitted to Roman imperial powers in order to keep his own power under the Romans. The authors once again highlight the concept of "loyalty to Rome," but it was a safety tactic for King Cogidubnus to maintain some semblance of the control he had previous to Roman arrival. The authors make clear that Roman imperialism means cultural erasure of British ways, as King Cogidubnus chose to adopt Roman religious beliefs "rather than [dedicating the temple to] British gods." He was the epitome of what Romans wanted for British rulers: to support Roman power, adopt Roman ways and reject their own, and become keepers of the imperial system. The passage stresses the desire to assimilate to Roman ways as beneficial, highlighting the "advantages of supporting the new government." The authors end the passage with the importance of submitting to the Roman emperor as a part of the imperial project "to ensure obedience and to build up a sense of unity." Central to their goal of establishing Britain as successors of Rome, imperial control is sanitized as a sense of togetherness and national identity rather than violence against and subjection of thousands of Indigenous peoples.

Representations of Roman imperialism and foreign peoples within textbooks such as *Ecce Romani* and *Cambridge Latin Course* are not simple or straightforward. Oftentimes, they support messages of Roman imperialism through glorification of Rome, sanitization,

or the usage of colonial masterplots. For instance, *Ecce Romani* strips agency from Helge by making her complicit in assertions of Roman superiority and glorification while disparaging her own Ubian tribe. At times, however, textbooks also attempt to present a more nuanced and inclusive view. *Cambridge Latin Course* is successful in some ways, asserting that Britain was a highly developed civilization prior to Roman arrival and portraying Queen Boudica as a powerful figure of Roman resistance. Yet, such improved representation may be used towards the ultimate goal of establishing a nationalist message—one in which Britain is a worthy inheritor of Rome's legacy due to its strength prior to Roman conquest and its consensual adoption of Roman culture. As a result of juggling both their identity as a conquered group and their nationalist message, the authors of *Cambridge* bounce back and forth between representing the brutality of Roman imperialism and perpetuating suggestions of colonial masterplots and sanitization of the violence. Their ultimate goal is to make Britons active and willing inheritors of Rome while still taking pride in their endurance of Roman rule. Though there have been steps taken to improve representation, there is still much more work to be done in order for the portrayals of Roman imperial violence to be truly critical.

Chapter 3: Critical Pedagogy in the Latin Classroom

Introduction

As demonstrated in the previous two chapters, *Cambridge Latin Course* and *Ecce Romani* have significant shortcomings and failures in representing the issues of ancient slavery, imperialism, and the diversity of the ancient world. Yet these books continue to be in wide circulation and use within secondary Latin classrooms all over the world, and they will not be stopping anytime soon. Understandably, textbooks like *Cambridge* and *Ecce Romani* can provide helpful starting places for Latin teachers, especially new ones, to teach the language in their classrooms. Such textbooks have established lesson plans, texts, vocabulary lists, and language grammar practice already embedded and included. And for teachers who may already be understaffed, underpaid, and under-resourced, these textbooks can provide the means to teach the Latin language in one place. The problem arises when teachers *only* use these textbooks and stop short of expanding their curriculum and classrooms beyond the information within those pages.

Textbooks like *Cambridge Latin Course* and *Ecce Romani* can be good starting points for Latin classrooms, but teachers must be committed to a socially just, multicultural critical pedagogy beyond them. Such a pedagogy, however, is often not as easily translated to a classroom that teaches an ancient language. For other modern language classrooms, there is more access to diverse voices and stories that can be included. However, many of the voices that have been historically erased within classics have only recently been and

continue to be recovered (though the majority will never be), and much has changed between our world and the one of Greco-Roman antiquity. Likewise, the majority of resources and books surrounding critical pedagogical practices do not include information on how to teach ancient languages justly. As the history of classics is one steeped in elitism and white supremacy, work and research surrounding a critical Latin classroom has only surfaced in the last few decades. Therefore, it leaves much of the work to individual Latin teachers to figure out what such a critical Latin pedagogy means for their own classrooms.

Utilizing *Cambridge Latin Course* and *Ecce Romani* in their current forms as the sole or even primary text or source of Roman history and culture in a classroom fails to educate students about the realities of the ancient world, especially the perspectives of enslaved and conquered peoples, women, the lower classes, and other historically oppressed groups. The texts carry too many instances of sanitization, erasure, and misrepresentation to be a socially just source, even if educators try to apply critical teaching principles to them. It is therefore imperative for educators to turn to other ways beyond the myopic lens of these books to create more critical, inclusive, and equitable Latin classrooms. If such texts are to be a part of the Latin curriculum, other avenues to the historically silenced perspectives of enslaved, conquered, and otherwise marginalized populations and critical coverage of ancient systems of oppression must be offered through readings, projects, and lessons outside of the textbooks.

Latin teachers have an extra obligation to incorporate principles and practices of critical pedagogy into their Latin classrooms, especially given the problematic history of the discipline of classics and its entanglement with elitism and white supremacy. Until more critical and inclusive Latin textbooks are well established and readily available on

shelves, it is unrealistic to ask all Latin teachers to constantly craft entire original lessons outside of any textbook. However, it would be morally unjust as educators to continue to use these textbooks without addressing their issues or utilizing them as opportunities to encourage critical thinking among their students.

The scholarship of critical pedagogical theorists and experts Freire, hooks, Shor, Yosso, Bishop, Ladson-Billings, and Paris, offers theories, tools, techniques, approaches, and practices that educators can use to accomplish this. Based on their work, I propose in this chapter student-centered, critical pedagogical Latin classroom practices and values from my perspective as a Latin student of 8 years, a student of critical, culturally relevant pedagogical theory, and a future teacher. I trace such practices and values through three different Latin classrooms, whose teachers I have interviewed about their work. I propose that these classrooms demonstrate several components that are pivotal to a critical, social justice oriented Latin classroom. These components include Freirean concepts of liberating pedagogy, culturally relevant pedagogy that reflects counterstories, the willingness of teachers to be vulnerable and take risks, critical literacy, differentiated learning, and the importance of building a classroom community.

Some of these concepts have room to work alongside the Latin textbooks despite or because of their issues with representation. For instance, the Latin lessons in the textbooks could still be adapted to fit student needs in multiple ways, and the portrayals of ancient slavery and imperialism could be used to practice critical literacy skills in an analysis of why the authors take a sanitized approach. However, other components require educators to go beyond the textbooks to other sources or practices. Little can be done about the lack of diversity and inclusion in both *Ecce Romani* and *Cambridge Latin Course* without

pivoting to other materials that can more fully represent the experiences of the marginalized in the ancient world. The purpose of this chapter is to urge educators to think deeply about the ways in which they can make their Latin classroom more inclusive and equitable for all students, both with the textbooks and beyond them, and to recognize their responsibility to contribute to the emergence of a critical Latin pedagogy in innovative and creative ways.

This chapter begins with a description of the Latin teachers I have conversed with and their teaching situations and then discusses each of the critical pedagogical components listed above in detail. Each section will start with a description of the scholarly roots from which the critical pedagogical component is drawn and a brief overview of the concept. Then, I will detail how the principle or value takes shape in several Latin classrooms across the country, as well as other practices and ideas that I propose from my own experience and knowledge.

Background

Magistra Grace Curcio, Magister Alexander Paras, and Magistra Lana Sum:

As part of my chapter on the use of Latin textbooks in classrooms alongside critical pedagogical practices, I reconnected with one of my former Latin teachers at St. Ignatius College Preparatory, Grace Curcio, and her new colleague, Alexander Paras. St. Ignatius College Preparatory (SI) is a private Jesuit high school in San Francisco. The Latin Program at St. Ignatius had used *Cambridge Latin Course* during my time there from 2014-2018 and continues to today. Curcio has taught there since 1998, and Paras recently started there in 2020. The former teaches Latin 1, a combined Latin 3 and 4 class, and Advanced Placement Latin, while the latter teaches Latin 2, Latin 2 Honors, and Latin 3 Honors.

I asked Curcio how she had started using *Cambridge Latin Course* as the primary text for her introductory Latin courses, and she detailed a story of trying several different textbooks before finally landing on *Cambridge*. Before the previous Latin teacher had left, they had been using *Ecce Romani* for many years, and Curcio noted that she was simply tired of the textbook and was looking for something fresh and new to revitalize her classroom. *Cambridge* provided Curcio with the reading-centered method she was looking for that she did not find from other textbooks, with each stage beginning with several reading passages and the grammar concepts and explanations following. Curcio had also found that her Latin students were drawn and attached to the storyline of *Cambridge* and its characters, especially the adventures of Quintus and Cerberus. In addition, *Cambridge* was more economical for St. Ignatius classrooms, which requires students to have Apple iPads. When bought as eBooks, *Cambridge* chapters cost only 99 cents each. All of these factors led to *Cambridge* being used in her classroom for nearly 10 years now.

Though it has now been four years since I was there and many things have changed, I can attest that I loved my time in my SI Latin classroom with Magistra Curcio and Magistra Lana Sum (who has recently started teaching at another school in Berkeley). *Cambridge's* scaffolding approach towards the Latin language, along with the practices and expertise of Curcio and Sum, worked for me in terms of learning the Latin language. However, neither Curcio, Paras, or Sum have been ignorant of its shortcomings in other ways, particularly the culture sections. Curcio recounts times when *Cambridge's* santization of the topics encouraged students to assume that ancient slavery was not particularly bad because manumission was painted to be a normalized or common occurrence for all enslaved people, or that women in Rome were equal to ancient men because they had more

rights compared to the women of other ancient civilizations. Though they had always addressed these incorrect assumptions when expressed during class, Curcio and Sum decided that a more comprehensive and sustained approach to such topics was needed.

Mr. Evan Armacost:

Evan Armacost is a Latin teacher for the Fessenden School in Massachusetts, an independent school for boys from Pre-Kindergarten to Ninth Grade. Armacost teaches 3 sections of Latin to students from Grade Seven to Nine, including two Latin 1 sections and one Latin 3 section.

I had the privilege of watching Armacost's presentation of his work in the classroom at the "Classical Studies Now: Trends, Tools, and Techniques" panel during the 2022 annual Society for Classical Studies conference. His presentation, titled "Inclusive Teaching in Uncertain Times: Comprehensible Input and Equity in the Latin Classroom," brought to light many of the strategies, techniques, and projects he has been implementing in his own teaching in hopes of transforming the traditional, inequitable, and inaccessible Latin classroom space. I reached out to Armacost after his presentation and soon connected with him to talk more about his pedagogical approach.

Armacost started using the *Cambridge Latin Course* for his students because it was the text already in use by other Latin teachers in the Fessenden School. He quickly found that the text alone was not enough to suffice for his classes for a number of reasons. First, the characters of *Cambridge* were simply not diverse enough for his classroom of multicultural students. As discussed in the previous chapter, the coverage of *Cambridge* Unit 2 primarily focuses on Britain and Egypt as the settings outside of Rome, but the plotlines still mainly center elite Roman families in those locations. In my experience, being

a student of color in classics can be particularly isolating if efforts are not made to combat the association with whiteness in the field. Though I had two inspiring Asian women as my Latin teachers in high school, the perceived whiteness of the ancient world as presented through *Cambridge Latin Course* made me feel as though I had no place in the discipline as a young Asian woman. For Armacost, it is important to dispel the notion of "western" whiteness that is so central to many views of the Roman Empire. He wants his students to see the Roman Empire and beyond in all of its diversity and to see reflections of themselves in the ancient world they are studying.

A Liberating Latin Pedagogy

In order to address any of the issues mentioned above and create progress in the Latin classroom, we as educators must begin by diverging our entire conceptualization of education from one that views students as vessels to impose knowledge upon and shift it to one that recognizes them as partners in learning. Following Paulo Freire's theory of a liberating pedagogy as explained in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, I believe that Latin teachers should reject dominant models of the "banking method" of teaching and disrupt imbalanced power structures between teachers and students in favor of a mutual experience of learning and growth. The "banking method" describes classrooms and teaching approaches in which students are seen as mere empty vessels for an educator, in their position of power, to fill with knowledge as they see fit. A Freirean approach to teaching is the crucial foundation of any critical classroom that strives for equity.

Rather, teachers should adopt a "problem-posing" approach to education, in which the classroom is treated as a space of mutual learning and growth for both teachers and students. Freire explains problem-posing education, noting how, "Through dialogue, the

teacher-of-the-students and the students-of-the-teacher cease to exist and a new term emerges: teacher-student with students-teachers. The teacher is no longer merely the-one-who-teaches, but one who is himself taught in dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teach" (Freire 1972, 80). In order for a truly liberatory classroom space to take place, it must first start with the teacher's perception of their role as an educator. Latin teachers must forcefully reject the elitist, white supremacist, historically dominant narrative of classics that has been fed to the minds of students through the banking method for centuries, and instead view students as individuals with diverse experiences, perspectives, and strengths to offer the classroom. The diversity and power of students should be celebrated and fostered as agents of learning.

Ira Shor further describes the role of an educator within problem-posing education:

> The responsibilities of the problem-posing teacher is to diversify subject matter and to use students' thoughts and speech as the basis for developing critical understanding of personal experience, unequal conditions in society, and existing knowledge. In this democratic pedagogy, the teacher is not filling empty minds with official or unofficial knowledge but is posing knowledge in any form as a problem for mutual inquiry. (Shor 1992, 33)

For a classroom that may have *Cambridge Latin Course* or *Ecce Romani* in its repertoire of texts, it becomes the teacher's responsibility to present a more inclusive and comprehensive view of the ancient world, including a critical reading of the information provided by the textbooks. The cultural information in these textbooks cannot merely be presented as fact to students, but rather as an opportunity to engage critically with the messages they may be sending about Greece and Rome.

Centering Freirean values is the initial step for every critical classroom, as it transforms all approaches to any of the materials being used in the curriculum. Freirean values pave the way for all of the other principles of a critical Latin pedagogy that are later

described in this chapter. Rather than teaching the cultural material of *Cambridge Latin Course* and *Ecce Romani* as they present them, a problem-posing educator would utilize the text as a starting point for critical conversations with students. For instance, students would not be conditioned to blindly accept the representations of the majority of enslavers as kind and benevolent. Instead, prompted conversations between students and educators together would question the institution that allows for humans to be considered property, as well as ask why authors may be tempted to sanitize its violence. This approach takes significantly more effort than the former, but only educators who are informed and dedicated to a liberating pedagogy would strive to make it work. Freirean values drive the motivation and the work to make a critical Latin classroom possible. It is the foundation of all of the critical pedagogical teaching components to come.

Though I cannot speak for their personal education beliefs, Armacost, Paras, Curcio, and Sum have all followed the spirit of Freirean pedagogy and a problem-posing education from my observations. Their approach to education is evident through the lengths they go to to diversify the classroom curriculum for their students. Such efforts will be detailed in later sections.

Culturally Relevant Practices that Reflect Counterstories

The main issue with *Cambridge Latin Course* and *Ecce Romani* covered in this thesis is with the lack of inclusion or sanitized portrayals of marginalized identities in the ancient world. These stories center the lives of rich, elite, perceivably "white" Roman men and their households. All illustrations of the main characters depict them with white features, and very little diversity exists beyond minor characters. Such portrayals and lack of inclusion paint a myopic vision of the ancient world that rarely reflects the demographics and

interests of modern Latin students. Because the depictions within these textbooks analyzed in the previous two chapters often sanitize the violence of the ancient world and remain complicit in messages of enslavement and imperialism, this is an area that requires Latin teachers to turn to resources and materials outside of the textbooks to provide a more holistic, inclusive, and representative view of antiquity.

Latin classrooms must be committed to Ladson-Billings's theory of culturally relevant pedagogy, especially when such textbooks are in regular use. Ladson-Billings describes the proponents of culturally relevant pedagogy: "(a) Students must experience academic success; (b) students must develop and/or maintain cultural competence; and (c) students must develop a critical consciousness through which they challenge the status quo of the current social order" (Ladson-Billings 1995, 160). When students feel that their identities are included and portrayed in the curriculum, it opens up access to the ancient world that has previously been gatekept for elite, wealthy, white male students. Students can feel like they have a place in the Latin classroom rather than question their validity or right to study the classics, especially for those with marginalized identities wondering how they fit into this traditionally white-washed discipline. Students of color can feel as if the space is designated for the privileged and that they do not belong if a culturally relevant pedagogy is not in place. In addition, the inclusion of diverse representation in the ancient world allows students to develop cultural competence in addressing diversity within antiquity and to analyze how portrayals of whiteness in classics have contributed to arguments of white supremacy throughout history.

Ancient notions of race and ethnicity were notably different than modern ones, which can make culturally relevant pedagogical theory difficult to translate in some cases.

For instance, our modern divisions of race (Black, white, Asian, Indigenous, etc.) did not exist in the ancient world, and concepts of ethnicity were based on cultural practices and religious beliefs more than physical appearance (Kennedy, Roy, and Goldman 2013). Despite this, attitudes of xenophobia and ethnic hierarchies were still prevalent, with Greeks and Romans viewing themselves as superior. Such differences between ancient ideas and modern ones serve as important tools through which students can critically challenge the social constructions of race today. By looking at how concepts of race and ethnicity have transformed or persisted over time, students can truly grasp race as a social concept that was formulated to serve the purposes of white supremacy. Then, students are able to apply such knowledge to conversations about modern day issues surrounding racial identity and inequity from a critical perspective. In addition, discussion on diversity provides a gateway into critical conversations about ancient trade, wars, and imperialism that made cultural diffusion possible. Students have an opportunity to not only understand the vastness of the Roman empire, but also *why* imperialism happened, *how* conquest was conducted, and to hear the perspectives of those conquered.

Wherever possible, Latin teachers should also strive to prioritize Yosso's theory of critical race counterstorytelling, in which voices of marginalized communities are uplifted over privileged ones. Yosso writes of the importance of counterstorytelling for Critical Race Theory, noting that, "Counterstories seek to document the persistence of racism from the perspectives of those injured and victimized by its legacy. Furthermore, counterstories bring attention to those who courageously resist racism and struggle toward a more socially and racially just society" (Yosso 2005, 10). I extend Yosso's counterstorytelling argument to narratives of all marginalized groups in the ancient world. This can present a

problem in acquiring the words of marginalized voices for Latin teachers, as ancient voices are already few and far between in terms of survival. Yet simply prioritizing the voices and stories of women, people of color, foreigners, the conquered, and poor populations wherever possible makes a significant difference. For example, teachers could include sections of Apuleius's *Golden Ass* for discussion or translation, in which he writes from the perspective of someone deemed foreign and discusses views of foreign people. Or perhaps in discussing many of Rome's notable landmarks and buildings, teachers can take time to also show depictions of Roman *insulae* and descriptions of the conditions to which lower classes were subjected. The inclusion of such perspectives allows students to see Rome in a nuanced way and to give voice to those who have been silenced to the best of our modern ability. For Grace Curcio and Lana Sum at St. Ignatius, the inclusion of such counterstories took the form of crafting an entire reader about marginalized voices in the ancient world.

In 2018, Curcio and Sum took on the Herculean challenge of writing a supplemental reader on various topics that have been left out of *Cambridge's* pages for St. Ignatius's Latin students. The reader, titled "*Sine Voce*: Social Issues of the Ancient World," is specially curated by Curcio and Sum with scholarly texts and ancient passages that describe many groups and experiences that have been historically silenced. The reader includes sections on Roman apartments, the behaviors of women deemed socially acceptable and unacceptable, deep dives into the institution of ancient slavery and the treatment of enslaved peoples, race, ethnicity, and foreigners, social classes, the treatment of provinces, and much more. Each chapter begins with secondary scholarly sources that give an overview of the topic and proceeds to include ancient primary sources that describe those

aspects of the ancient world. The chapters are then assigned either alongside or in lieu of certain culture sections in the *Cambridge* series.

The reader debuted in St. Ignatius's Latin classrooms in the Fall of 2018, and students continue to love it today. Curcio describes how, with the reader, students feel as if they now have more of a grasp on how it must have felt for those marginalized and erased populations. The reader does not shy away from the brutality of the ancient world, including passages from Apuleius and Juvenal about the violence that enslaved people endured and inscriptions about services provided by a company that tortured enslaved people for others. It urges students to think critically about the portrayals and descriptions of enslaved people that they may come across in *Cambridge*. Curcio also recognizes when the textbook has its strengths. For culture sections in *Cambridge* that are done well, such as the section on Queen Boudica in *Cambridge's* coverage of ancient Britain, Curcio supplements the reading with an extra video that goes in depth into her story. Such efforts to add a different or deeper understanding of antiquity come from a desire to help quench the thirst and satisfy the curiosity of students to know more about the world from which the language they are learning. Curcio even describes how one current Freshman student has already read the entire *Sine Voce* reader from cover to cover of her own volition.

It's important to note that not all teachers have the time and resources to write an entire supplemental reader, nor should they feel obligated to. Teachers can start with providing supplemental chapters or articles from other authors that discuss marginalized groups of the ancient world on certain days or alongside certain lessons. The culture sections in *Cambridge Latin Course* and *Ecce Romani* could be assigned alongside these critical readings to offer students two opposing perspectives, or more in depth readings

could be assigned for topics that the textbooks may gloss over. Teachers can also assign projects that ask students to research the experiences of those groups or even screen videos or documentaries that depict the varied lives of the ancient world. Even smaller steps like these pave the way for more inclusion in the classroom.

Pivoting to Evan Armacost, he has transitioned to using a mixture of other resources to create a classroom that celebrates the diversity of the ancient world. At times, he pairs *Cambridge* with *Suburani*, a recently released series of textbooks that aims to "[provide] an opportunity to reconsider some priorities, provide a more balanced coverage of women and men, show the diversity of the Roman Empire and address other issues which teachers tell [*Suburani*] are important to them and their students" (Hands Up Education, n.d.). From the covers of the textbook, the images portray Roman characters of many different skin tones and ethnicities. The text also seems to take place in several different locations across the Roman Empire, including Gaul, Lusitania, Pompeii, and Carthage.

Armacost also prioritizes projects that center the diversity of the ancient world outside of Italy. One such project includes researching the relationship and influence between Native peoples of the Iberian Peninsula, Roman Spain, and modern Hispanic culture for Hispanic Heritage Month, in which students explored cuisine and crafted Roman and Iberian swords. Another project for Black History Month in the works asks students to "Become the New Herodotus," in which students must research and create a history, either in a written or physical model, that accurately portrays the story of a Roman province in Africa or any African Kingdom in contact with Rome. The project asks students to confront the oftentime xenophobic portrayals of foreign peoples presented in Herodotus's writing and to take agency in rewriting the narrative. Armacost has expressed his desire to work

closely with the Fessenden School's Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion team to ensure that no curricular harm is being enacted on teachers or students in exploring the writing of Herodotus. He is also working on projects about ancient women and the near or far East's interactions with Rome. By discussing his projects and approaches with specialists at his school, Armacost is actively seeking community help in navigating such an ambitious task of diversifying the voices and representations within his Latin classroom. Though the work to develop critical Latin pedagogy often falls into the hands of individual teachers, there are countless networks to seek support in this endeavor, including other faculty members and Latin teachers attempting to do the same.

All of these teachers have gone above and beyond to center culturally relevant practices in their classrooms and to uplift the voices of marginalized identities of the ancient world as much as they can. Conversations, content, and projects like the ones implemented by Curcio, Sum, and Armacost have the potential to spark critical conversations about race, ethnicity, gender, class, imperialism, and much more, both in the ancient world and in our world today. Other ideas can include conversations about polychromy and asking students to restore the color and diversity back to an image of an ancient statue, or perhaps students could write their own movie reviews about portrayals of whiteness and people of color and Greco-Roman antiquity in blockbuster movies such as *Gladiator* or popular television shows. By including topics that reflect student interests and identities, teachers can actively reject the history of elitism within classics starting with their own classrooms.

Taking Risks in the Latin Classroom

There is no doubt that rejecting dominant teaching culture and methods can be scary for educators. Afterall, the dominant narrative became and remains dominant for a reason; the people in power do not wish for their power to be disrupted. Latin teachers may receive backlash from administrators, parents, and traditional classicists for making an effort to turn their classrooms and lessons into critical ones. Some may face criticism about making things too political or for discouraging students from studying Greco-Roman antiquity by illuminating the harsh realities of the ancient world rather than participating in its glorification. As a field with a shrinking number of students across the country, many may be worried about enrollment numbers and retaining students.

Nevertheless, a critical Latin classroom cannot be sacrificed for any of those reasons. Though often easier said than done, educators must be willing to take the risk to make their Latin classes an inclusive and critical space. Activist and scholar bell hooks writes of the importance of taking risks in a problem-posing education:

> Any classroom that employs a holistic model of learning will also be a place where teachers grow, and are empowered by the process. That empowerment cannot happen if [teachers] refuse to be vulnerable while encouraging students to take risks…Progressive professors working to transform the curriculum so that it does not reflect biases or reinforce systems of dominance are most often the individuals willing to take risk that engage pedagogy requires and to make their teaching practices a site of resistance. (hooks 1994, 21)

In order to fully adopt a problem-posing classroom, educators must be willing to put themselves in a position to learn from and grow alongside students. Such growth would not be possible without vulnerability on the part of the teacher. Attempting to incorporate critical content and progressive ideas and practices can be daunting, and it also requires careful planning and meticulous attention when exercised, since the issues of white

supremacy, misogyny, elitism, and systemic oppression at hand are complicated ones to discuss. Yet they are complicated to navigate because of the gravity that they hold.

As I talked with Armacost about his SCS presentation and his efforts to diversify the curriculum in his classroom, he stressed the importance of building trust with his students, especially whenever new classroom activities are being introduced. Armacost expressed that his environment at the Fessenden School has played a supportive role in the risks he has been able to take, but that still does not take away the fear of initiating more progressive practices, especially as a new teacher. He told me that the biggest fear and hurdle was finding the bravery to take these risks. Armacost had a bit of imposter syndrome at first and worried about the reception among his students towards these new projects and classroom structures. For him, it became a matter of reflecting critically, running it by the students, and revising as he went. Constantly exploring, revisiting, and revising, allows teachers to make changes to the classroom slowly and therefore more manageable, realistic, and less intimidating. He says he is grateful that he felt supported and safe enough in his teaching environment to try new things, and that every time he does, he has a conversation with his students about the trial activities that they are about to embark on. He asks the students to trust him and informs them that they would be learning alongside each other. So far, many of his risks have paid off, and his students have loved the new projects, content, and activities that have been introduced in the classroom. However, whenever something is not working, Armacost is not afraid to reassess and restart. He places himself as a learner beside his students and encourages them to work together.

A critical pedagogical approach also requires vulnerability simply because of the seriousness of most, if not all, critical conversations surrounding oppression. The inclusion

of the *Sine Voce* reader has sparked many conversations in St. Ignatius's classrooms. Paras and Curcio, however, are also fully aware of the implications and challenges that accompany having a reader such as *Sine Voce*. Both had expressed that discussions and conversations can be very difficult to conduct, and Curcio is especially conscious and mindful about language usage or sounding too opinionated. The exposure of students to many of the brutal realities of the ancient world may also leave students feeling horrified, and teachers must carefully navigate student reactions and emotions. Paras feels that it is difficult to find balance between giving the subjects and discussions the time they deserve and utilizing class time for language practice and grammar concepts. Nevertheless, both educators are willing to take steps of vulnerability like these to ensure that marginalized voices of the ancient world are not further silenced in their modern classrooms. In the words of the introduction of the reader by Curcio and Sum, the teachers state that:

> We believe that it would be a disservice to [students] to shield [them] from the harsh realities of the Roman world, not simply because ignoring those realities would be historically misleading, but because so many of Rome's systems of power and oppression have directly influenced the structure and problems of our own society. (Curcio and Sum 2018, 3)

Though uncritically presenting textbook materials or only focusing on language would require less work and less risks, St. Ignatius's past and current Latin educators recognize the importance of including critical representations of the ancient world and having conversations despite the challenges. As the students are asked to be vulnerable in exploring the marginalized identities of the ancient world and thinking critically, Curcio and Paras are right beside them, and both students and teachers are presented with opportunities to grow together.

There are understandably many factors that go into taking risks to implement more progessive classroom practices such as the ones mentioned above. Educators may face

backlash or resistance from administrators or parents about their work, or they simply lack the time, resources, funding, and support to begin. Many structural factors can prohibit a teacher from doing so. However, every choice makes a difference, and even smaller conversations while flipping through a textbook can be helpful in disrupting dominant narratives. Latin educators have a responsibility of dispeling notions of whiteness and elitism traditionally conflated with classics in order to teach equitably, and this cannot be done without stepping outside of comfort zones. Students are asked to be vulnerable in their daily classroom practices and assessments, and such vulnerability should also be demonstrated and modeled by educators.

Socially just and critical teaching does not come naturally. It will require work on the part of educators, and the drive to put in that work comes from their core values towards teaching. As illustrated by Armacost, Curcio, and Paras, navigating such conversations are worth the moments of uncertainty and vulnerability, and they are certainly necessary in order to break from traditional classics teaching.

Latin Textbooks and Critical Literacy

Central to a critical pedagogical approach to using these textbooks in the Latin classroom is utilizing them as a tool for students to develop critical literacy skills toward the text and the history of the discipline of classics as a tool of white supremacy and elitism. Bishop summarizes critical literacy praxis, as proposed by Lankshear and McLaren, as the following:

> Critical literacy praxis…involves textual studies that are analyzed at the discursive level in which the texts were created and in which they are sustained…They argued that even when students are introduced to texts that might be considered "reactionary," a critical literacy approach involves working with them "to understand the nature and implications of the ideologies on parade; and in doing so

> engage students in reflection upon their own ideological investment"... (Bishop 2014, 53-54)

In a Latin classroom that encourages critical literacy praxis, students should be encouraged to think deeply and analyze why information is included, excluded, or presented in a way that suggests a certain message, as well as *why* particular rhetorics and perspectives have continued to remain privileged and dominant. Students would be asked about their perceived images of Greece or Rome, the concept of "Western Civilization," and to trace the history and problems of its glorification. With contextual knowledge about classics and elitism and practice critically analyzing privileged texts, students would develop skills for critical consciousness surrounding all texts that they may come across in their academic careers.

In St. Ignatius's classrooms, Paras describes how the *Sine Voce* reader has allowed his students to reflect on the reality that the majority of ancient people faced and to critically analyze the myopic representations of the ancient world as rich, elite, white men. He describes how initial reactions of students to *Cambridge* culture sections include thoughts about how great it would be to live in the Roman world, as some may have made assumptions about every ancient person being wealthy or thought positively about Roman imperialism. When such assumptions are made, Paras invites his students to a discussion of the contrasting realities that the reader presents. He makes it clear that wealth would have been disproportionate, with only one student in the entire class who may have been rich, while the others would most likely have lived in the apartments described in *Sine Voce*. Or, if students praise the accomplishments of Roman imperialism, Paras will also remind them of the opposite perspective of those conquered, who would have had to pay many taxes to

Romans after fighting battles in which the Roman army killed many of their people. Such discussions encourage students to analyze the information presented to them in textbooks critically and to reflect on why they may have an idealized image of Rome.

Combined with culturally relevant practices and inclusive representation of the ancient world, this is an area where the textbook depictions in *Cambridge Latin Course* and *Ecce Romani* serve as useful practice for developing critical literacy skills, especially through conversations like the ones illustrated above. In addition, critical literacy should encourage students to think critically about their own role in the study of Latin. For example, a conversation about why *Ecce Romani* criticizes German culture and praises Roman imperialism from the perspective of an Indigenous Ubian woman (as analyzed in pages 40-41 of this thesis) can lead to discussions about how uncritical glorification of Greece and Rome has supported the involvement of classics with a history of elitism and white supremacy, as well as ask students to confront if they have held such ideas of glorification themselves.

After these discussions, students should also be encouraged to play an active role in combating harmful representations of Greece and Rome. Some suggestions include analyzing motives behind textbook portrayals, reconstructing stories to be more inclusive, or even writing letters to textbook authors and editors about the importance of diverse and accurate representation. Examples of critical literacy lessons for *Cambridge Latin Course* and *Ecce Romani* textbooks are included on pages 93-102 of this thesis. Through these practices, students will be motivated to formulate their own thoughts and opinions based on critical analysis, and they will foster their own agency in reformulating representation themselves.

Differentiated Learning

In an effort to make classrooms more accessible and equitable for all students, Latin teachers should adopt practices that follow Universal Design for Instruction (UDI) in order to address learning differences and interests both pertaining to the Latin textbooks and beyond. Central to UDI is the concept of differentiation, which encourages educators to provide multiple modes and avenues of instruction, assigned work, learning, materials, and assessment in attempts to provide an option that works for all learning styles and differences. UDI practices ensure that lessons, materials, assessments, and classroom spaces are differentiated to fit the needs of all students. Valle and Connor highlight several core principles of UDI that are central to an accessible classroom environment: equitable use, flexibility of use, simple and intuitive instruction, perceptible information, tolerance for error, low physical effort, size and space for approach and use, a community of learners, and inclusive instructional climate (Valle and Connor 2010, 77-79). In short, UDI aims to foster the agency of all students by providing an equitable learning space where students are free to make choices that best fit their learning desires and strengths. UDI in practice could look like giving students the choice of what media form their project may take, providing several different ways to access a text (such as audiobook, digital text, etc.), clear outlines and rubrics of expectations provided in multiple forms, classroom materials and furniture that supports the physical needs and mobility of all students, and much more.

In an area of success for one of the textbooks, the digital versions of *Cambridge Latin Course* impressively provide a wide range of accessibility tools that fit some of the goals of UDI. On the eBook, students have access to videos, audio recordings of the Latin stories

being read aloud, as well as an interactive "Explore the Story" feature in which students can tap on a word of the story and have immediate access to its definition. Such tools can be very useful for students who benefit from reading digitally or listening to audio recordings. The Latin stories and language practices could also be differentiated and repurposed in other ways by educators to fit the needs of students, such as including a visual vocabulary list with corresponding images to terms, or rotating between individual, partner, group, and classwide translating practices.

There are many other ways to differentiate the material found within the textbooks. At the Fessenden School, Armacost utilizes *Cambridge* text in differentiated forms of instruction to fit the needs for his students. Most recently, they have turned to prioritizing reading comprehension and class discussion of *Cambridge* passages during classroom time rather than direct translation. In some ways, Armacost has seen Latin to English translation as a "colonial enterprise" in the act of turning a foreign language into one that is familiar and understandable, and it creates an inequitable atmosphere in which certain students have advantages and are ranked or graded above others. Therefore, he has pivoted to reading the passages as a class in Latin and conducting discussions about the *Cambridge* plot in English, often sprinkling Latin vocabulary into the English questions to encourage familiarity. Though this practice has been in early stages, Armacost has reported that the students have expressed much more interest, and that they have been getting through the same amount of material and comprehension.

Furthermore, Armacost is not afraid to pivot away from translation and *Cambridge* when it no longer serves the interest of his students. He has made the decision to assign culture based homework assignments rather than traditional language translation

assignments. Cultural study assignments on the ancient world and its relationship to the modern one have allowed students to further explore their interests outside of the classroom and serve as an equitable assessment that is not based on their varied levels of translation skills. Classroom time is then left for translations and language practices that they could do together and with material that takes student interest into account. For instance, Armacost drew up some passages on the Pandora myth from Hyginus's *Fabulae* at a student's request to cover more mythology. Rather than remaining with *Cambridge* even when students did not find it useful, the famous myth interested students, and previous familiarity with the story provided context for the translation done in class. In addition, the simpler translation allowed students to feel confident in their abilities and to revisit already known grammar concepts and vocabulary. The students even expressed great interest in continuing to translate more *Fabulae*, and Armacost is happy to continue anything that seems to work for his students.

Similarly at St. Ignatius, the pandemic has limited student engagement and interest in *Cambridge'*s plotlines compared to previous years. In such cases where *Cambridge* is no longer serving student interest as well as it could have been, Curcio and Paras have turned to other short stories in Latin that could more vividly engage them both on Zoom and in the classroom. These short stories, originally written by Sum, include ones centered around Greek mythology, such as ones on Scylla and her transformation and the Trojan War. Paras notes that these stories are not as challenging for his students, so they provided a wonderful avenue for a gentle ease back into Latin after time away, to review previous grammar concepts, and to build up the confidence in translation.

Student interest in projects is also key for differentiated learning, as that is what drives educational curiosity and fuels learning. Creative approaches to projects or assignments can better cater to multiple ways of assessment that allow students to demonstrate knowledge beyond traditional forms such as writing academic papers. In St. Ignatius's Latin program, students will be familiar with the *De Mentibus Antiquis* project, in which all students research and present a brief overview of one assigned topic about the ancient world. Latin 1 through Latin 3 have topics that include a variety of mythological, cultural, and historical figures, places, and stories that are not included in *Cambridge Latin Course.* This year, Curcio also allowed AP Latin students to choose their own topic that interests them, and the results proved to be engaging and original. Students researched and presented subjects that included free will in the ancient world, ancient cosmology, and even a brief history of prejudice against left-handed people. The possibilities that come from student agency are limitless and intellectually intriguing, and students have the fulfillment of researching and presenting a topic that they chose on their own.

Other projects and tools have been useful in St. Ignatius's classrooms to reinforce Latin skills and engage students. Both Curcio's and Paras's classes have utilized Google Book Creator as a tool for practicing and reviewing grammar concepts. For instance, students may be asked to make a celebrity gossip magazine using indirect statements in Latin, or perhaps they may be asked to recreate Latin stories in English to demonstrate their reading comprehension skills. They have also drawn cartoons and comics with Latin captions to practice their composition. Other assignments throughout grade levels include creating their own *vestimenta Romana*, writing, practicing, and delivering complete

orations in pairs, and creating scrapbooks in various media forms that review grammar concepts.

Inspired by the Fessenden School's emphasis on Project Based Learning, Armacost has a great desire to bring history alive beyond two-dimensional textbooks. These projects and practices fill in the gaps within *Cambridge*'s culture sessions, as well as allow for students to demonstrate their strengths through mediums that work for them. Some projects and classroom practices beyond the ones that cater to diversity in the ancient world include a debate between students on which Roman emperor is best, developing Roman recipe books, learning about the Roman calendar and holidays regularly during class, and incorporating more conversational Latin and relatable Latin vocabulary beyond textbook ones into their routine. Armacost notes how excited students are to participate and create through these projects as they cater to their interests and encourage student agency in differentiated forms of assessment.

Differentiated learning is about creating an equitable classroom environment for all students regardless of ability, identity, or learning interests or preferences. By constantly assessing student engagement and revisiting what is working or not working in the classroom, educators can address the needs of everyone. Some students may work better on a digital device rather than through a physical book, or some may be more interested in learning about culture than vocabulary. A variety of methods and content used in class can offer a chance for all students to succeed. Differentiated learning can be as simple as offering choices to students, whether that be choosing the topic of a project, choosing the form an assessment takes, or choosing the subject of the Latin stories they read. By

pivoting away from dominant forms of assessment and content, the classroom curriculum can be diversified to accommodate all.

Building a Latin Classroom Community

Finally, and perhaps the goal of all of the principles mentioned above, teachers must prioritize forming a classroom community in which their students feel free to learn, grow, make mistakes, and connect with others, the world, and themselves. Teaching must come from a place of love for students, for the act of education itself, and for a better future. bell hooks discusses the importance of teaching from the heart in order to reach the heart in her book, *Teaching Community: A Pedagogy of Hope*: "When as teachers we teach with love, combining care, commitment, knowledge, responsibility, respect, and trust, we are often able to enter the classroom and go straight to the heart of the matter. That means having the clarity to know what to do on any given day to create the best climate for learning" (hooks 2003, 134). hooks writes of the principles that come together to formulate love in teaching, and these virtues of "care, commitment, knowledge, responsibility, respect, and trust" are the foundational blocks of any classroom community.

In order for students to feel safe in their classroom environment to learn and grow, such principles from the educator must be evident from the very first day. Students must feel deeply that their teacher cares about their well-being beyond just academically, but holistically as a person. They must feel that the educator is committed to their growth in multiple ways, and that there is mutual respect and trust between them. Once such principles are embodied by the teacher, students are then encouraged to extend these principles themselves to their teacher and their classmates. A cultivated classroom community allows students to feel empowered to take risks and to be vulnerable, both of

which are necessary in all learning and growth. They can feel that they are offering a unique perspective and role to the classroom community that only they can fill and that their work and presence is valued and appreciated.

For Armacost, the center of teaching revolves around building relationships and trust with his students, and that is where the drive to reframe his classroom beyond *Cambridge* originated. He prioritizes conversations with his students about what is working for them and what is not, as well as what they want to learn and what they would be excited about. Armacost wants his classroom to be a space where all members are centered together and can find investment in something that creates community. His overall goal for any student that comes through his classroom is to ask good questions, enjoy reading more, and to treat people with kindness and respect. His desire, drive, and dedication to creating a progressive classroom space all stem from these goals, and though such practices have made it possible for his students to walk away with much more, Armacost is simply grateful that they have gained lifelong skills and attitudes towards learning.

My conversation with Curcio and Paras was cut short, and I did not have the opportunity to speak with them much about their views on building a classroom community. However, I can speak to the experience of being in St. Ignatius's Latin program for four years. Magistra Curcio and Magistra Sum's Latin classrooms were the first places that I remember feeling comfortable with making mistakes, and that was because they constantly encouraged us to ask questions. By the time that I was translating Caesar and Vergil in my senior year, I had developed a growth mindset towards learning Latin, which I was then able to extend towards my other classes. Asking a question about word order or

recognizing the wrong participle was no longer an embarrassment to me, but an opportunity to do better and practice more. The teachers at St. Ignatius's Latin program also demonstrated that they care deeply about their students, and they saw and fostered potential in me before I saw it in myself. Though I only knew Paras briefly when we were both students, I have no doubt that he and Curcio have continued these practices in their classrooms today.

Educators like Armacost, Curcio, Paras, and Sum give me hope for the future of Latin classrooms, and they are also the reason I was motivated into writing a thesis about this topic. Across the globe, Latin educators have gone above and beyond to combat many of the harmful narratives that exist within Latin textbooks and the history of classics. Without the crucial work of these educators, the study of Greco-Roman antiquity would fail to find its way in the emerging 21st Century. Latin students deserve better than what textbooks and history have been offering them, and they crave knowledge and representation about stories and identities that have historically been undervalued and erased. Teachers like Armacost, Curcio, Paras, and Sum have been doing their part to ensure that they receive it in a critical way. Their work shows that a more critical and equitable Latin classroom can be possible even alongside the textbooks analyzed in this thesis, and it all lies in the hands of the educator.

Conclusion

As illustrated by *The Telegraph* article mentioned in the introduction, older generations who have taken Latin in their adolescent years have a sense of nostalgia and strong attachment to preserving the ways they were taught it. This desire runs deeper than retaining the same characters and textbooks they used as youths—it is also the same reason that they feel connected to Greco-Roman antiquity. People who are upset about critical revisions to the *Cambridge Latin Course* evoke the same appeal to nostalgia as white supremacists who see themselves as the inheritors and keepers of Greece and Rome thousands of years later. And with the wish to see problematic portrayals endure throughout future Latin classrooms comes the wish to see classics as a symbol of whiteness and elitism endure as well.

Still, classics as a discipline in post-secondary academia has made considerable progress in diversifying the field over the last few decades, both with the identities of the people studying it and the content that is researched and taught. However, such progress

has failed to make its way into the pages of the textbooks in secondary Latin classrooms. Change is too often made from the top down and not the bottom up. Division between secondary and post-secondary education has retained new practices and improvements at the collegiate level, as if a critical approach to classics is only applicable when education is more specialized. However, helping to foster an inclusive, critical, and diverse Latin secondary education across the world would set the stage for better advancement on all levels. More students would be encouraged to continue their classics career beyond high school courses, and they would already be exposed to the critical work in high school rather than being introduced to it in college. In order to truly change the field, we must start with the places where young people are first encountering Greco-Roman antiquity.

One such place to begin is within the pages of popular secondary Latin textbooks, such as *Cambridge Latin Course* and *Ecce Romani*. As established in the first two chapters of this thesis, textbook coverage of subjects such as ancient slavery and Roman imperialism often sanitizes the violence of the institutions in order to present a more positive, glorified image of ancient Rome. These books often misrepresent ancient enslavement as comparatively less violent, perpetuate common tropes of enslaved peoples as happy or lucky, and absolve responsibilities of enslavement from an institutional level onto a personal level. Coverage of Roman imperialism often praises Romans for being a "civilizing" force to Indigenous groups, and positive representations for conquered groups are included to convey a message of ancestral nationalism and claim that they are rightful successors of Rome. As writers at *The Telegraph* mourn the potential loss of the enslaver Caecilius within *Cambridge Latin Course*, I feel that his absence would be a worthy and welcomed exchange for improved representation for ancient enslaved people, conquered

people, women, and other marginalized identities. These textbooks need immense rewriting in order for more critical representations, and though some publishers have voiced their commitment to improving their works and diversifying the content, the change cannot come fast enough.

For the time being, it is hard for Latin teachers to completely remove such textbooks from their classrooms, as they often provide an accessible and scaffolded way to learn the language. As a result, they have the responsibility to make the classroom more inclusive and equitable by other means. The critical pedagogical practices and components mentioned in chapter three are starting places and sources of inspiration for Latin teachers who are embarking on the journey of making their classroom more socially just, effective, and meaningful for all students. Nor should teachers try to transform their classroom overnight. It can begin with incorporating a single project or conversation and grow over time. Being in conversation with students about what is effective and what is not is crucial. Work alongside each other and take risks together, as vulnerability needs to come from both ends. With dedication and determination, a critical Latin classroom can be possible within any space and with any teacher.

There are already countless Latin teachers who tirelessly put in work into making their classrooms more inclusive and critical for their students. The teachers I interviewed in the third chapter have only shared a few of the ways that they have transformed their learning environments and curricula to better reflect and serve their students. I applaud all educators who are driven by love and are dedicated to contributing to a more liberating Latin pedagogy. Their creative approaches and inventive teaching practices give me hope for the future of the discipline.

Adults often underestimate the capabilities of young people to confront difficult subjects. Instead, they opt to sanitize and hide critical lessons from them. Yet the very young people they try to protect often *crave* that kind of knowledge and critical learning. Students want to know that what they are learning matters. They want to find their place in the world, and it can only be done if we show them all of it. Latin students deserve to learn about the ancient world in all of its diversity and complexities, not just a white-washed, glorified image of Greece and Rome. If a field cannot be studied for all of its positives and negatives, if it cannot be studied critically and justly, if worth cannot be found in its study after confronting the dark realities it may have, then classics as a collective discipline is failing its students.

As a part of this concluding chapter, I have included two sample lesson plans on how the textbooks could be used as a tool of critical literacy practice for students. Designed for a 45 minute class, these lesson plans are just one example of how critical pedagogy can be integrated into Latin classrooms one period or class activity at a time. Take inspiration or ideas from them and modify and adapt it to fit your own classroom and situation. In order to use these plans, teachers will need to do some of their own research and utilize outside resources to present an unsanitized perspective on the ancient world. This could come from primary ancient sources or critical secondary sources. It is important to encourage conversations and practices surrounding critical literacy for students to develop those skills. Through discussion, teachers and students can come to a conclusion together about what life may have been like for marginalized identities of the ancient world and refuse to further silence their voices and stories.

This thesis has been a project dedicated to my past 8 years as a Latin student and a labor of love for Latin students and teachers of the future. I have tackled this topic in hopes that, with the work I have done, there will be a diminishing number of students with marginalized identities who feel out of place in their Latin classrooms. I believe that there is a very bright future for the field of classics if we only work towards common goals of equity and inclusion for all levels of the discipline. We need to start from the beginning in order to reach those goals, from the very first day students step into the Latin classroom.

Cambridge Latin Course and Ancient Enslavement

ESSENTIAL QUESTION(S) FOR THE LESSON:

- How well do textbook representations of enslavement reflect what ancient sources tell us about enslavement?
- Why might authors present a certain image of ancient enslavement in their writing? What is their goal?

LEARNING OBJECTIVES FOR THE LESSON:

- Students will practice comparing primary and secondary sources
- Students will learn about the institutional aspect of slavery in addition to individual experiences within the system
- Students will be able to practice critical literacy skills by analyzing ancient sources and *Cambridge Latin Course*'s reading on slavery

PROCEDURE: (minutes, activities—what students will be doing, what teachers will be doing, equity measures)

Time	Activity/Teacher actions: What will students be doing? What will the teacher be doing?	Rationale (how is this activity connected with learning objectives?)	Equity measure	Materials needed

5 minutes	Opening Activity: Greet students and let them know that you will be discussing slavery in the ancient world in today's class. Students should have read the *Cambridge Latin Course* culture section on slavery prior to today's class. As an opening discussion, ask the students what they thought enslavement in the ancient world was like based on the reading. How were enslaved people treated?	This activity allows students to recall the information they have read in *Cambridge Latin Course* and to reflect on what messages it may be sending. It allows a basis for comparison to ancient sources.	Students can volunteer to answer the discussion question, which is based on work previously assigned.	None
15 minutes	Individual or Partner Activity: Have students read compiled collection of ancient passages about slavery either individually or with a partner. Passages may include ancient sources on how enslaved peoples were viewed, treatment of enslaved peoples, or laws surrounding enslavement. Let them know that some passages depict graphic	Students are introduced to the primary sources with which they will compare to the secondary source. Students are offered an alternative perspective on the realities of ancient slavery directly from Roman writers.	Students have the opportunity to choose whether or not they work with a partner in this activity. Alternatively, students who find the material upsetting or overwhelming may opt for an alternate assignment.	Collection of ancient passages on enslavement

	violence that may be upsetting and offer an alternative activity in case it becomes overwhelming. Ask them to think about the following questions: How were enslaved people treated in the ancient sources? How did enslavers view the people they enslaved?			
20 minutes	Class Discussion: Bring the conversation back together and have students compare and contrast the ancient passages to the *Cambridge* culture section. Have students point out where there are similarities and differences. Do they think that the authors of *CLC* captured it justly? Have their opinions of how ancient slavery was changed? Why do they think the authors would present ancient slavery that way?	Students have the opportunity to discuss the differences and similarities between the textbook and the ancient passages provided. Such differences may lead them to analyze the motivations and suggestions of textbook authors and practice critical literacy skills.	Students have the option to participate both verbally or through a written exit-ticket. Discussion questions also ask students to share their personal perspectives and opinions on the subject matter, which lessens risk of being right or wrong.	None

	Talk to students about the institution of slavery rather than interpersonal relationships between the enslaver and the enslaved. Not everyone had enslaved people in their households, but the practice of slavery allowed Rome as an empire to grow and expand, and all citizens benefitted from their work. One example to discuss might be the *Senatus Consultum Silanianum* and the case of Pedanius Secundus. Despite the protests of many individuals, the law still executed hundreds of innocent enslaved people because it deemed that their lives were expendable in exchange for their enslaver's. When an institution that allows for dehumanization is in place, even good interpersonal relations have little effect. Alternatively, offer students who may be			

	hesitant to verbally participate the option to write down thoughts and questions and turn in at the end of class.			
5 minutes	Closing: Ask students why they think it's important to look at the two different sources. What would have happened if we only read the textbook version? Do they think that the textbook version should be changed?	Students reflect on the importance of critical literacy and critical, unsanitized representation.	Students can volunteer to answer the discussion questions.	None

FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT FOR LESSON (Sometimes broken down by each activity):
Assessment should be drawn from student engagement and shared thoughts about the material. For students who may be hesitant to participate verbally, offer the option to write down thoughts and questions during discussion and submit at the end of the class.

SUGGESTED HOMEWORK:
Have students write a letter to *CLC* publishers describing what they learned today and why it is important to represent ancient slavery accurately. Include at least one difference between the ancient sources and what the textbook says.

REFLECTION: (What aspects of the lesson best illustrate a multicultural/critical pedagogy approach?)
Students are encouraged to learn about the perspectives and realities of enslaved people in ancient Rome, whose stories are often silenced, misrepresented, or lost in Latin classrooms. Students also begin to reflect on why critical representations of antiquity are important and how glorification of Rome can be harmful.

Resistance Against Roman Imperialism

ESSENTIAL QUESTION(S) FOR THE LESSON:

- What are some reactions of conquered people that are not included in *Ecce Romani*?
- How and why did groups of people resist Roman conquest?
- What did Roman conquest mean for those being conquered?

LEARNING OBJECTIVES FOR THE LESSON:

- Students will reflect on the perspectives of conquered tribes and peoples about Roman imperialism
- Students will learn about revolts against the Romans from several communities

PROCEDURE: (minutes, activities—what students will be doing, what teachers will be doing, equity measures)

Time	Activity/Teacher actions: What will students be doing? What will the teacher be doing?	Rationale (how is this activity connected with learning objectives?)	Equity measure	Materials needed

5 minutes	Opening Activity: As a response to the *Ecce Romani* chapters on Roman conquest, show students various maps that illustrate the expansion of the Roman empire. Ask students what they think were the reactions of the people who were already living in the newly conquered areas. Did they welcome the Romans like Helge in *Ecce Romani* did? Or did some reject and resist the Romans?	This activity allows students to visualize Roman imperialism and expansion through images and asks them to consider the reactions of those who were conquered.	Students can volunteer to answer the discussion question, which is about their opinions and previously assigned work.	Maps of the Roman empire
20 minutes	Group Activity: Have students split into groups and briefly research one of the following revolts or figures against ancient Rome in an encyclopedic database: the siege at Masada in Judea, Tacfarinas of the Musulamii tribe in North Africa, Arminius of the Germanic Cherusci tribe, and Queen Boudica of the Celtic Iceni tribe. Ask them to record the basic events of the	This activity asks students to learn about various revolts across the Roman empire and analyze reasons why conquered groups would revolt.	Students have the opportunity to practice collaborative work and assume different roles in the group that work best for their learning styles. For instance, those who do not wish to share verbally can volunteer to write down the events.	Devices for research, poster paper and markers (optional)

	revolt and what each group was revolting against. Let them know that one representative will share the findings with the entire class. Optional: Have students write down a bulleted summary of events on large poster paper with markers.			
20 minutes	Class Discussion: Have each group share their findings. Record on the board the list of reasons why each group or tribe revolted. Some examples can include taxation, annexation of land, avoiding enslavement, etc. After all groups have shared, ask students to look at the list and reflect on how life would change for each group under Roman occupation. The people within these revolts evidently found it important to resist and fight the Romans. Why do they think that was? Do they think that the	This activity asks students to consider the situation of conquered peoples and their agency and autonomy (or lack thereof if stripped by the Romans).	Students have the option to participate both verbally or through a written exit-ticket. Discussion questions also ask students to share their personal perspectives and opinions on the subject matter, which lessens risk of being right or wrong.	Board for writing

	people who revolted had a choice? Alternatively, offer students who may be hesitant to verbally participate the option to write down thoughts and questions and turn in at the end of class.			
5 minutes	Closing: Tell students that people often praise ancient Rome because of its influence, such as how *Ecce Romani* does. However, Roman influence was a result of violently invading and conquering their neighbors, oftentimes changing their lives without giving them a choice. Because of the conquest, their stories and histories are often erased or left out. Encourage the students to think more about the perspectives of those we rarely hear from, such as the conquered and marginalized. Ask them what groups and identities of the Roman empire they may be interested in studying.	This discussion asks students to consider marginalized perspectives and express their interests in various groups they may wish to learn about. Teachers can then record their responses and integrate them into future lessons to appeal to their interests.	Students can volunteer to answer the question, which is about their interests and curiosity around different groups of the ancient world.	None

FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT FOR LESSON (Sometimes broken down by each activity):
Assessment should be drawn from student engagement and shared thoughts about the material. For students who may be hesitant to participate verbally, offer the option to write down thoughts and questions during discussion and submit at the end of the class.

SUGGESTED HOMEWORK:
Have students create a recruitment poster for a revolt against the Romans. How would they convince their peers that Roman conquest is worth resisting?

REFLECTION: (What aspects of the lesson best illustrate a multicultural/critical pedagogy approach?)
This lesson encourages students to consider the perspectives of conquered peoples in the Roman empire through an analysis of revolts and resistance efforts. Rather than assuming passivity or even support of Roman imperialism like *Ecce Romani* does, this lesson restores agency to conquered peoples by highlighting their efforts against imperialism.

N.B. As explored in Chapter 2 of this thesis, these stories of resistance to Romans have also been co-opted for nationalist purposes. In order for a truly critical perspective, this lesson plan should eventually be followed with discussions or future classes about how such stories have served nationalist messages.

References

American Classical League. 2020. "National Junior Classical League Chapter Handbook."

Bishop, Elizabeth. 2014. "Bringing Theory to Praxis" 30 (1): 13.

Bradley, K. R., and Paul Cartledge, eds. 2011. *The Cambridge World History of Slavery*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cambridge Latin Course: Book I. 2015. 5th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

"Cambridge Latin Course Stage 13." 2012. In , 4th ed. Cambridge University Press.

"Cambridge Latin Course Stage 14." 2012. In , 4th ed. Cambridge University Press.

"Cambridge Latin Course Stage 15." 2012. In , 4th ed. Cambridge University Press.

Curcio, Grace, and Lana Sum. 2018. "Sine Voce: Social Issues of the Roman World." Unpublished Manuscript.

Dugan, Kelly P. 2020. "Antiracism AND Restorative Justice in Classics Pedagogy: Race, Slavery, and the Function of Language in Beginning Greek and Latin Textbooks." PhD diss., University of Georgia.

Ecce Romani, Vol I. 2009. 4th Edition. Pearson Education.

Freire, Paulo. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. 30th Anniversary Edition. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Gechter, Michael. 1990. "Early Roman Military Installations and Ubian Settlements in the Lower Rhine." In *The Early Roman Empire in the West*, edited by Thomas Blagg and Martin Millett, 97–102. Oxbow Books.

Hands Up Education. n.d. "Suburani Overview." Hands Up Education. Accessed April 20, 2022.

hooks, bell. 1994. *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. Routledge.

hooks, bell. 2003. *Teaching Community: A Pedagogy of Hope*. New York: Routledge.

Hunt, Peter. 2017. *Ancient Greek and Roman Slavery*. Newark, United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.

Kennedy, Rebecca, Sydnor Roy, and Max Goldman. 2013. *Race and Ethnicity in the Classical World : An Anthology of Primary Sources in Translation*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.

Ladson-Billings, Gloria. 1995. "But That's Just Good Teaching! The Case for Culturally Relevant Pedagogy." *Theory Into Practice* 34 (3): 159–65.

Nyström, Markus. 2018. "Narratives of Truth: An Exploration of Narrative Theory as a Tool in Decolonising Research." In *Indigenous Efflorescence: Beyond Revitalisation in Sapmi and Ainu Mosir*, edited by Gerald Roche, Hiroshi Maruyama, and Åsa Virdi Kroik, 1st ed., 29–51. ANU Press.

Parodi, Ella. 2020. "A Critical Investigation of Y7 Students' Perceptions of Roman Slavery as Evidenced in the Stories of the Cambridge Latin Course." *Journal of Classics Teaching* 21 (42): 43–54.

Shor, Ira. 1992. *Empowering Education: Critical Teaching for Social Change*. Book, Whole. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Simpson, Craig. 2022. "Vale, Caecilius: Cambridge Latin Textbook Rewritten Because Roman Banker Had a Slave." *The Telegraph*, April 7, 2022.

Valle, Jan, and David Connor. 2010. *Rethinking Disability: A Disability Studies Approach to Inclusive Practices*. Routledge.

Williams, Carolyn. 1999. "'This Frantic Woman' Boudicea and English Neo-Classical Embarrassment." In *The Uses and Abuses of Antiquity*. Peter Lang AG, European Academic Publishers.

Yosso, Tara. 2005. "Why Use Critical Race Theory and Counterstorytelling to Analyze the Chicana/o Educational Pipeline?" In *Critical Race Counterstories Along the Chicana/Chicano Educational Pipeline*. Routledge.