UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

THE MODERN EDUCATOR'S LIBRARY
General Editor—Professor A. A. Cock.

A SURVEY OF THE HISTORY OF EDUCATION

BY
HELEN WODEHOUSE, M.A., D.Phil.
PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL

LONDON
EDWARD ARNOLD & CO
1924

Made and Printed in Great Britain by
Butler & Tanner Ltd., *Frome and London*

EDITOR'S PREFACE

THE *Modern Educator's Library* has been designed to give considered expositions of the best theory and practice in English education of to-day. It is planned to cover the principal problems of educational theory in general, of curriculum and organization, of some unexhausted aspects of the history of education, and of special branches of applied education.

The Editor and his colleagues have had in view the needs of young teachers and of those training to be teachers, but since the school and the schoolmaster are not the sole factors in the educative process, it is hoped that educators in general (and which of us is not in some sense or other an educator?) as well as the professional schoolmaster, may find in the series some help in understanding precept and practice in education of to-day and to-morrow. For we have borne in mind not only what is but what ought to be. To exhibit the educator's work as a vocation requiring the best possible preparation is the spirit in which these volumes have been written.

No artificial uniformity has been sought or imposed, and while the Editor is responsible for the series in general, the responsibility for the opinions expressed in each volume rests solely with its author.

ALBERT A. COCK.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,
SOUTHAMPTON.

PART I

THE CONTENT OF EDUCATION

CHAPTER I

BEGINNINGS

I

LIFE on this planet is believed to have begun many hundreds of millions of years ago. Much more than half that time was spent before certain creatures living in the water became fitted to spend part of their lives on land. Nine-tenths of it was spent before mammalian animals appeared. The last tenth passes; we come to its last million, and well within that million (according to most scholars) we find Pithecanthropus Erectus, something like a man. We go on, for hundreds of thousands of years, and life is still something less than human. Only in the final fragment of time, within the last thirty thousand or twenty thousand years, do we first find clear traces of men like ourselves.

After this, half the life of mankind passed before we learnt to make a pot or to plant a seed. Two-thirds or three-quarters passed before towns were built or written records made. Let the whole period of life on the planet, reasonably guessed at, be represented by fifty years[1]; then the life of human and sub-human races, from Pithecanthropus onwards, is confined in the last month of those fifty years. *The institutions of civilization are contained in the last eight hours.* When we

[1] If an hour stands for a thousand years, fifty years will stand for 438 million; a moderate guess.

are disposed to say of any custom, 'This has been from the beginning and can never be changed,' it may be well to look back to the beginning and to see how recent it is; how small and new and young are the inventions of the new half-conscious maker of history.

An effort is needed, because this ability to be conscious of our newness is itself so new. 'Primitive man' does not feel primary, pioneering, the first of a series to come—he feels primeval. He does not start with a blank mind and fresh keen impressions of a newly discovered world; his mind is fully, immemorially furnished, for it comes into being only as his ideas come into being. Change is very slow. Tens of thousands of years have left us repetitions of the same simple tools in stone, with very gradual improvement of their workmanship. Yet the pace does quicken. The coming of our own kind of man is marked by a workmanship inferior to the old, but a great increase in the number of shapes attempted. In the last day and a half of the last month on our fifty-year scale we find a new courage of experiment. Men made great quantities of different tools, and stored them till they were needed. They invented personal adornments—shell necklaces and the like. They drew pictures. These things are spread over ten thousand years or more.

II

Finally, with the last retreat of the ice from Europe and the spread of the forests as it retreated, we come to relics of a new kind of life. We find the axe and the spade, the wedge and the lever; clay pottery; wooden shelters; the domestication of cattle; the beginnings of travel and of trade. The New Stone Age began perhaps in Mesopotamia or in Egypt before it came to Europe; it exists, in essentials, among many peoples at this day.

Children were born henceforth into a state of life where

they could remain children much longer than of old, and there was much more for them to learn. Many more things could be done, and there were far ampler explanations of everything; for, while Later Palæolithic man had reached the making of pictures, Neolithic man has reached the making of stories. The explanations need not be given to everybody; some perhaps not to the girls and women at all, and some to the boys only when they are solemnly initiated at a certain age into the citizenship of the tribe. Religion, science, custom, and law are long undifferentiated, and religion is the spokesman. Stories and doctrine can be told, sung, acted, and above all danced; and when imagination or tradition fails the teller and the hearers can go on dancing, and so help their world on its way. The proper dance can drive away an eclipse or make the corn grow, or help the warriors in the field if the women are diligently performing it at home.

Neolithic man is at no loss for material for the instruction of his children. His world may be small, but it is a crowded world, and not a simple one. And the good he seeks for and the spirit he tries to satisfy are in essentials no more unlike our own than his body is unlike ours. He, like ourselves, can be very fond of his children, loyal to his comrades, and conscious of issues deeper than those of bodily welfare. If some anthropologists describe primitive religious ceremonies as directed to the propitiation of spiritual powers, and give only a mean interpretation to those words, they are rightly corrected by such a scholar as Mr. Marett. 'When the civilized observer watches the blackfellow rub one of these sacred stones against his stomach he is apt to smile, or perhaps weep, at so crude a ritual act. Let him, however, mark the blackfellow's earnest and devotional manner. Better still, let him attend to the account he gives in his halting language of the inward experience accompanying the rite. For he asserts in so many words that it makes him "strong" and

"wise" and "glad" and "good." This is not prayer, of course. Yet in a very real sense the savage asks humbly and is answered.'[1] 'It is shallow to regard the totemic ritual of Australia as a sort of science of stock-raising gone wrong. What you have first to learn in the deserts of Australia is how to go without your dinner on occasions, and nevertheless to fare on bravely until you find one. Having by the aid of your rites made yourself "strong" and "glad" and "good," then you get good hunting as matter of course; and even then you have the decency and the sound sense to ascribe your good fortune, not to yourself, but to the higher powers that are with and in you, yet are never merely you.'[2]

To turn to a modern philosopher:[3] 'Out of weakness are made strong'—that is the story of all love and loyalty, all worship, devotedness, aspiration.... 'We have this experience in innumerable degrees, and it is a matter of words where you begin to call it religion.' 'Anyone who considers human nature in the light of the facts of love, loyalty, community, will see that the character which in religion comes to a climax, is its very essence or centre or vital knot.' 'Religious experience is not like anything else, except the degrees of itself.'

This is what our ancestors ten thousand years ago knew as really as ourselves, and tried to pass on to their children. They used strange forms for it, as many generations have done. It is fortunate for our race that this experience and strength seem not to depend too much on the forms we think important at the time. The forms of Neolithic man were often wasteful and sometimes cruel; as other people's have sometimes been since his day. Of some of the things he taught and did in the name of religion, we can only think now that they should never have been done. But we shall

[1] Marett: *The Threshold of Religion*, p. 191.
[2] Marett: *Psychology and Folklore*, p. 194.
[3] Bernard Bosanquet: *What Religion Is* (*passim*).

miss the heart of his doings if we do not see that the reality which he tried to express was much the same as that which we try to express now; and that, mercifully, it has supported him and ourselves in considerable independence of our success in expressing it. As to the mixture of better and worse in motive and desire, in his heart and in ours, there seems no reason to think that the proportion has altered much.

III

One other point may be noted here at the beginning of our survey. In any age of the world, a man considering education must have in his mind the elements of two ideas, and one or the other is likely to be the more prominent, though they have to fuse in the total thought. On the one hand he contemplates, in some shape or other, some objective system; something which is and which ought to be; something greater than any individual, for which the youth is to be made serviceable by the training he receives. Whether we call it the welfare of the tribe, the law of the gods, the good way of virtue, the rule of Nature or of Reason (primitive thinkers make no such fine distinctions), here is something which he and his children must serve; an Eternal Idea. On the other hand, he contemplates those who are to be trained. The father or mother in him must look at the children, and yearn over them, and ask, What is good for these? In every century and in every teacher these two ideas, as thesis and antithesis, must play their part. Neither can be isolated; some kind of synthesis must always be formed; and no synthesis is ever final.

On the whole, and certainly in primitive times, it is the thesis that is prominent first. Early thought knows nothing of 'rights of the individual,' but much of the demands of the tribe, the world, the gods, of the order of things and old customs; of What Ought to Be. Such and such things must

be done, and the boy must learn them and do them, though they should lead up to the sacrifice of his own life to hallow the sowing of the corn next year. The antithesis cannot be absent, but it must work chiefly suppressed and in the dark, as a hidden criticizing force. It may work most obviously in some of the mothers, from whom therefore the sons are likely to be taken at an early age, lest individualism should corrupt them. But it will work also elsewhere, until some day the curriculum is a little revised, or some day the old custom jerks and halts and goes on again in a modified form, and the procession carries an image round the fields, a Jack-in-the-Green, instead of a boy's body.

If we had not such division and conflict in our thought and will, between two sides of truth and two elements in what we crave for, presumably we should never revise or go forward at all.

CHAPTER II

GREECE

I

THE slow normal development of primitive life is crossed and varied by the movement of peoples, and the conquest of one people by another. The dwellers in some favoured land become by degrees more prosperous, more skilled, better cultivators and artists and craftsmen, and less practised as fighters. The wilder tribes from the neighbouring hills or steppes or islands presently raid them and overcome them. The conquerors live as kings and nobles for a time, but are finally absorbed into the classes below them, and a common life with a new colouring goes on again. Let us now study one such incident, where the new colouring was extraordinarily brilliant, and the mixed community produced some thinking about education which we have hardly surpassed since.

About 1500 B.C., Greece was inhabited by a dark Mediterranean race which had reached a considerable degree of civilization along its own lines—such lines as we discern most clearly now through excavations in Crete. These men possessed, and passed on to their children, the arts of agricultural and of city life; trade of many kinds, craftsmanship in gold and bronze, elaborate costume and public games, and an elaborate religion with human sacrifice. Upon this people there came down, in a process covering many centuries, successive splashes and ripples and waves of alien settlers; raiders or fugitives or conquerors from the North, themselves

pushed by other waves behind. The fair-haired 'sackers of cities' in Homer belong to these new-comers who were breaking up the old order.

'In the main, if we try to conceive the Ægean in, say, the thirteenth century B.C., we must think of the ancient seats of power as generally standing; but at each palace a northern chief established as king with a band of northern followers about him. Their power was based partly on sheer plunder, partly on the taxes yielded by a constantly decreasing trade. It was an unstable condition. Some northern Agamemnon might sit at Mycenæ, a northern Idomeneus at Cnossos. They might have imbibed a fair amount of civilization. They were perhaps good rulers. No one could doubt their valour. But too many of their own kinsmen were prowling the adjacent world. It was only by memory that they knew the

> Riches that Ilion held, the walled and beautiful city,
> Of old in the passing of peace, ere came the sons of Achaia.

Fewer and fewer caravans of laden mules plodded up the stone ways of the Argive mountains. Fewer and fewer fleets of trading boats came to pay toll in the harbours of Southern Crete.'[1]

So, bit by bit, civilization broke down and fell away into the Dark Age of Greek history, from which there comes to us little of art except some wonderful poetry, and little of craftsmanship except some pottery and some iron weapons. It is the iron age in which Hesiod lived, of which he said that 'men never rest from labour and sorrow by day and from perishing by night.'

Then, about the seventh century B.C., the eclipse began to pass, and the shattered life of generations to build its fragments into something new. Peace within the city came back. Trade began again, and Greek towns and islands

[1] Gilbert Murray: *The Rise of the Greek Epic*, p. 48.

formed connexions all over the Mediterranean world. They learned from Persia, from Egypt, from Mesopotamia. New inventions were made; new families rose into power. Great inter-city festivals began to be held. Then at Marathon and Salamis and Platæa, Greeks found they could hold their own against the Persian conqueror of the world. And so with the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. we reach the short and splendid day which Greece has left for a memory and heritage of the world.

Let us look back on this story to see how its incidents touched or altered what a man would set before his children.

II

We might begin with a passage from Professor Murray, depicting the more violent part of the movements southward.

'It is a time,' as Diodorus says, of 'constant war-paths and uprootings of peoples'; a chaos in which an old civilization is shattered into fragments, its laws set at naught, and that intricate web of normal expectation which forms the very essence of human society torn so often and so utterly by continued disappointment that at last there ceases to be any normal expectation at all. For the fugitive settlers . . . there were no tribal gods or tribal obligations left, because there were no tribes. There were no old laws, because there was no one to administer or even to remember them: only such compulsions as the strongest power of the moment chose to enforce. Household and family life had disappeared, and all its innumerable ties with it. A man . . . had left the graves of his fathers, the kindly ghosts of his own blood, who took food from his hand and loved him. He was surrounded by the graves of alien dead . . . who were beyond his power to control, whom he tried his best to placate with fear and aversion. One only concrete thing existed for him to make henceforth the centre of his allegiance, to supply the place of his old family hearth, his gods, his tribal customs and sanctities. It was a circuit wall of stones, a *Polis*; the wall which he and his fellows, men of diverse tongues and worships united by a tremendous need, had built up to be the one barrier between them-

selves and a world of enemies. Inside the wall he could take breath. He could become for a time a man again, instead of a terrified beast. The wall was built, Aristotle tells us, that men might live, but its inner cause was that men might live well. It was a ship in a great sea, says a character in Sophocles, whose straight sailing is the first condition of all faith or friendship between man and man. The old Koré or earth-maiden changes her type, and appears on coins wearing a crown made of a city-wall. The *Polis* had become itself the Mother-Goddess, binding together all who lived within its circuit and superseding all more personal worships. When this begins we have the germ of historical Greece.'[1]

This religion of the City, the intense corporate feeling, gives the setting for what a Greek valued. A good man, a man of worth, of Areté, was the man whom his city found worth having; who could guide and defend and adorn her; on whom she could count. For this a boy is to be dedicated —and what better could there be for himself, if anyone wants to ask that question, than to live and die in her service, and to be praised by her when he is dead? The fifth-century Athenian youth on the threshold of manhood must swear in the temple of Aglauros, 'I will not disgrace my sacred weapons nor desert the comrade who is placed by my side. I will fight for things holy and things profane, whether I am alone or with others. I will hand on my fatherland greater and better than I found it. I will hearken to the magistrates and obey the existing laws and those hereafter established by the people. I will not consent unto any that destroys or disobeys the constitution, but will prevent him, whether I am alone or with others. I will honour the temples and the religion which my forefathers established. So help me Aglauros, Enualios, Ares, Zeus, Thallo, Auxo, Hegemone.'

Life and training in Greece are not less religious than amongst other ancient peoples, but they are more secular.

[1] Gilbert Murray: *The Rise of the Greek Epic*, pp. 78–79.

The priest is less important; the soldier, the statesman, and (most characteristicly) the bard, are more important. It was not the priest but the poet and the singer who brought humane thoughts into the castle with the lord from the North, and who kept such thoughts alive through the dark centuries.

What was it that would make a man of worth to his fellows, and how could a boy be bred into such a man? The needs are narrowed in the early days. He must learn to fight, and to use practical judgment, and to speak clearly and sensibly in the council of the army or the garrison. Courage and self-control, and indifference to hardship and pain will be indispensable. In later Greece we find such an education stereotyped and elaborated, in one state where the northerners had never blended with the rest, but held themselves throughout as a garrison in a conquered country, surrounded by a subject race far outnumbering themselves. Spartan boys, said an Athenian scornfully, had to 'toil from childhood in laborious pursuit after courage.' They were bred hard, in camps of their own under military discipline, with boy officers, but under strictest supervision by the older men. The only relief from supervision came with scouting and foraging expeditions into the country; developing for the grown youths into the work of secret police, or something more. Sparta declared war yearly against her Helots, and a man of the subject race who showed signs of leadership was apt to disappear.

But in other states, and above all in Athens, the growth was far freer. North and South had blended, and the blend, not only of race but of custom and tradition, had great things to give. If the idea of the Garrison is still there, it has a very different form:

'Every Greek community is like a garrison of civilization amid wide hordes of barbarians; a picked body of men, of whom each individual has in some sense to live up to a higher standard than can be expected of the common human animal. As the shield

is the typical weapon of the Greek warrior, so the wall is the typical mark of Greek civilization. It is one of the facts that most need remembering in order to understand the greatnesses and the flaws of Hellenism, that it was represented everywhere by a handful of men holding an outpost, men who wrought their wonderful day's work in political and moral wisdom, in speculation, in beauty of outward form and inward imagining, with an ear ever open to the sternest of life's calls, and the hated spear and shield never far out of reach.'[1]

A true Greek city, when the great days came, asked more of her sons than Sparta asked. She must be made wiser and more beautiful than the barbarian world. Her citizens' courage must be that of thoughtful and sensitive men; their temperance, the 'spirit that saves,' must be not mere asceticism or indifference but something wider, deeper, more subtle. They must have minds able to conceive justice and freedom, and wills to follow them.

III

Greek education in the fifth century B.C. consisted half of physical training, developed largely from the old training for war, and still necessarily serving that purpose, but much more widely planned. The wrestling, running, and leaping, the throwing of spear or discus which played so great a part in the boys' lives, and in the games and competitions between city and city, were meant to produce not only efficiency but beauty and dignity of body, alertness, judgment and control. Side by side with this heritage from the soldier went the heritage from the bard. The child memorized, and the boy recited to the accompaniment of the lyre the wonderful epic poetry of his race, gathered together under the name of Homer. Finally, partaking of both 'music' and 'gymnastic,' and older than either in their more specialized form, came the dance; the oldest of all arts; the predecessor of

[1] Murray: *Rise of the Greek Epic*, p. 11.

the drama; the expression for story and worship in every early religion.

A writer seven hundred years later gives a list of some of the dances he knew of, many of which must be extremely old.

'In everyday life there was a dance called "The Offering." As people danced it, they used to repeat these words:

A. Where is my lovely parsley, say?
My violets, roses, where are they?
B. Your parsley, roses, violets fair,
You see before you. All are here.

'The people of Syracuse have a special dance, performed in honour of Artemis with a flute accompaniment, and there was an Ionian dance called "The Banquet"; they also practised a third convivial measure called "The Telling of the News." There is again another dance which is styled "The World-Conflagration," the steps showing how everything may take the shape of burning fire. . . .

'. . . Among the postures used in dancing, there is the sword step, the basket step, the cock's comb, the look-out and the watcher. The watcher was a posture to be used by those who were looking a long way off, the tips of their fingers making an arch over their eyebrows. Æschylus mentions it in his play, *The Spectators*.

'"These ancient watcher gestures," he says, and Eupolis in *The Flatterers* remarks: "He has the true cock's comb walk." . . .

'. . . There are three kinds of dances used in dramatic composition—the tragic, the comic and the satyric dance. Similarly in lyric composition there are three—the pyrrhic, the gymnopædia, and the hyporcheme. . . . The pyrrhic would seem to be a military dance, for the boys that dance it carry arms. . . . The gymnopædia is like that form of tragic dance which is called "the Harmonious"; in both serious

gravity is a prominent feature. The hyporcheme is akin to the comic dance called kordax: both are of a jocular type. . . . The martial character of the pyrrhic shows plainly that the invention was due to a Spartan. . . . Every one above the age of five years in Sparta learns to dance it. With us . . . the dancers carry wands instead of spears, and they only point reeds at one another. They have torches also and represent in the dance the adventures of Dionysus in India and with Pentheus. The gymnopædia resembles the dance which the ancients called "The Fling-off," for the boys who dance it are always naked. . . . The turns of the dance are called the "Grape-carrier" and the "Bacchanal" so that this dance also has a reference to Dionysus.'[1]

'The boy who danced in honour of Dionusos,' says Mr. Freeman, 'was trying to assimilate himself to the god. . . . The vine that came so mysteriously out of the earth, lived its short life in the rain and sunshine, and was crushed and killed at the harvest, to rise again in the strange juice which thrilled him with such wondrous power—there was plenty of parable for him there. And while he felt the god's history so vividly, he was acting it, for acting was the very essence of Hellenic dancing. He would act the sorrows of Dionusos, his persecution from city to city, and his final conquest; he would match each incident in the story with suitable inward feelings and outward gestures of sorrow and triumph. Thus his dancing came to be a keenly religious observance, accompanied by more vivid acting than is possible on a modern stage.'[2]

These Greek arts were all, in fact, more closely unified than ours, and therefore probably better suited to many young minds and bodies. We have separated poetry and music

[1] Athenæus (2nd–3rd centuries A.D.), quoted by F. A. Wright: *The Arts in Greece*, pp. 18–23.
[2] K. Freeman: *Schools of Hellas*, p. 144.

from each other and from dancing, and have developed music to heights undreamt of by any ancient people, but we have lost a peculiar thrill which the unspecialized mind can find in their union. 'Damon's pupils at Athens were right when they said songs and dances are a law of nature, whenever the mind is in any way aroused.' [1] Epic poetry was something recited, and recited to music; lyric poetry, when it appeared and presently found its way into education, was something sung. 'The poetical *foot*' corresponded to our modern *bar*. 'But we must not press that analogy too closely. 'Our minds have had hammered into them for centuries the heavy thump of regularly recurring beats. . . . The Greeks had no such prepossessions. All they asked of music was that it should reinforce by means of pitch the highly elastic prosody of their solos and choruses. . . . The greater part of the Greek music . . . must have consisted merely of a long, vague, tortuous, disjointed sort of *arioso*. To us it would be unendurable. We should be exasperated by a constant rhythmical change and variety which we were unable to appreciate.' [2] It is impossible to go back. With ancient peoples the primary element in the complex art was rhythmic bodily movement, the dance; the second element, which with Aryan races presently became dominant, was rhythmic speech—poetry. Music was the subordinate; servant and enrichment to both. Modern attempts at combination, such as M. Dalcroze's, start with a transformed music and proceed with this as with a despotic mistress.

Primitive peoples do not criticize their traditions, but the Greeks after their Renaissance criticized and analysed everything they thought about. Rhythm, they said, should evidently be good for children's minds and bodies; it should

[1] Athenæus, quoted by Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 18.
[2] Stanford and Forsyth: *History of Music*, Ch. 3.

bring harmony into their souls. What kind gave the best harmony? What kind of music and poetry would help courage and temperance and avoid softening of the manly nature? What kind of tune (what *pitch* of tune, apparently) had the best effects on character? There was much room for discussion here, hard for us to follow because so little Greek music has survived.

It is easier to understand the discussions of what was recited and dramatized; of the learning or the dancing of histories, of which some were more edifying and some less. Sometimes criticism is directed against what are thought to be fantastic and decadent variants of the old sober ways. But sometimes, as with Plato in the fourth century, what is rejected includes also the old and outgrown in the national beliefs. Such expurgations as Plato would make in Homer would leave little, for better or worse, of some parts of the Old Testament that still find a place in English schools. 'We will not have the poets teaching our youth that the gods are the authors of evil, and that heroes are no better than men.'

Gymnastic had its critics from the sixth century onwards. 'It is not right,' pleads a poet-philosopher,[1] 'to honour strength more than the excellence of wisdom. Not by good boxing, not by the pentathlon, nor by wrestling, nor yet by speed of foot, which is most honoured in the contests of all the feats of human strength—not so would a city be well governed. Small joy would it get from a victory at Olympia.' Strength and grace and beauty did give so much joy, and were so supported by the practical needs of army and navy, that gymnastic held its own as long as the Greek cities stood. But the special development of education from the later fifth century onwards was not on the bodily but on the intellectual side.

[1] Xenophanes, quoted by Freeman: *Schools of Hellas*, p. 121.

IV

The cities of Greece, and especially the new Athens that had guided the victories over Persia, could not be content without opportunities for learning everything that was now to be known. The Renaissance had brought not only the birth of a new lyric poetry, and of the comic and tragic drama; it had brought also new work in geometry and astronomy, new philosophical ideas, new ideas on politics and the social structure, new knowledge of the world around. The travelling lecturer appeared; the 'Sophist' or wisdom-giver, who had travelled and studied, who could inform his audience about the latest discoveries and current opinions, and fit them for joining in enlightened talk. Some Sophists were great men and original thinkers; some were not. Aristocratic scholars looked askance at them because they had to attract audiences in order to make a living. But they made an educated nation.

In the schools the new subjects crept in upon the old. The boy still practised gymnastics and recited Homer to the lyre, but in adolescence he had more poetry and more modern poetry, and learnt to discuss its good points and its bad. He learnt some mathematics and some science and philosophy, and practised speech-making and debating. The use of books was growing, but the life of the age was not in writing, but in talk; the affairs of the age were guided not by newspaper articles and memoranda but by oral discussion and oratory; and in the life and affairs of such an age, every lad must wish to be equipped to join.

The dangers are obvious—the bad side of popularizing, the talk for talk's sake or for victory's sake, the playing with many ideas and subjects and working thoroughly at none. It is the price that is paid for sowing ideas broadcast. In any age, an education for boys or for adults against which

no such charge can be brought is apt to be an education which has sown no ideas. Greece produced her own critics—in Socrates, himself a talker, working persistently, maddeningly, at the exact meaning of the words and the exact implications of the ideas which were so lightly used: in Plato, himself a teacher, making the contribution of patient and passionate genius to hard-sought knowledge of realities, piercing through the appearances of things. Though this fourth-century Athenian may watch bitterly the growing evils of his day, and crave for concentration and deepening, and for something of the discipline of Sparta, yet he is a true Athenian and will never stint knowledge. His lover of youth

'will search out and bring to the birth thoughts which may improve the young, until his beloved is compelled to contemplate and see the beauty of institutions and laws, and understand that all is of one kindred, and that personal beauty is only a trifle; and after laws and institutions he will lead him on to the sciences, that he may see their beauty, being not like a servant in love with the beauty of one youth or man or institution, himself a slave mean and calculating, but looking at the abundance of beauty and drawing towards the sea of beauty, and creating and beholding many fair and noble thoughts and notions in boundless love of wisdom; until at length he grows and waxes strong, and at last the vision is revealed to him of a single science, which is the science of beauty everywhere.'[1]

V

The day of the scholar was following in natural course on the day of the universal teacher and the splendid amateur. Musical theory, for instance, which had been a fair field for any moralist, mystic, or philosopher in Greece, was transformed by the investigations of Aristoxenus *the* musician. He remarks that Harmonic is not a sublime science, neither

[1] *The Symposium.*

is it of any moral value; it is simply a necessary part of a musician's equipment. Also 'to make the amateur a judge in science is the mark of ignorance profound and invincible.' [1] More famous is the son of a Macedonian physician, who was a pupil of Plato for twenty years before he opened his own school, and who made it then a school of research. Aristotle 'surrounded himself with fellow-students—directed them to various special collections and researches; admitted difference of opinions in them, and exercised the right of free criticism himself; and so built the gigantic structure of organized and reasoned knowledge which has been the marvel of succeeding ages.' [2] Under the influence of Greek ideas the same thing was happening outside Greece. The new Museum in Alexandria was a college of research which did extraordinary work in the third century B.C. Euclid was one of its members. Eratosthenes measured the size of the earth. Apollonius wrote on conic sections. Hipparchus made a catalogue and map of the stars. Hiero devised the first steam-engine.

But Alexandria flagged after the first few generations, and in the Western world the movement died before its time.[3] With the establishment of the Roman Empire, men's thoughts turned to other matters than discovery, and to other visions than that of 'a single science, which is the science of beauty everywhere.' Romans might send their sons to study at Athens, but their view of the world was different.

[1] Quoted by Wright: *The Arts in Greece*, p. 47.
[2] G. Murray: *Ancient Greek Literature*, p. 374.
[3] The East was more fortunate.

CHAPTER III

ROME

I

THE Roman mind was heavier than the Greek; less sensitive, less inventive, less curious. The traditional education was a training for the necessities of life without expansion beyond them; the boy learnt to fight and to farm, to swim and ride, and to take his part in the worship of innumerable deities (the Romans were a very devout people); and to follow 'the custom of the ancestors.' The life of the ideal Roman was grave, restrained, austere. He must govern his household well, defend his State bravely, and take his share in guiding it if that belonged to his station in life. He must know the Law of the State; after the Laws of the Twelve Tables were adopted and published in 450 B.C., they became the chief part of a boy's reading and study. Indeed, in Latin down to the third century B.C. there was little else for him to read.

Expansion could come only from uniting with the wider culture of the Greek world. Late in the third century the Odyssey was translated into Latin by a Greek slave.[1] This was followed by translations or imitations of other Greek poems and plays, which came to furnish most of the material for study in Roman schools. Two hundred years later, in the time of Cicero (106–43 B.C.) the pace was quickening. Greeks were no longer leaders of the world, but they were

[1] Or ex-slave (Livius Andronicus).

teachers of the world. A well-educated Roman would learn to read Greek as well as Latin, and in both languages he would meet the Greek rhetoric and philosophy. Cicero himself did much for the transference of Greek thought into Latin words.

The great effect wrought on Roman education by its contact with Greece is of a characteristic and remarkable kind. So far as it is ever safe to speak of types, we may say that the typical Greek had desired knowledge and novelty and beauty, whilst the typical Roman desired power. Roman business was the governing of the world. But how was power to be gained, or how made likely for one's children? There was the old way of fighting, in which the new education did not attempt to improve on the old. There was the new way of money-making, in the new uncharted seas into which economic changes had opened the way—that must be left for life after school days. But finally, there was the way of speech. How many doors might not be opened, if one learnt the way to 'persuade men'! The old brief speech in Council was not enough now that audiences were so much bigger and affairs so much more complicated, and now that other people were learning to speak better. Our son must learn to speak better. He has learnt his Twelve Tables, but a nation of lawyers, or a governing class of lawyers, consists of something more than persons who know the abstract statements of the law. He must go to school to become something more. The Greeks, the great talkers of the world, were the right people to start such schools, and Roman citizens could learn after a time to develop them further. If the Greeks said that to become a really good speaker you ought to have a wider training and to study more subjects, a Roman parent would consider it; but they must show the relevance.

Cicero published a book on oratory in 55 B.C., but the

complete form of the Græco-Roman education is best shown by the *Institutes of Oratory* of a lawyer-schoolmaster some hundred and fifty years later. Quintilian was born in Spain, opened a school in Rome under Domitian (who reigned A.D. 81–96), and died probably A.D. 118.

Quintilian writes on the means of forming the complete Roman of the new day. 'The man who can duly sustain his character as a citizen, who is qualified for the management of public and private affairs, and who can govern communities by his counsels, settle them by means of laws, and improve them by judicial enactments, can certainly be nothing else but an orator.' His training must begin from the beginning. 'Before all things, let the talk of the child's nurses not be ungrammatical.' Some have thought that regular study should not begin till seven years old, but 'what else, after they are able to speak, will children do better, for they must do something.' Let them be helped to it by ivory letters, and little rewards, and 'whatever can be invented, in which that infantine age may take delight.'

A child of Quintilian's own died at ten years old. Remembering all his promise of character and mind, the bereaved father gives some special words to the memory of his sweet voice, and 'peculiar facility in sounding every letter in either language.' 'When he was losing his senses and unable to recognize me, he fixed his thoughts in delirium only on learning.'

This writer's feeling for children and boys is unmistakable even when his prescriptions are no longer ours. Interest in children is one of the signs that in some respects a certain humanity was increasing in the world. But the Romans on the whole were not a refined or a merciful race, and we see some dark shadows between the lines when the eager gentle schoolmaster writes about home influence, and the sort of thing that children had better not see at

home; as also when he writes of the 'received custom' of corporal punishment and its abuses. 'No man should be allowed too much authority over an age so weak and so unable to resist ill-treatment.'

Let a teacher 'adopt, above all other things, the feeling of a parent towards his pupils. . . . In amending what requires correction, let him not be harsh, and least of all reproachful; for that very circumstance, that some teachers blame as if they hated, deters many young men from their proposed course of study.' 'The powers of boys . . . sink under too great severity in correction; for they despond, and grieve, and at last hate their work, and while they fear everything, they cease to attempt anything.' 'If a boy's composition were so faulty as not to admit of correction, I have found him benefited whenever I told him to write on the same subject again, after it had received fresh treatment from me, observing that "he could do still better," since study is cheered by nothing more than hope.' 'Above all . . . a *dry master* is to be avoided, not less than a dry soil for plants that are still tender.'

Quintilian is all in favour of school as against the private tutor. 'Let him who is to be an orator, and who must live . . . in the full daylight of public affairs, accustom himself from his boyhood not to be abashed at the sight of men.' Besides, 'masters themselves, when they have but one pupil at a time with them, cannot feel the same degree of energy and spirit in addressing him, as when they are excited by a large number of hearers.'

Reading and writing being mastered, the boy comes to Grammar, 'distinguished . . . into two parts, the art of *speaking correctly*, and the *illustration of the poets*.' 'Nor is it of importance whether I speak of the Greek or Latin grammarian, though I am inclined to think that the Greek should take the precedence.' This 'language and literature' study

is different from its Greek original, because the Romans had taken over education and poetry alike from a foreign country. Roman poetry was modelled on Greek, and often needed explanation; so that philology, and antiquarian history, and 'illustration' based on accessory studies, naturally grew up. Quintilian defends a wide range of these. 'Grammar cannot be complete without a knowledge of music, since the grammarian has to speak of metre and rhythm; nor if he is ignorant of astronomy, can he understand the poets, who . . . so often allude to the rising and setting of the stars in marking the seasons; nor must he be unacquainted with philosophy, both on account of passages in almost all poems drawn . . . from physical investigation, and also on account of Empedocles . . . and Varro and Lucretius . . . who have committed the precepts of philosophy to verse.' But he has a hard task with the utilitarian Roman parent. 'Of what service is it, say some people, for pleading a cause, or pronouncing a legal opinion, to know how equilateral triangles may be erected upon a given line? Or how will he, who has marked the sounds of the lyre . . . defend an accused person . . . the better on that account?' Quintilian retorts with a wonderful collection of arguments, ranging down to the fact that mathematics explains eclipses of the sun, 'a branch of knowledge which may be sometimes of use to the orator.' But anyhow, he asks, why object, since the energy of boyhood is inexhaustible? 'Since the teacher of grammar cannot occupy the whole day, to what studies can we better devote the fragmentary intervals of time?' 'People have been eloquent,' some one may say, 'without these arts; but I want a perfect orator.'

Then when language and literature, and such other subjects as can be inserted, are sufficiently known, the boy goes to the highest school and learns rhetoric as such.

Quintilian gives us many examples of the kind of subject

on which his pupils practised the composition of speeches. They might begin with the simple reproduction of a narrative, and go on later to refute or confirm narratives. 'As if it be inquired whether it is credible that a crow settled upon the head of Valerius when he was fighting, to annoy the face and eyes of his Gallic enemy with his beak and wings, there will be ample matter for discussion on both sides of the question; as there will also be concerning the serpent, of which Scipio is said to have been born.' They may debate the value of the various laws; or speak in praise of illustrious men and in censure of the immoral. 'Hence is acquired an extensive knowledge of things in general.' Or there are 'speeches in which, without specifying persons, it is usual to declaim against vices themselves, as against those of *the adulterer, the gamester, the licentious person.*' 'These are usually altered from their treatment as general subjects to something specific, as when the subject of a declamation is *a blind adulterer, a poor gamester, a licentious old man.* Sometimes also they have their use in a defence, for we occasionally speak in favour of *luxury or licentiousness*; and a procurer or parasite is sometimes defended in such a way that we advocate, not the person, but the vice.'

His discussion of the rules of good speech-making is extraordinarily intricate; confusing and pedantic to the modern mind. A good deal is based on Aristotle's logic; Greek reflection on the nature of things turned to practical Roman use, or a use intended to be practical, though one can hardly imagine that anybody ever made a good speech with the help of the results as Quintilian gives them. The chapter on Jocularity is still more baffling to the modern reader. But his advice on elocution is easy to understand and sometimes helpful, though the conventions of his day are different from ours. And his suggestions about tact in a law-court are interesting at any rate. 'We must take care not to appear

insolent, malignant, overbearing, or reproachful towards any man or body of men, especially such as cannot be wounded without exciting an unfavourable feeling in the judge. That nothing should be said against the judge himself, not only openly, but nothing even that can be understood as adverse to him, it would be foolish in me to advise, if such things did not sometimes take place.'

'The favour of the judge we shall conciliate, not merely by offering him praise (which ought to be given indeed with moderation, though it is to be remembered at the same time, that the privilege of offering it is common to both parties), but by turning his praises to the advantage of our cause, appealing, in behalf of the *noble* to his dignified station, in behalf of the *humble* to his justice, in behalf of the *unfortunate* to his pity, in behalf of the *injured* to his severity; and using similar appeals in other cases. I should wish also, if possible, to know the character of the judge, for, according as it may be violent, gentle, obliging, grave, austere, or easy, it will be proper to make his feelings subservient to our cause where they fall in with it, and to soften them where they are repugnant to it.'

Practical psychology has seldom been so plainly taught in schools in later days, and I understand that neither this nor any training in speech is explicitly given to English barristers. We leave it to tradition, informal communication, and such fruits of experience as Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth passes on to his son. 'When you are going to a meeting or a committee, prepare yourself thoroughly on the questions to be discussed. If you draft a resolution on some point on which a decision has to be taken, put this in your pocket, and produce it at the right moment; you will very likely find that nobody has come similarly prepared, and you may probably carry it without difficulty.' [1]

[1] *Life of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth*, by F. Smith, p. 343.

'Sometimes, too,' writes Quintilian, 'the judge must be misled, and wrought upon by various artifices, that he may suppose something else to be intended than what is really our object. A proposition is sometimes startling, and a judge, if he sees it prematurely, dreads it as a patient dreads the surgeon's instrument before an operation is performed; but if, without any proposition being advanced beforehand, our observations come upon him when off his guard, and penetrate his mind, without any warning, when wrapt up, as it were, in itself, they will make him believe that which he would have distrusted if we had advanced it at first.'

'I have often watched in some small sub-committee,' says Professor Graham Wallas, 'the method by which either of the two men with a real genius for committee work . . . could control his colleagues. The process was most successful towards the end of an afternoon, when the members were tired and somewhat dazed with the effort of following a rapid talker through a mass of unfamiliar detail. If at that point the operator slightly quickened the flow of his information, and slightly emphasized the assumption that he was being thoroughly understood, he could put some at least of his colleagues into a sort of waking trance, in which they would have cheerfully assented to the proposition that the best means of securing, e.g., the permanence of private schools was a large and immediate increase in the number of public schools.'[1]

'But when violence is to be offered to the minds of the judges, and their thoughts are to be drawn away from the contemplation of truth, then it is that the peculiar duty of the orator is required.' . . . 'The judge when his feelings are touched by the orator, shows, while he is still sitting and hearing, what his inclination is. When the tear, which is the great object in most perorations, swells forth, is not

[1] Graham Wallas: *Human Nature in Politics*, p. 110.

the sentence plainly pronounced? To this end, then, let the orator direct his efforts; this is his work, this his labour; without this everything else is bare and meagre, weak and unattractive; so true is it, that the life and soul of eloquence is shown in the effect produced on the feelings.'

'Of the two modes of producing fear in the judges, the one is common and well received, when we express concern, for example, *that the Roman people may not think unfavourably of them; or that their privilege of sitting as judges may not be transferred from them to another body*; but the other is unusual and violent, when the speaker threatens the judges with a charge of bribery; a threat which it is certainly safer to address to a larger body of judges than to a small one, for the bad are alarmed and the good pleased, but to a single judge I should never recommend it to be used, unless every other resource has failed.'

True law, said Cicero, is Right Reason—man's reading in little of the divine government of the universe. Perhaps a man is truly educated when he can understand one of these positions without ceasing to hold the other.

'Let us then pursue, with our whole powers, the true dignity of eloquence, than which the immortal gods have given nothing better to mankind, and without which all nature would be mute, and all our acts would be deprived alike of present honour and of commemoration among posterity; and let us aspire to the highest excellence, for, by this means, we shall either attain the summit, or at least see many below us.'

This is the last page of Quintilian's book, but we may end with two other passages for the sake of their relation to past and future.

'Until philosophers are kings,' said Plato, 'or till kings have the spirit of philosophy, cities will never have rest from their evils—no, nor the human race.' [1] Quintilian writes: 'Not

[1] *Republic*, V, 473.

that I should wish the orator to be a philosopher, since no other mode of life has withdrawn itself further from the duties of civil society. . . But I should desire the orator, whom I am trying to form, to be a kind of *Roman wise man*, who may prove himself a true statesman, not by discussions in retirement, but by personal experience and exertions in public life. . . . Would that there may some day come a time, when some orator, perfect as we wish him to be, may vindicate to himself the study of philosophy . . . and, by a reconquest as it were, annex it again to the domain of eloquence ! '

Finally, 'The way to eloquence is not impracticable, or indeed extremely difficult; for that which is the first and most important point, that an orator should be a good man, depends chiefly on the will; and he who shall sincerely cherish a resolution to be good, will easily attain those qualifications that support virtue. The duties incumbent upon us are not so complex or so numerous, that they may not be learned by the application of a very few years. . . . The ordering of an upright and happy life is but a short task, if we but give our inclination to it. . . . So easy is it, for those who are well disposed, to learn what is good, that to him who looks fairly on the world, it is rather surprising that there should be so many bad men.'

Some fifty years earlier another Roman citizen had written to an obscure gathering:—'That which I do I know not —what I hate, that I do. The good which I would I do not. Who shall deliver me out of the body of this death ? '

CHAPTER IV

CHRISTENDOM: THE FIRST THOUSAND YEARS

I

PAUL of Tarsus, as we all know, had the education of a Jewish boy. For five hundred years since the national crisis of the Exile, the Jewish race had developed a strange, fanciful, passionate learning and practice of its own, which became with every century more intricate and severe, and which affected national thought most deeply in the generation which immediately preceded that of Paul himself. For the serious-minded Jew, the men-children born to him were dedicated to the mission of Israel; a people chosen to set forth the Law of the Lord in word and deed in a heathen world.

In the synagogue school the Scriptures filled an even larger place than Homer amongst the Greeks, for they yielded not only the humanities—poetry, history, philosophy, religion—they filled in a sense the place of gymnastic as well. That discipline and ordered activity which other races have found in military exercise and physical training, the Jew found in the minute carrying out into conduct of all the ritual prescriptions accumulated during the centuries of growth of the written Law and the centuries of oral discussion afterwards. The regulations became encyclopædic, and the youth who faithfully kept them all would have little more to learn in the way of self-control. Small things alternated with great, no doubt; the welfare of the universe did not depend on the exact length of a Sabbath day's walk, the exact

weight of a Sabbath day's burden, the tithing of the kitchen spices, the washing of the garment that had brushed against a dead body. And yet somehow the universe did depend on the willing obedience of God's people to God. A Rabbi contemporary with Jesus said, 'A corpse does not defile, and waters do not cleanse. But it is a decree of the King of Kings.'[1]

'If ever a nation was faithful to an idea,' writes Professor Toy, 'the Jews were faithful to the conception of legally ordered life. . . . They reached an unequalled fullness and rigidity of social-religious organization. The sharp-sighted earnestness with which they watched over the details of life, the interest they threw into the discussion and determination of minutiæ of faith and practice may be compared with the metaphysical enthusiasm of the Scotch people. . . . The people enjoyed those benefits which result from habits of organized study—intelligence, alertness, definiteness of opinion, decision of conduct; and this training of life moved on a high moral-religious level.'[2]

'If ten men assemble together and study the law,' says the Talmud, 'the Shechinah rests among them.' 'Thus is the law to be observed: Thou shalt eat bread and salt, and water by measure shalt thou drink; on the earth shalt thou sleep, and a life of trouble shalt thou live; and thou shalt labour in the study of the law. . . . Seek not grandeur for thyself, neither covet more honour than thy learning merits. Crave not after the tables of kings; for thy table is greater than their table, and thy crown is greater than their crown; and the Master who employs thee is faithful to pay thee the reward of thy labour.'

We cannot withhold our admiration from such a spirit. But enthusiasm, like molten iron, sets hard, and makes a

[1] R. Johanan b. Zaccai, quoted by C. Herford: *Pharisaism*, p. 104.
[2] Toy: *Judaism and Christianity*, p. 240.

sharp and heavy yoke for those whom it does not fit, or for those who have outgrown it. Paul, a Jew who spoke and read Greek, had met other kinds of thought since he left the synagogue school, and when at last he found his new world he had no mind that it should be enclosed in synagogue walls. No Christian boy, if he could help it, should be trained as he had been. 'Who hath bewitched you?' he cries to Gentile converts who proposed it. 'The law was our schoolmaster, but we are no longer under a schoolmaster. Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.'

II

A new liberty indeed was coming into the world. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, once a rhetorician, writes a letter one hundred and fifty years after Quintilian in Latin that Quintilian would have praised. It is written, from exile, to Christians in the mines. 'They have put fetters on your feet . . . as if the spirit could be bound with the body. . . . O blessedly bound feet, which God shall release! O blessedly bound feet, which are guided in the way of salvation to Paradise! O feet, bound in the present time that shall always be free before the Lord! . . . Not with pillows and couches is the body cherished in the mines, but with the comforts of Christ. Wearied it lies on the ground; but it is not pain to lie down with Christ.'[1]

In many a soul there was no hesitation in the spirit of Christianity. Yet, just as the working out of its philosophy had to hesitate and stumble, so there had to be hesitation in the detailed organization of life, and amongst other things in the teaching of children. If a Christian boy was debarred from Jewish education, was he not debarred from the fashionable Roman education by a gulf much deeper? What of

[1] Quoted by H. O. Taylor: *The Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages*, p. 210.

Quintilian's classes, learning to make declamations on 'a blind adulterer' or 'a licentious old man,' and 'sometimes defending a procurer or a parasite in such a way that we advocate, not the person, but the vice'? What of the kind of poetry which the literature lesson included? Even apart from this, for many a Christian parent, the literature esteemed greatest was only the work of heathens, and the philosophy esteemed greatest could be no more than a mistake.

'Not many learned,' said Paul, had joined the new faith in its early days, and later on some who had been learned turned bitterly against the use or misuse, by opponents of Christianity, of arts and sciences which had once been their own. 'They know not Christ,' writes Eusebius, 'but seek with pains what figure of the syllogism can be found to confirm their unbelief. Should one by chance bring forward the testimony of Holy Writ, they reply by asking whether he can construct the conjunctive or disjunctive figure of the syllogism. Skilled in the cunning and subtlety of the ungodly, they corrupt the simple and natural truth of Scripture.'[1] 'Unhappy Aristotle,' cries Tertullian, 'the inventor of dialectic, artful in building up and cunning to destroy.' The simpler brother must often have felt as inarticulate rebels did in the early nineteenth century, when educated men refuted them with reasonings out of the political economy of the day, and left them with nothing but passive resistance for defence of what they felt in their bones to be true. Political economy became 'the wicked science' for them, as logic and rhetoric had become for their spiritual ancestors some seventeen centuries before.

But as economics came later to be studied, and written, by men of every point of view, so strategists of the new religion were found to urge that the use of the enemy's weapons, 'the nets of the dialecticians and the thorn-bushes

[1] Quoted by Mullinger: *The Schools of Charles the Great*, pp. 86, 87.

of Aristotle,' was worth learning. 'If any among you is skilled in dialectic, let him use it as a soldier would use a good sword.' Some heathen studies, they said in an often-repeated parable, were like the gold and silver vessels of the Egyptians, which the Israelites rightly appropriated for the service of the true God. The rules of logic, said Augustine, were no inventions of man, but the very laws imposed on our thought by God Himself. 'This study teaches us how to teach and teaches us how to learn. In this, Reason herself shows herself, and opens to us her being, her will, and her worth.' Jerome clung to literature as a gift of God, and Clement of Alexandria wrote of Greek philosophy as Paul had written of the Jewish law, that it had been a pedagogue to bring the world to Christ; without Paul's conclusion that the pedagogue must now be sent away.

It was an uncertain struggle, in which on the whole the Greek Fathers defended learning and the Roman rejected it. On the whole the cause of learning failed, and some of its best defenders disowned it before they died. But the failure in the end was hardly the work of Christianity; it was an incident in the crumbling of civilization. As the barbarians advanced and the Roman Empire faded away, no culture could survive which was not obviously of practical use in a stormy universe. The Christian Church saved some of it by insistence that the duties of religion, and such study by some persons as was necessary for these, formed an anchor in the storm and led to a haven beyond it.

For centuries to come the teachers and learners in the Western world, in the little spots of light in the monastery or the cathedral school, were like 'shipwrecked children.' Their knowledge consisted in such fragments of the wisdom of the ancients as were saved from the wreck by a few scholars, chiefly of the fifth century. Those ancients, moreover, who had preceded them had not belonged to one of the great

ages of thought. Roman literature had been imitative; Roman science was an affair of books and authorities, quotation and epitome. There was little in it to resist the tempest. Meanwhile what remained must be turned to practical use for the children of a darker and a wilder world.

III

'Wisdom hath builded her house,' said the Book of Proverbs; 'she hath hewn out her seven pillars.' This and other passages showed the Scriptural student how natural it was that just seven 'liberal arts' should from eternity have been destined for use in the teaching of boys. We recognize them in Quintilian's list of studies, and later on they were formally divided into the Trivium—consisting of grammar, rhetoric and dialectic—and the Quadrivium, i.e., music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy. But even in Quintilian's school the first group had made up the real body of the work, the training of the future lawyer, and the centuries that followed continued the same tradition in training the future ecclesiastic. 'Music included little but a half-mystical doctrine of numbers and the rules of plain-song: under Geometry Boëthius gives little but a selection of propositions from Euclid without the demonstrations.'[1] 'As to the principles of arithmetic, what shall be said?' writes a monk about A.D. 680, 'when the despair of doing sums oppressed my mind so that all the previous labour spent on learning, whose most secret chamber I thought I knew already, seemed nothing, and . . . I, who thought myself a past master, began again to be a pupil, until . . . at last, by God's grace, I grasped after incessant study the most difficult of all things, what they call fractions.'[2]

As with the Romans, then, so throughout the first thousand

[1] Rashdall: *Universities of Europe*, Vol. I, p. 35.
[2] Aldhelm, quoted in Leach's *Educational Charters*, p. 11.

years of Christendom the Trivium formed the main part of ordinary education. Within the Trivium the emphasis was changed. Grammar (language and literature) was still a necessary preliminary; the more necessary, but the more meagre, because Latin had now to be taught to boys for whom it was not the mother tongue. Rhetoric was studied chiefly south of the Alps, and included there some outlines of Roman law. But in northern Europe the chief interest attached to Dialectic or logic; that study of reasoning which Greeks had pursued for its own sake but Romans for the sake of oratory. The northern mind, new to learning, fastened on what survived in this study. The power of argument seemed very desirable to them, as it does to many children now; also perhaps then as now their race had genuine gifts for philosophy. Not much did survive for their use, but they made the most of it.

A few standard schoolbooks, some by pagans and some by Christians, came into use as the Roman civilization crumbled, and remained in use for a thousand years. Printers after A.D. 1500 were still reproducing the Universal History written by Orosius about 417; the grammar made by Ælius Donatus in the fourth century; the short encyclopædias of Martianus Capella, Cassiodorus, and Isidore of Seville written in the fifth, sixth and seventh centuries respectively, and containing epitomes of all the liberal arts. Higher education was dependent on Boëthius, a truly great man who lived from about 475 to 524. He had hoped to translate all Plato and Aristotle into Latin to make them accessible to his struggling world. He accomplished only part of his task, but the translations and commentaries which he did accomplish became for generation after generation the ultimate sources of knowledge. The books which he translated without commentary remained indeed comparatively unknown; but teachers and students clung to his explanations of some of the logical writings of Aristotle, and of the work of Por-

phyrius, who had written an introduction to a book by Aristotle. 'In Boëthius,' says the historian of logic, 'we meet fully for the first time an exposition of logic which is obviously framed throughout with a special purpose, that of hammering a certain number of rules into even the stupidest heads.' [1]

IV

The food of intellectual life was scanty, yet some life went on. If men were largely ceasing to read the ancient literature, something like a new literature had begun to appear here and there before the old world died. Besides the great Latin Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries—Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Hilary of Poictiers—there were other writers. Colet in 1518 suggests for reading in St. Paul's School no classical writer, but certain 'authors Christian' of those two centuries, whose mixed bad and good were significant of their day. 'Lactantius, Prudentius, and Proba and Sedulius and Juvencus' are Colet's names. Proba wrote a poem entirely composed of lines of Virgil wrested from their context, with the names changed; rearranging them as a Life of Christ. Juvencus, a Spanish priest and master of a rhetoric school, rewrote the Gospels in Virgilian hexameters. Lactantius wrote Christian philosophy in prose. Prudentius and Sedulius wrote theological and Biblical poems, and the first at least had a very marked influence on the future writings of a schoolboy at St. Paul's, John Milton.[2] They were members also of a fine succession of writers of hymns, who began with old forms, but led up slowly to the birth of a new kind of poetry—rhymed poetry.

'Assonance turning to rhyme gradually became a marked feature of Latin verse during the period from the fifth to the ninth centuries, while the cognate change from quantity

[1] Prantl: *Geschichte der Logik.*
[2] See Leach: *Milton as Schoolboy and Schoolmaster.*

to accent was in progress.' Many Latin poems 'may be compared with the mediæval and modern ballad and elegy of which they were the forerunners.' In the hymns to martyrs written by Prudentius, 'the hymn to Vincent, like that to St. Laurence, is a precursor of the ballad, the spirited, popular narrative poem, which tells an occurrence with vivid detail. . . . The iambic dimeter of the hymns to Laurence and Vincent is not unlike the verse form of English ballads. The hymns of the *Peristephanon* (his hymn-book of martyr-legends) carry the feeling of the occurrence, and sometimes seem to herald the emotional fullness of late mediæval verse:

O virgo felix, O nova gloria,
Cœlestis arcis nobilis incola—

these lines truly sum up the feeling of the hymn to St. Agnes. One notices that they rhyme, and that the rhyme adds to the surge of feeling.'[1]

From the fifth to the ninth centuries, then, poetry was discovering a new kind of music. At the end of the ninth century it appeared that music proper had been doing the same thing. The music of the Greeks and Romans, and all music before their time, had been one-line melody. The ninth century, in the darkest part of the Dark Ages, discovered plural melody—part-singing.

Boys and men, indeed, had always been allowed to sing the same tune in different octaves, or to have a stringed instrument accompanying them an octave apart. But the 'new and inexplicable craving of the harassed generations that lived between 800 and 900 was the desire, when they heard a tune, to sing or play that tune simultaneously at a different part of the octave.' 'The singer . . . at each step took for the first time in history a daring and unexampled look vertically downwards.' And the free part below him

[1] Taylor: *The Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages*, pp. 263–272.

could presently find ways of moving other than the merely parallel line. 'It is no exaggeration to call this the most important invention of the last 2,000 years; for it betokens the existence of a new and hitherto unsuspected human faculty. Naturally in all ages the *accidental* coincidence of voices singing or shouting must have been common. But there was nothing *a priori* to show that these haphazard intersections of speech could be made the basis of a new and complex art-form. To a Roman of the fourth century A.D. such an idea would have appeared to be a fantastic dream. . . . All the great musical reformations . . . are incomparably smaller when viewed on the wide field of human history. . . . The discovery of plural-melody . . . was not made by one man—not even by any single group of workers. It required the slow effort of many nameless men and probably a desperation of painful thought.'[1] They began a new art whose riches are still unfolding for us.

Once more, consider the visual arts. Here is the view of at any rate one modern writer on the subject:

'The earliest Christian paintings in the catacombs are purely classical. If the early Christians felt anything new they could not express it. But before the second century was out Coptic craftsmen had begun to weave into dead Roman designs something vital. The academic patterns are queerly distorted and flattened out into forms of a certain significance. . . . These second-century Coptic textiles are more like works of art than anything that had been produced in the Roman Empire for more than four hundred years. Egyptian paintings of the third century bear less positive witness to the fumblings of a new spirit. But at the beginning of the fourth century Diocletian built his palace at Spalato, where we have all learnt to see classicism and the new spirit . . . fighting it out side by side. . . . The century . . .

[1] Stanford and Forsyth: *History of Music*, pp. 120–122 and 87–88.

350-450 is a period of incubation. . . . In 450 they built the lovely Galla Placidia at Ravenna. It is a building essentially un-Roman; that is to say, the Romanism that clings to it is accidental and adds nothing to its significance. . . . When S. Vitale was begun in 526 the battle was won. . . . To the sixth century belong the most majestic monuments of Byzantine art. It is the primitive and supreme summit of the Christian slope. The upward spring from the levels of Græco-Romanism is immeasurable. The terms in which it could be stated have yet to be discovered. . . . But in one part of Europe or another the new inspiration continued to manifest itself supremely for more than six hundred years. . . . Some new race was always catching the inspiration and feeling and expressing it with primitive sensibility and passion. The last to be infected was one of the finest; and in the eleventh century Norman power and French intelligence produced in the west of Europe a manifestation of the Christian ferment only a little inferior to that which five hundred years earlier had made glorious the East.'[1]

Such things were growing outside formal education (though choir-boys must have learnt the new music as soon as it was written, even if they did not understand the words they sang). They were growing outside the work of intellect in the narrower sense, during centuries in which that intellect could do little besides re-learning part of the work of men who had gone before. Yet even in this the joy of learning may go on. Scanty grammar and bad rhetoric and thrice-told dialectic and queer encyclopædias and Bible-study in the dark may seem dusty enough, but if their dreariness looks too great to us we might turn to a manuscript of the ninth century from Reichenau on Lake Constance.[2] Here, amongst a variety of

[1] Clive Bell: *Art*, pp. 126–132.

[2] I owe this information, and leave to use his rendering of the verses, to the kindness of Mr. Robin Flower of the British Museum. The manuscript is now at the monastery of St. Paul in Carinthia.

matters ranging from Greek declensions (sometimes incorrect) to a strange pagan charm for good luck, we find the following, not in Latin but in Irish :—

'I and Pangur Bán, my cat,
'Tis a like task we are at;
Hunting mice is his delight,
Hunting words I sit all night.

Better far than praise of men
'Tis to sit with book and pen;
Pangur bears me no ill-will,
He, too, plies his simple skill.

'Tis a merry thing to see
At our tasks how glad are we,
When at home we sit and find
Entertainment to our mind.

Oftentimes a mouse will stray
In the hero Pangur's way;
Oftentimes my keen thought set
Takes a meaning in its net.

'Gainst the wall he sets his eye
Full and fierce and sharp and sly;
'Gainst the wall of knowledge I
All my little wisdom try.

When a mouse darts from its den,
O! how glad is Pangur then;
O! what gladness do I prove
When I solve the doubts I love.

So in peace our task we ply,
Pangur Bán, my cat, and I;
In our arts we find our bliss,
I have mine and he has his.

Practice every day has made
Pangur perfect in his trade;
I get wisdom day and night,
Turning darkness into light.'

CHAPTER V

SCHOLAR AND KNIGHT: FROM A.D. 1000 TO THE END OF THE MIDDLE AGES

I

In darkness, and with little record in history, the roots of civilization had been spreading and growing stronger. In the eleventh century the plant begins to put forth leaves and flowers. A quickening change comes over Europe, and education revives along with the rest of life. More schools and better schools appear; more books are written; old discussions find new participants, with richer thoughts. When the next century begins the change has become rapid and remarkable.

Here is a description of St. Paul's Cathedral school in the early twelfth century:

'The elder scholars spoke argumentatively, others by way of question and answer. These roll out enthymemes, those use the form of perfect syllogisms. Some dispute merely for show as they do at collections; others for truth. The rhetoricians . . . observe the precepts of their art and omit nothing belonging to it. The boys of the three schools hold contests in verse or prose with each other on the principles of grammar or the rules of preterites and supines. Others in epigrams, rhymes, and metres use the old street gags, with Fescennine licence scourging their schoolfellows. . . . Without mentioning names they hurl abusive epithets at them, with Socratic salt girding at their failings or perhaps those of their elders, and in bold dithyrambics biting them with the sharp tooth

of Theon. The audience ready to laugh with wrinkled noses redouble their shrill guffaws.'[1]

Every subject of study and teaching, humane or scientific, is filled with a new vigour. Italy was the scientific centre. Classical Latin and its literature were keenly studied again, not only in Italy, where their tradition had never quite died out, but for half a century in at least one school in France, the Cathedral School at Chartres. But in Northern Europe every other study presently withered through the fervour of the revival in Dialectic. We have the remarkable spectacle of a passion for logic and metaphysics dominating the mind of almost every group of studiously minded men.

The central topic of this study was not a new one. Plato, seeking the reality that must lie somewhere behind or within the appearances of things and the changeful opinions of men, had continually recurred to questions which we might paraphrase in some such way as this: 'Here is a table; and there is another, whose appearance is different; and a third still more different, yet this also is a table; but this fourth object, though offered for sale under the same name, is so badly constructed that we say, "It isn't a table at all." What is it then that constitutes "table-ness"? What is the Form or shape or nature (in Greek, the Idea) which they are all trying to set forth? Similarly, here are many differently appearing men. What is the reality which makes their manhood? What is the idea of man? Above all, here are many different good men and many different good deeds, and others that are bad. Popular opinion classifies them readily, but is not so ready with any satisfactory reasons. The seeker of truth must go deeper than opinion. What *is* Goodness?'

Even Plato's genius could not keep the question steadily in its best shape. The would-be tables might be described

[1] Quoted by A. F. Leach: *Milton as Schoolboy and Schoolmaster*, p. 4.

either as trying to 'embody' some Form or as trying to 'copy' it. Plato used often the second and more dangerous expression, picturing the Idea of a table as a pattern laid up in heaven, and the things of earth as mere copies, often twice and thrice removed. For dwellers on earth are content with imitations, few of them having clear enough eyes to perceive the Idea or to look on reality at all. How can we train our children, he asks, so that our chosen rulers at least may have faced reality—so that philosophers may be kings?

The question goes to the roots of philosophy, but the language lays itself open to the criticisms of Aristotle, the man of learning and of common sense. It is wrong, he says, to imagine 'tableness' or '*the* table' in this way, as something substantial and separate from the actual tables. This disagreement is specially noticed by Porphyrius, the author of that introduction to Aristotle's Logic which Boëthius had handed on. 'Concerning genera and species,' he writes, 'the question indeed whether they have a substantial existence, or whether they consist in bare intellectual concepts only, or whether if they have a substantial existence they are corporeal or incorporeal, and whether they are separable from the sensible properties of the things (or particulars of sense) or are only in those properties and subsisting about them, I shall forbear to determine. For a question of this kind is a very deep one and one that requires a longer investigation.'

For mediæval Christians, the issue had entanglements additional to those which the Greeks had known. For if, as the 'Realist'[1] said, it was Tableness or Manhood that was truly real, and particulars belonged to the realm of appearance, then what became of the reality, and therefore of the immortality, of a man's soul? What became indeed of God Himself? Could anything be real except that 'highest genus' which included everything in the universe? Could

[1] This term in modern philosophy stands for almost the opposite view.

Realism stop short of Pantheism? On the other hand, if the 'Nominalist' held that the universal, the genus or species, was only a name, and that only the particular existent things were realities, then how could One God exist in Three Persons, and how could one Body of Christ be present at once on the throne in heaven and in the wafer on the altar?

Such was the central topic of those metaphysical discussions which flamed up in the twelfth century; which found new fuel in rediscovered writings of Aristotle in the thirteenth century; and into the midst of which the Universities of Paris, Oxford, and Cambridge were born. Contributions came from East as well as West; for during the Dark Ages of Europe the Arabs had kept study and inquiry alive, and their learning now reached Northern Europe by way of Spain. The intellectual ardour of the scholastic revival has been compared to the great outburst of enthusiasm which produced the Crusades. There were a few voices to protest against the absorption of all intellect in philosophical studies: John of Salisbury in the twelfth century pleads for classical literature, Roger Bacon in the thirteenth for mathematics and experimental science, and for such language-study as would relieve men from having to read their Aristotle, for instance, in a Latin translation of an Arabic translation of a Syriac translation of the Greek. But for the time nothing could stand against Scholasticism, even though it dried up as it grew.

The Scholastic age is a supreme example of concentration of the intellect. The keen-edged mind and fervent industry of its scholars fastened on some fundamental questions of the universe, and sought out with incredible pains all that the wisdom of the past could contribute to their solution. Intellectual delight, and the thrill of the mind 'voyaging through strange seas of Thought,' were familiar to these men. But the beauty of literature, like the beauty of sense, seemed irrelevant to what they were seeking.

II

Meanwhile, outside the Universities another tradition was alive. About the end of the month of April, 1371, the Knight of La Tour-Landry listened in a garden to the sweet song of the birds till it 'made my heart to lighten, and made me to think of the time that is passed of my youth.' 'How love . . . gave me a fair wife, and of all good she was belle and the flower; and I delighted me so much in her that I made for her love songs, ballades, rondelles, virolayes, and diverse other things in the best wise that I could.'

After the Roman Empire had crumbled to dust, society slowly began to restore itself through each man attaching himself to some stronger neighbour who might protect him in return for service. Out of this crystallization the feudal system grew. The castle of each lord could become, if he chose, a little court reflecting on a smaller scale the court of the greater lord above him. The custom grew up of sending boys, and even girls, to be brought up in a household of this kind, equal to or rather above their own position in the scale of gentle birth. There the knight's son could learn his music and gymnastic, to fight and to sing, as a chief's son learnt in old Greece or in any other land of a warlike and gifted race. With the later eleventh century came the wakening of knighthood, as of most other institutions, to a new vigour and consciousness—the Age of Chivalry.

The value of such a household training must have varied greatly from place to place. A rough ignorant lord in some solitary castle of the mountains or marches might have little to give to young minds about him. The boys would wait at table, make his bed and groom his horse, and learn to keep his armour in order, but might learn little else except such moderate skill in feats of arms as squire or retainer was able to teach; and discipline in such a house was likely to be more

harsh than profitable. On the other hand, the service of a strong and intelligent man who had taken full part in affairs of peace and war, who kept open house for other such men and for travellers from abroad, and who rode abroad himself and took page and squire with him—such service might form an admirable preparation for life, and give inspiration for living. In most households the educational weakness was likely to be found not in lack of strictness but in lack of solid content. Certainly feats of arms could be practised indefinitely, and those who could make songs, like the Knight of La Tour-Landry or Chaucer's Squire, might perhaps come to make them better and better. But 'to learn in his youth to carve at table and to serve, arm and equip a knight' should not after all take very long. Some of a page's duties with respect to his lord's armour must have had as much or as little value as the button-polishing of the modern private soldier. His waiting on the ladies of the household, and playing with them at chess, draughts, or backgammon, was good so far as it went, but must have involved a good deal of waiting about when spread over fourteen years. The idea of training a different kind of capacity from the purely scholarly is a good one, and this knightly upbringing was indispensable in the circumstances out of which it first arose. But in the later Middle Ages the advantage may sometimes have lain not necessarily with the University student, but perhaps with the son of an intelligent craftsman or merchant of a free city; rather than with the nobly born youth apprenticed to 'the chivalrous, frivolous, sensuous ideal of "courtesy."'[1]

Similarly the effectiveness of a girl's education must have varied. Housekeeping and household arts, if well taught, can be highly educative for many girls; if badly taught, they may be worth very little; and the value of waiting on

[1] Eileen Power: *Mediæval English Nunneries*, p. 8.

one's lady will depend a good deal on the kind of person the lady is. In humane studies, some maidens learnt a good deal. A queen's daughter in an early thirteenth-century romance learns French and Latin and music, and can make and sing lyrics in many metres.[1] But Miss Power estimates the attainments of the ordinary English gentlewoman, inside a convent or outside it, as reading and singing the services of the church, sometimes but not always writing, Latin very rarely after the thirteenth century, French very rarely after the fourteenth century; needlework and embroidery, and an elementary knowledge of physic.[2] The Knight of La Tour-Landry holds, in opposition to some of his acquaintance, that a woman should be able to read the Bible. The book which he writes or compiles for the benefit of his daughters consists of a collection of thrilling moral tales, some Scriptural and some far from Scriptural; admirably told, but somewhat monotonous in moral, since nearly all of them deal either with the punctual performance of religious duties, and the terrible things which happen to ladies who neglect them, or with the lady's chastity, and the incessant care which her conduct needs if scandal is to be avoided. The book which the knight wrote to benefit his sons is unfortunately lost.

The Middle Age continued later in England than elsewhere, so that we may quote without unfairness from some English verse-books of the fifteenth century. These are books of instruction in manners, addressed to boys who are being thus brought up in a great man's household. The same precepts recur again and again at different dates, and the kind of thing that has to be forbidden reminds us of remarks made by the Dutchman Erasmus at a later time on the dirty habits of the

[1] Gottfried of Strasburg's version of *Tristan and Iseult*, quoted by Adamson, *Short History of Education*, pp. 56–57.

[2] E. Power: *Mediæval English Nunneries*, p. 260.

English. But some of the advice might be useful for small boys even now.

'When thou comest before a lord
In hall, in bower, or at the board,
. . . . . .
All the while thou speakest with him,
Fair and lovely hold up thy chin,
So after the nurture of the book
In his face lovely thou look;
Foot and hand thou keep full still
From clawing or tripping, it is skill.
. . . . . .
In chamber among ladies bright
Keep thy tongue and spend thy sight;
Laugh thou not with no great cry,
Nor Rage thou not with Ribaldry.
Play thou not but with thy peers;
Nor tell thou not that thou hears.'

(*c.* A.D. 1460. *Urbanitas.*)

'And if they speak with you at your coming,
With stable Eye look upon them Right,
To their tales and give ye good hearing
Whiles they have said; look eke with all your might
Ye Jangle nought, also cast not your sight
About the house, but take to them intent
With blithe visage, and spirit diligent.'

(*c.* 1475. *The Babees' Book.*)

At the end of a meal,

'Sit thou still, what so befall,
Till grace be said to the end;
And till thou have washen with thy friend.
. . . . . .
And arise up soft and still,
And jangle neither with Jack nor Jill,
But take thy leave of the lord lowly,
And thank him with thine heart highly.'

(*c.* 1480. *The Lytylle Childrenes Lytil Boke.*)

For the girls, we have a spirited poem of about 1430, 'How

the Good Wife Taught her Daughter.' The daughter must be pious:

'Go to church when you may,
Look thou spare for no rain,
For thou farest the best that ilke day
When thou hast God y-seen.
He must need well thrive
That liveth well all his life,
My leve child.'

No book-learning is mentioned, but she must be mannerly, charitable, and discreet, and love her husband. Beware of romping:

'Fare not as a gigge, for nought that may betide,
Laugh thou not too loud, nor grin thou not too wide
But laugh thou soft and mild,
And be not of cheer too wild,
My leve child.'

and beware of intemperance:

'For, if thou be oft drunk, it fall thee to shame.'

Let her grow up to be a good housekeeper and a good mother herself.

'And look to thy daughters that none of them be lorn:
From that ilk time that they be of thee born,
Busy thee, and gather fast toward their marriage,
And give them to spousing as soon as they be of age.'

CHAPTER VI

THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY, AND THE RENAISSANCE IN ITALY

I

THE flowering of the Middle Ages had spent itself, and new forces of life had been gathering. Europe spent about three hundred years, from the later fourteenth to the seventeenth century, in passing out of mediævalism into the modern world. The change and growth were many-sided, and only one side can be touched on in a history of education. In this chapter we will survey its early days in Italy.

The Renaissance began first in Italy for many reasons. One was the vivid local life which came, as in Greece, from the division into small independent states which yet had communication with a wider world. The social system of the Middle Ages was broken up, for good or evil, in the course of political struggles, and free play was opened for any man of talent who could be useful to his city, for a worthy or a less worthy end. Again, as in Greece, economic changes and the growth of trade and skill had transformed society in some of the great towns. New families had arisen; the community had new leaders and rulers who had to justify their place. The new rich, the successful soldier and the great merchant, were ready to take their part in a new world and anxious to bring up their children to take a greater part in it; and the new municipality, proud of itself and emulating every neighbour, was filled with the same spirit.

There was still another reason for the priority of Italy in one special feature of the Renaissance, the renewal of love for the ancient civilizations, first of Rome and afterwards of Greece. Italy had never wholly ceased to feel herself the heir and representative of the Republic and Empire of Rome, and her thought and tradition had never broken off completely from Roman thought. The old myths, the old poetry, clung about her very soil. The Latin grammar and rhetoric that survived through the Dark Ages was still the grammar and rhetoric of a half-native tongue; and the ideal was less the training of an ecclesiastic (as in the North) than the training of the lawyer, 'a kind of Roman wise man.'[1] When the twelfth century flowered, the new enthusiasm flowed less into the northern Dialectic and theology than into the study of Roman law. Its students discussed the struggle of Pope and Emperor and the rights of the cities, not the Real Presence or the immortality of the soul. Yet reverent minds felt a kind of divinity in the subject, a foundation in the nature of things. Were they not seeking, at their best, that true law which Cicero had said was Right Reason?

The North Italian, therefore, was prepared by culture as well as by race to welcome the ancient civilization when he found it again. 'The finer minds of Florence had, before the fourteenth century was out, exhausted the culture of their time; they were, not knowing, groping for a fuller world. When, almost by accident, it opened out before them in the form of their historic past they leapt forward to make it their own. For the age was ripe; intelligence, artistic potentiality, many-sided human vitality, sheer vigour of personality, the social and material environment, were all ready, and could be satisfied with nothing less than the absorption of a whole civilization. The genius of the time which might, under other circumstances, have pushed

[1] Quintilian.

forward scientific inquiry, or religious reform, or national unity, or foreign exploration, was irresistibly drawn to antiquity and to the great arts of speech, of building, of painting, in which this enthusiasm found constructive expression. Progress on other lines was suspended for a century; and the social order as it advanced—in the home or the state, in language, in fine art, in leisure, in education—took a cast in which antique suggestion was the dominant motive.'[1]

'Now, indeed, may every thoughtful spirit thank God that it has been permitted to him to be born in this new age, so full of hope and promise, which already rejoices in a greater array of nobly gifted souls than the world has seen in the thousand years that have preceded it. If but our distressed land enjoy assured peace, most certainly shall we garner the fruits of the seed now being sown. Then shall we see these errors, deep-seated and long reputed, which have perverted every branch of knowledge, surely rooted out. . . . I see the day coming when all philosophy and wisdom and all arts shall be drunk from the pure fountain head—the great intelligences of old.'[2]

II

The Middle Ages had offered education separately to the clerk and to the knight. Both types were professional; corresponding to the mediæval root idea of organization by rank, class, and corporate unit. Italy created or rediscovered the concept of man as a layman, as an individual, and personality became the conscious goal of development. 'Antiquity revealed types of excellence unfamiliar yet full of attraction, to that energetic yet receptive age. Such were the cultured democratic statesman, the orator, the learned adviser, the provincial governor, the patriotic captain sprung

[1] Woodward: *Education during the Renaissance*, p. 5.
[2] Matteo Palmieri, about 1435. Quoted by Woodward, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

from the people.'[1] Surely an education should be possible which would be suitable for all these. Quintilian's *Institutes*, fully available early in the fifteenth century, seemed to offer the Italian citizen almost exactly what was needed, and its influence was immense. One Italian teacher of the fifteenth century communed with the Roman teacher of the first century, with all Christianity and all chivalry between, and, losing nothing, built out of that threefold spirit a school which must have been one of the most beautiful in the history of the world.

Vittorino de Feltre was called in 1423 to educate the children of the Lord of Mantua, one of the successful captains who was founding a family. He was allowed to join with them the children of others, and the school eventually numbered about sixty. The house assigned to them was spacious and dignified, set in a great meadow of grass and trees. Vittorino sent away its luxurious furnishings, but prized its essential fineness and the loveliness of the Italian country-side which he led his boys to love. Like Plato, he would have youth dwell 'amid fair sights and sounds, where beauty may visit the eye and ear like a healthful breeze, and insensibly draw the soul even in childhood into harmony with the beauty of reason.' They spent much time in the open air, and the games and athletic training which led to bodily skill and grace and to a wider self-command were valued as they had been valued by the Athenian citizen or the mediæval knight.

Vittorino was a man of extraordinary beauty of character, whose serene gentleness, selflessness, and earnest vision were remembered by all who ever knew him, and impressed the most diverse temperaments in men and children. The brilliant scholars whom he sought for his colleagues were sometimes men who could work with no one else, but they

[1] Woodward, *op. cit.*, p. 244.

worked affectionately with him. He lived amongst the boys, knew all their separate characters and difficulties, and tried to adapt the work to the needs of each. The centre and body of that work, for the school as a whole, consisted of the languages and literature of Rome and Greece, taught with the new enthusiasm of the age, with the new straightforward scholar's mind; taught by men for whom they were the transparent vehicles of a world more splendid than their own, which might now be brought back to earth again.

The boys were to become worthy citizens of that world. The power of expression was valued and trained as much as the inquiring and retentive mind. They must read aloud with grace and intelligence, and write and speak as well as read. Arithmetic and geometry were added, with drawing and surveying. Music was carefully taught under careful supervision. It must be remembered that the way to almost every branch of knowledge still lay through the ancient languages. 'To read Roman history involved of necessity a first-hand study of Livy. Greek history was only to be had from Thucydides, Xenophon, or Plutarch. Geography must be learnt from Strabo or Ptolemy, Mela or Dionysius. Aristotle, Theophrasus, and Pliny were the indispensable manuals of science.'[1] Logic was taught in the spirit in which Quintilian had used it, as an aid to expression and to thought; but Vittorino seems much farther than Quintilian from any encouragement of the mere fencing and disputing spirit. The soul of reasoning was to be the search for truth.

He taught for seven or eight hours daily, partly in class and partly with individual scholars, in that careful tutorial work for which the school was famous. 'I remember,' writes one of his old scholars, 'that Vittorino, now well advanced in years, would of a winter's morning come early,

[1] Woodward, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

candle in one hand and book in the other, and rouse a pupil in whose progress he was specially interested; he would leave him time to dress, waiting patiently till he was ready: then he would hand him the book, and encourage him with grave and earnest words to high endeavour.' [1] Pupils might stay at La Giocosa till they had passed their twenty-first year, for this new learning was not established in the Universities at anything like the same level. Vittorino's school, till nearly the end of his life, was the home of the best humanist training to be found in Italy. Nor was it confined to the rich or nobly born; poor children who showed promise were admitted free, and the Master maintained some such boys from his own purse for ten years or more.

'In the city of Mantua, Vittorino was, we are told, held in profound veneration. He thoroughly identified himself with his adopted city. . . . The poor he visited as a friend, and he aided distress so liberally that at his death he left no substance behind him that his heirs cared to claim. His gifts to churches were continuous, though made without ostentation, and often secretly. He was known to be a watchful power at Court on the side of mercy and good government: for he had never lost sight of the motive which had been prominent in bringing him to Mantua—that in moulding the character and guiding the conduct of a prince lay a sure opportunity of benefiting his fellow-men.' [2]

III

Different elements in the Renaissance ideal appealed to different men. Francesco Patrizi of Siena writes: 'No quality is of more vital concern to the State than that of public speaking. For the entire business of the State is dependent on the ability of the men of affairs to persuade to, or dissuade

[1] Quoted by Woodward: *Vittorino da Feltre*, p. 62.
[2] Woodward: *Vittorino da Feltre*, p. 79.

from, a proposed course of action.'[1] Battista Guarino, son of one of the first great teachers of Greek, sees the ideal rather in the scholar's life. 'Good books give no offence, call forth no rebuke; they will stir you, but with no empty hopes, no vain fears. . . . Through books, and books alone, will your converse be with the best and greatest, nay, even with the mighty dead themselves. . . . Theophrastus was in the habit of reproaching nature for granting long years of life to the stag and the crow, who could not use them, whilst denying them to man who has before him the illimitable task of knowledge. Let us . . . see to it that we allow not our short working years to pass idly away. To each species of creatures has been allotted a peculiar and instinctive gift. To man only is given the desire to learn. Hence what the Greeks called *παιδεία* (the business of children) we call "studia humanitatis.'"[2]

But for the fullest and finest statement we may turn to a book written in the early years of the sixteenth century. One of the boys at La Giocosa, Federigo di Montefeltre, grew up to be Duke of Urbino, a soldier for whom art and letters were his heart's love. He built at Urbino among the mountains 'a palace regarded by many as the most beautiful to be found in all Italy; and he so well furnished it with everything suitable that it seemed not a palace but a city in the form of a palace; and not merely with what is ordinarily used—such as silver vases, hangings of richest cloth-of-gold and silk, and other similar things—but for ornament he added countless antique statues in marble and bronze, pictures most choice, and musical instruments of every sort, nor would he admit anything there that was not very rare and excellent. Then at very great cost he collected a goodly number of most excellent and rare books in Greek, Latin and

[1] Woodward: *Education during the Renaissance*, p. 75.
[2] Woodward: *Vittorino*, pp. 176–177.

Hebrew, all of which he adorned with gold and with silver, esteeming them to be the chiefest excellence of his great palace.' Federigo's son and successor, Guidobaldo, 'very wise of counsel and unconquered in spirit,' was crippled from boyhood, and many things went ill with him, yet he 'lived in illness as in health and in adversity as if fortunate, with perfect dignity and universal esteem.' The wife of this young Duke was the great-niece of a girl pupil of Vittorino's (for some Italian circles, though by no means all, had admitted girls as well as boys to the New Learning). She was a most loyal wife in good fortune and bad, and a great and gracious woman. 'There was born in the hearts of all a supreme contentment every time we came into the presence of my lady Duchess.' 'She seemed to attune us all to her own quality and tone; accordingly every man strove to follow this pattern, taking as it were a rule of beautiful behaviour from the presence of so great and virtuous a lady.' In this palace on certain evenings about the year 1508 the circle of brilliant guests and friends discussed the ideal of a gentleman; and Baldesar Castiglione, who sat amongst them, based on the conversation his Platonic dialogue, *Il Cortegiano*.[1] 'Let us form such a Courtier,' they said, 'that any prince worthy to be served by him, although of but small estate, might still be called a very great lord.'

Such a man must be first a soldier and commander, excelling 'in all horsemanship and tourneys and manly sports'; of 'perfect loyalty and unconquered courage.' Yet he must be no mere fighter—the kind that ought to be 'well oiled and stowed with his battle harness in a closet' till needed again for war. He must write well and speak well, which involves first knowledge and then command and grace, 'to

[1] Published 1528 and translated into many languages; in English as *The Courtier*. The quotations are taken from Opdycke's rendering, New York, 1903.

choose the words most expressive of his meaning, and to exalt them, to mould them like wax to his will, and to arrange them in such position and order that they shall at a glance show and make known their dignity and splendour, like pictures placed in good and proper light.' He must know not only Latin but Greek, 'for the sake of the many different things that have been admirably written therein,' and he must be proficient at writing verse and prose in these, but still more in his mother tongue.

He must understand and read music, and play on divers instruments. He must draw and paint; 'and truly he who does not esteem this art, seems to me very unreasonable; for this universal fabric that we see—with the vast heaven so richly adorned with shining stars, and in the midst the earth girdled by the seas, varied with mountains, valleys and rivers, and bedecked with so many divers trees, beautiful flowers and grasses—may be said to be a great and noble picture, composed by the hand of nature and of God; and whoever is able to imitate it, seems to me deserving of great praise: nor can it be imitated without knowledge of many things, as he knows well who tries.'

The Courtier must possess all these gifts not merely for his own sake. The purpose is that his prince should find in him a counsellor beloved, wise, and good. 'From not knowing how to govern people there spring so many woes, deaths, destructions, burnings, ruins, that it may be said to be the deadliest pest that is to be found on earth. And yet some princes who are very ignorant of government are not ashamed to undertake to govern.' But the good prince, well guided by his friends, will 'have his city all united and agreed in friendship . . . populous, not poor, peaceful, full of good artificers. . . .' It is his office 'so to establish his people, and under such laws and ordinances, that they may live at ease and peace, without danger and with dignity, and may worthily

enjoy the end of their actions, which ought to be tranquillity.'

All sides of the life of the great gentleman are discussed by one or other speaker, and the last word lies with Pietro Bembo, scholar and poet from Venice, in a prayer to 'most holy Love.' The dialogue ends when 'the windows having been opened on that side of the palace which looks towards the lofty crest of Mount Catria, they saw that a beautiful dawn of rosy hue was already born in the east; and that all the stars had vanished save Venus, sweet mistress of the sky, who holds the bonds of night and day.'

CHAPTER VII

THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY: RENAISSANCE AND REFORMATION IN THE NORTH

I

CASTIGLIONE's dialogue took place, he mentions, at a time when Henry, Prince of Wales—Henry VIII to be—was 'growing up under his great father in every sort of virtue, like a tender shoot under the shade of an excellent and fruit-laden tree, to renew it with much greater beauty, and fruitfulness when the time shall be.' Henry VIII, indeed, loved the New Learning, but the issues were intricate, and the changes in his country and lifetime were wider, darker and more tangled than those of Vittorino's day.

An English equivalent to *The Courtier* and to Quintilian appeared in 1531 in *The Book of the Governor*, dedicated to Henry by Sir Thomas Elyot, a government official under Wolsey and Thomas Cromwell. Elyot was a very well-read man and a man of the world. His face in the portrait by Holbein is colder, sadder, much less serene than Castiglione's; a strenuous uneasy face, with full lips in a tight line.

He begins, like Quintilian, with early childhood. 'It shall be expedient that a nobleman's son, in his infancy, have with him continually only such as may accustom him by little and little to speak pure and elegant Latin. Semblably the nurses and other women about him, if it be possible, to do the same: or, at the least way, that they speak no English but that which is clean, polite, perfectly and articulately

pronounced.' After the boy is seven or eight years old, for moral as well as intellectual reasons, 'the most sure counsel is to withdraw him from all company of women, and to assign unto him a tutor, which should be an ancient and a worshipful man, in whom is approved to be much gentleness, mixed with gravity, and, as nigh as can be, such one as the child by imitation following may grow to be excellent.' Though he is brought up privately and not at school, some other boys may be taught with him, 'and there is no better allective to noble wits than to induce them into a contention with their inferior companions; they sometime purposely suffering the more noble children to vanquish, and, as it were, giving to them place and sovereignty, though indeed the inferior children have more learning.'

The boy must learn to wrestle, run, swim, and ride. He may learn music, chiefly 'for the better attaining the knowledge of a public weal; which . . . is made of an order of estates and degrees, and, by reason thereof, containeth in it a perfect harmony.' He may also use music 'secretly, for the refreshing of his wit, when he hath time of solace; or else, only hearing the contention of noble musicians, to give judgment in the excellency of their cunnings.' But 'a gentleman, playing or singing in a common audience, impaireth his estimation: the people forgetting reverence, when they behold him in the similitude of a common servant or minstrel.'

Painting, carving, and such arts may be encouraged on the same conditions as music: not 'to make of a prince or nobleman's son a common painter or carver, which shall present himself openly stained or embrued with sundry colours, or powdered with the dusts of stones that he cutteth, or perfumed with tedious savours of the metals by him yoten.' Still, he may practise such crafts in private, since great princes have delighted in them.

The main business of boyhood will be Letters, and over these Elyot's real enthusiasm awakes. The preliminaries of language-learning are not to keep the pupil too long from the real thing. 'Grammar being but an introduction to the understanding of authors, if it be made too long and exquisite to the learner, it in a manner mortifieth his courage. And by the time he cometh to the most sweet and pleasant reading of old authors, the spark of fervent desire of learning is extinct with the burden of grammar, like as a little fire is soon quenched with a great heap of small sticks: so that it can never come to the principal logs where it should long burn in a great pleasant fire.'

The work is thought of as pleasant above all; there is no talk of mental discipline from study which may be disliked. Take Virgil for example. 'What things can be more familiar than his Bucolics? nor no work so nigh approacheth to the common dalliance and manners of children, and the pretty controversies of the simple shepherds, therein contained, wonderfully rejoiceth the child that heareth it well declared, as I know by mine own experience. In his Georgics, Lord, what pleasant variety there is: the divers grains, herbs, and flowers that be there described, that, reading therein, it seemeth to a man to be in a delectable garden of paradise.' 'Then the child's courage, inflamed by the frequent reading of noble poets, daily more and more desireth to have experience in those things, that they so vehemently do commend in them that they write of.' 'If he have pleasure in wrestling, running, or other like exercise, where shall he see any more pleasant esbatements, than that which was done by Eurealus and other Troyans, which accompanied Eneas? If he take solace in hearing minstrels, what minstrel may be compared to Iopas, which sang before Dido and Eneas? or to blind Demodocus, that played and sang most sweetly at the dinner that the king Alcinous made to Ulysses: whose

ditties and melodic excelled as far the songs of our minstrels, as Homer and Virgil excel all other poets. If he be more desirous (as the most part of children be) to hear things marvellous and exquisite, which hath in it a visage of some things incredible, whereat shall he more wonder, than when he shall behold Eneas follow Sibille in to hell?'

For Quintilian's pupils, Latin was the mother tongue. For the mediæval scholar it was foreign, but a living and international speech. In Henry VIII's reign it was on its way to become a dead language, yet it may be true enough that its literature excelled the songs of English minstrels. Chaucer and Langland had written, but we are still thirty-three years from the birth of Shakespeare.

After fourteen, the boy will study argument and oratory, 'that when he shall hap to reason in council, or shall speak in a great audience, or to strange ambassadors of great princes, he shall not be constrained to speak words sudden and disordered, but shall bestow them aptly and in their places.' At seventeen he comes to philosophy, with Aristotle and Plato. But all the time he will have 'inexplicable delectation' in all the knowledge of the world and the history of it which he will meet in the ancient writers. 'For what pleasure is it in one hour to behold those realms, cities, seas, rivers, and mountains, that in an old man's life cannot be journeyed and pursued: what incredible delight is taken in beholding the diversities of people, beasts, fowls, fishes, trees, fruits, and herbs: to know the sundry manners and conditions of people, and the variety of their natures, and that in a warm study or parlour, without peril of the sea, or danger of long and painful journeys: I cannot tell what more pleasure should happen to a gentle wit, than to behold in his own house every thing that within all the world is contained.'

II

The sixteenth century was an age of ferment, when the old order was collapsing all over Europe as in certain of its parts it had collapsed in Italy in the century before. Explorers were making discoveries in geography and science; vernacular literatures were coming into being; ideas were being spread by the printing-press. New political theories, new forms of religion and church government, were offering themselves for trial. 'Renaissance' and 'Reformation' were but 'important episodes in a cataclysm, which was at bottom independent of both.'[1] And in the midst of all this the 'New Learning' was beginning to set hard, as the Jewish training, and rhetorical education, and dialectical education, had each set in turn.

The great Erasmus (1466–1536) valued classical studies because he found in them the light of reason, and an ideal of the reign of law and peace which he held to be supremely important for his own age. Latin was precious for the treasures of knowledge it contained, and because it might again become a living language in which all Europe might communicate. That boys should learn to write exactly as the ancient Romans wrote was not important. In Erasmus' opinion, the cult of Ciceronian prose was striving after what was useless as well as affected; 'but here he underrated the power of fashion. . . . All over Europe the ability to write good Latin prose was a passport to official life and to what would to-day be called the higher civil service and diplomacy. Fashion . . . decreed that good Latin meant Ciceronian Latin, and the schools proceeded to teach a very marketable accomplishment.'[2]

The classical writers were becoming to the new education

[1] J. W. Adamson.
[2] Adamson: *Short History*, pp. 128–29.

what Aristotle's philosophy had been to the Scholastics, or the Law to the synagogue school. When the Spaniard Vives, friend of Erasmus and of Katherine of Aragon, advises that a well-born maiden should 'both learn her book, and beside that, to handle wool and flax, which are two crafts yet left of that old innocent world,' he backs his advice with a list of all the great ladies of Greek and Roman literature who could spin and weave. F. Seager's *Schoole of Virtue, and booke of good Nourture for chyldren*, a sixteenth-century treatise on manners on the lines of the fifteenth-century *Babees' Book*, is full of appeals to the classics, and gives marginal references to classical writers, for every precept for which it can be done. Education was coming to mean Latin and Greek. The title of Roger Ascham's treatise (about 1565) is *The Scholemaster, or plaine and perfite way of teachyng children, to understand, write, and speake, the Latin tong*; and 'The First Book, teaching The Bringing up of Youth' begins abruptly, 'After the child hath learned perfectly the right parts of speech, let him then learn the right joining together of substantives with adjectives, the noun with the verb, the relative with the antecedent.'

Other subjects had failed to gain a permanent footing in the schools. Vittorino had encouraged his pupils to care for external nature, though the natural history they learned was probably of an uncritical kind. Erasmus commends 'the natural history of birds, quadrupeds, wild animals, serpents, insects, fishes: this will be chiefly derived from ancient writers, with additions from our own observations. Next we shall prize the accounts of singular adventures handed down to us by trustworthy authorities, such as the story of Arion and the dolphin, of the dragon who rescued his deliverer from the danger of the lion . . . and others which Pliny vouches for.' [1] He suggests a model lesson:

[1] Quoted by Woodward: *Education during the Renaissance*, p. 123.

'The picture of an elephant attacked by a dragon is presented. The master states the Greek name, which is identical with the Latin; he gives the nominative and the genitive, "elephantus,-i"; then the name of the trunk both in Greek and Latin. He then describes the tusks, giving the product, ivory; and the process of breathing. Next the Indian dragon is referred to in detail; the name in both languages, with its feminine, is noted. The teacher proceeds to an account of the combat between the two beasts, and gives any other particulars which may be suggested by the questions of the class.'[1] The teaching goes no further than this later in the century, and the zeal for Ciceronian style overshadows the 'incredible delight' which Elyot found in looking through the ancient books at the wonders of the world.

Vittorino, again, had taught some arithmetic and geometry, and the rules of commercial calculation had made great advances since his day in the merchant cities. But printers of mathematical books were few: mathematical instruments were expensive; and the customary Roman notation made a rational arithmetic impossible. Ascham is suspicious of mathematics altogether. 'Some wits, moderate enough by nature, be many times marred by overmuch study and use of some sciences, namely, music, arithmetic, and geometry. These sciences, as they sharpen men's wits overmuch, so they change men's manners over-sore, if they be not moderately mingled, and wisely applied to some good use of life. Mark all mathematical heads, which be only and wholly lent to those sciences, how solitary they be themselves, how unfit to live with others, and how unapt to serve in the world.'

Meanwhile, if we say that the New Learning of Latin and Greek was dominating everything else, and becoming itself a tyranny, we are reminded how impossible it is to make so simple a statement with truth about the whole of any

[1] Quoted by Woodward: *Vittorino da Feltre*, p. 238.

generation. Different currents of thought are always going on side by side.

On the one hand, in the universities the New Learning only made its way very slowly, and by means of the addition of new endowments of lectureships or colleges to the old. (Two or three hundred years later Adam Smith remarked on the contempt with which innovations are always treated in universities, especially in the rich ones.) The teaching of Dialectic went on much as before in spite of attacks from outside. The discussions of logic and metaphysics, says Vives, are thought profound and ingenious because they are half-comprehended, 'for it is no uncommon thing for men to applaud what they do not understand.' Really they are 'childish amusements . . . springing from an unoccupied mind . . . like noxious weeds in uncultivated ground.' Protestant reformers rejected logic exactly as the early Fathers had done. 'You ask,' writes Luther, 'how far I think dialectic is useful to theology; verily I do not see how it can be other than poison to a true divine. Grant that it may be useful as a sport or exercise for youthful minds, still in sacred letters, when simple faith and divine illumination are to be awaited, the whole matter of the syllogism is to be left below, even as Abraham, when about to sacrifice, left below the Youth with the asses.'

On the other hand, educators met, and disliked, another opinion then as now. 'Now will I somewhat declare,' writes Elyot, 'of the chief causes why, in our time, noble men be not as excellent in learning as they were in old time among the Romans and Greeks. Surely, as I have diligently marked in daily experience, the principal causes be these. The pride, avarice, and negligence of parents, and the lack or fewness of sufficient masters or teachers. . . . Pride is the first cause of this inconvenience. For of those persons be some, which without shame, dare affirm, that to a great

gentleman it is a notable reproach to be well learned and to be called a great clerk; which name they account to be of so base estimation, that they never have it in their mouths but when they speak any thing in derision.' Similarly the anonymous author of the *Institution of a Gentleman* writes in 1555 on the common idea of the gentlemanly life: 'What is a man if he know not how to wear his apparel after the best fashion, to stake his twenty nobles at cards or dice? If he be unwilling to do that, he is a lout or a miser, one who knows no fashion. But it becometh a gentleman, they say, to be a roysterer, which word I do not well understand unless it signify a ruffian. If a young gentleman use many vain words then they say that he can *talk well* and hath a good wit, but, if he talk wisely indeed, they say "*the young fox preacheth.*" If he understand somewhat more in learning than they do or get his living by way of writing, then in despite they call him a penman.' [1]

It may be interesting or consoling to reflect that it was into such an age, if hardly into such gentlemanly circles, that in 1564 Shakespeare was born.

[1] Quoted by Woodward: *Education during the Renaissance*, p. 297.

CHAPTER VIII

TWO BOOKS BY TWO SCHOOLMASTERS: 1612, 1632

I

In 1612, the year in which Shakespeare ceased writing, when Milton was 3 years old, John Brinsley published *Ludus Literarius, or the Grammar Schoole*, the product of twenty years' successful teaching. It is worth studying as a picture of school work as it was, not merely at the beginning of the seventeenth century, but for many years afterwards. The book takes the form of a dialogue between two schoolmasters; Spondeus in depression has come to visit Philoponus in search of advice and help in his many professional difficulties. Spondeus is the receptive and appreciative person whom any of us would enjoy advising, and whom we so seldom find. 'You have revived my heart,' he says almost at once, 'and put new spirits into me, by that which you have already said.' And Philoponus replies, 'The Lord will revive you, I hope, and all of us also who labour in this toiling kind; by causing us to find more sound fruit, and pleasant content in our teaching, than ever yet we felt. . . .'

They begin by discussing early education, for one of Spondeus' initial troubles is the smallness of the boys who come to him. 'The very little ones in a town, in most country towns which are of any bigness, would require a whole man, of themselves, to be always hearing, posing and following them. . . . Besides, it is an extreme vexation, that we must be toiled amongst such little pettyes, and in

teaching such matters, whereof we can get no profit, nor take any delight in our labours.' Philoponus sympathizes. 'It were much to be wished,' he agrees, 'that none might be admitted to the Grammar schools, until they were able to read English. . . . Yet notwithstanding; where it cannot be redressed, it must be borne with wisdom and patience as a heavy burden. Patience shall make it much more light.' He adds some advice on teaching to read, of which the most alarming paragraph consists of one hundred and thirty-nine 'of the hardest syllables to practise children in the spelling of them. These would be written in some little table to pose them oft.'

But further, says Spondeus, 'the trouble is this. That when as my children do first enter into Latin, many of them will forget to read English, and some of them be worse two or three years after that they have been in construction, than when they began it. Some of their parents . . . upon every light occasion are ready to rage and rail at me, for that their children, as they say, do get no good under me, but are worse and worse. For, whereas they could have read English perfectly, (it may be) when they came to me, now they have forgotten to do it. Thus am I grieved on every side, and vexed daily, let me labour never so much, and spend my heart amongst them for to do them good.'

Philoponus can assist here, for he is a reformer who has thought out means for carrying on the study of English. His boys practise English by making translations, by periodical compositions in English, and by being allowed an English crib for their Latin grammar (which of course was written in Latin). Spondeus is startled, but soon converted. 'Yet to return unto yourself,' adds Philoponus, 'concerning the complaint of the Parents . . . the chief fault in truth is in the Parents themselves; although we poor schoolmasters must be sure to bear all. For if such murmuring Parents

would but cause their children, every day after dinner or supper, or both, to read a chapter of the Bible . . . thereby to show their love to the Lord, and His word, and their desire to have the word dwell plentifully in their houses; then I say, this complaint would soon be at an end.'

But even when the boys can read English, they are incompletely equipped for everyday puzzles. 'I am much troubled about this, that my readers and others above them are much to seek in all matters of numbers, whether in figures or in letters. Insomuch, as when they hear the chapters named in the church, many of them cannot turn to them, much less to the verse.' 'This likewise,' answers Philoponus, 'is a very ordinary defect, and yet might easily be helped by common means in an hour or two. I call it ordinary, because you shall have scholars, almost ready to go to the University, who yet can hardly tell you the number of pages . . . in their books, to find what they should.' The remedy is to give 'an hour or two' to teaching them the system of numeration, Roman and Arabic. This 'will perform fully so much as is needful for your ordinary Grammar scholar. If you do require more for any you must seek Record's Arithmetic, or other like Authors, and set them to the Cypher-ing school.'

'I have troubled you overlong in this,' apologizes Spondeus, 'being in itself so very a trifle, though the want generally to be blamed. Now therefore let us hasten unto our profession for the Grammar Schoolmaster. For I desire earnestly to be in our own element, as more befitting and beseeming our place.'

Their own element is Latin, with a certain amount of Greek, Hebrew, and Religious Knowledge. Brinsley gives a good deal of detailed advice, in which the most valuable points seem to be that the master should be more careful and patient than most of his contemporaries in giving ex-

planations and securing understanding as the work goes on, and that the class organization should be better. He would keep the number of forms in the school as few as possible, putting from sixteen to forty boys into the same form, so that time may be saved and the work better controlled. The master should keep a special eye on the weakest pupils in each form. He says further, 'this may be a notable help, that the two or four seniors in each form be as Ushers in that form, for overseeing, directing, examining, and fitting the rest every way before they come to say; and so, for overseeing the exercises. Also in straits of time to stand forth before the rest and to hear them.' He is enlightened enough to have his monitors elected by the boys themselves; after which they 'pick sides,' dividing the form between them. 'By this means you shall find that they will choose very equally, and without partiality, to the end that each may have the best fellows; even as gamesters will do at matches in shooting, bowling or the like. . . . Also hereby all mutterings shall be cut off, whereby some kind of boys will be whispering to their Parents, that their Master doth not regard nor love them, but prefers others before them.'

As for Religious Knowledge, Philoponus gives a model lesson: 'I would propound my question thus, sundry ways, out of the words, and that they may answer directly in the very words: *Q.* What did God in the beginning? *A.* He created heaven and earth. *Q.* When did God create heaven and earth? *A.* In the beginning. *Q.* Were not heaven and earth always? *A.* No, God created them,' and so on. 'It shall be the safest in posing to ask those things which arise clearly and naturally out of the words, and may be fully understood; to omit the rest until God shall make them evident.'

Perhaps the best outcome of the religious studies was

Philoponus' moral for the teacher: 'We are to imitate the Lord himself; who though he be justice itself, yet is evermore inclined unto mercy. . . . If he should smite us . . . so oft as we offend, as many do the children, which of us could live?'

II

We find then Latin established as the school's main work, in the seventeenth century as much as in the sixteenth, and in England as in Italy. Yet its position in the two realms could never be the same. The Italian boy in learning Latin was learning a tongue which had once been native to his country—from which his own language was descended; the men who wrote it were his own ancestors, and their history and renown were his own. The same motive and the same results could never be found north of the Alps. Reaction and criticism there were presently inevitable.

The difficulty lay at first in the absence of a ready alternative. Except for the scholastic logic, which the humanists had pushed out of the schools (though not yet out of the universities), what else in the earlier sixteenth century could the schoolmaster find to teach? Vernacular languages were still unfixed; vernacular literatures just coming into being; mathematics and science had hardly gone beyond the stage at which the Greeks had left them. At any rate, nothing was yet organized, simplified, or prepared in the public mind. Only at a few moments in history has intellectual enthusiasm been so widely spread, and first-rate minds so drawn to the work of teaching, that we find schoolmasters imparting what is being discovered or created *at that moment*. The fifteenth century in Italy was near to being such a time, yet even Vittorino da Feltre had the aid of Quintilian, and of scholars from the East with tradition behind them. To draw English literature or Science into the schools would involve making

a new tradition; and much work, perhaps two or three centuries of work, would have to be done first.

When John Brinsley published his book in 1612 that work had been begun. English literature had burst into flower in Brinsley's own lifetime, and the last great wave of the Renaissance was creating the new Science. Copernicus (1473–1543) had showed that the earth moved round the sun. Kepler (1571–1630) had traced the orbits of the planets. Galileo Galilei (1564–1642) founded the science of dynamics and carried astronomy further. In 1600, William Gilbert published a treatise on Magnetism. The microscope was invented in 1608, the telescope before 1610. In 1614, Napier published his *Description of Logarithms*. The law of refraction of light was discovered in 1621; the word 'gas' appeared in 1624. Before 1628, Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood. Newton was born in 1642, the year of Galileo's death.

But the great workers, of whom a few names only have been given here, were scattered over Europe; and intermediaries were lacking who might bring detailed news of their work to the school governor or the busy teacher. In Greece of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., there were wandering Sophists to do such mediation; in the twentieth century we have an army of journalists, and scientific magazines and reviews ranging from the most technical to the most popular. In the seventeenth century it was hard for one investigator to know what any others were doing, and it was almost impossible for the general public. Even Francis Bacon (1561–1626), 'the poet, the prophet, and the journalist of the New Philosophy,' had only a confused and partial knowledge of the methods, aims, and results of contemporary scientific work. What could the ordinary schoolmaster have done?

Bacon's own writings did something at any rate in familiar-

izing the educated public with the fact of change. He notes, for instance, how three inventions—printing, gunpowder, and the compass—'have changed the appearance and state of the whole world; first in literature, then in warfare, and lastly in navigation, and innumerable changes have been thence derived, so that no empire, sect, or star appears to have exercised a greater power or influence on human affairs than these mechanical discoveries.'[1] As for the work of explorers, 'it may truly be affirmed to the honour of these times, and in a virtuous emulation with antiquity, that this great building of the world had never through-lights made in it till the age of us and our fathers.'[2] In such an age, he suggests (*Advancement of Learning*), we ought to have provision for teaching history, modern languages, politics, general literature. The State should spend great sums on instruments and apparatus, and there should be an international college of research. We cannot go on behaving as if nothing lay behind us but the Greek and Roman world, and nothing before us but such a life as that world knew. In particular, we ought to restore or cultivate through education 'a just and legitimate familiarity betwixt the mind and things.'

Two other ideas spread by Bacon influenced the thought of his time, partly for good and partly for ill. One was the habit of regarding every study as a branch of one great science or philosophy of which geometry or physics would be the truest type. It was in these branches that the greatest discoveries were being made, and the seventeenth-century spirit, 'the cold but deep passion of exact rationality,'[3] turned to these with almost a religious zeal. Nature, they felt, being reasonable, geometrizes throughout. If you

[1] *Novum Organum*, Bk. I, cxxix.
[2] *Advancement of Learning*, Bk. II.
[3] J. Royce: *The Spirit of Modern Philosophy.*

could once get her laws in mind, as Euclid got his axioms, then all facts down to the least would become clear, certain, and demonstrable. The other idea was that of a universal Method which, once grasped, could be used by the feeblest mind. 'Our method of discovering the sciences levels men's wits, and leaves but little to their superiority, since it achieves everything by the most certain rules and demonstrations.' [1] The Arts man may sometimes be tempted even now to think that this must somehow be true in physical science, since so many students at so early a point in their studies can apparently add something, under good guidance, to the sum of human learning. He knows, when he thinks of it seriously, that the Baconian hope was an illusion, but the seventeenth century had less reason for knowing it. It is in Bacon's spirit exactly that a great educator wrote a few years after Bacon's death, 'As soon as we have succeeded in finding the proper method it will be no harder to teach schoolboys, in any number desired, than with the help of the printing-press to cover a thousand sheets daily with the neatest writing, or with Archimedes' machine to move houses, towers, and immense weights, or to cross the ocean in a ship, and journey to the New World. The whole process, too, will be as free from friction as is the movement of a clock whose motive power is supplied by the weights. It will be as pleasant to see education carried out on my plan as to look at an automatic machine of this kind, and the process will be as free from failure as are these mechanical contrivances, when skilfully made.' [2]

III

John Amos Comenius (1592–1670), a Bohemian, bishop and teacher in Poland and Hungary among the exiled Mora-

[1] *Novum Organum*, 1 Aph., cxxii.

[2] Comenius: *The Great Didactic*. The quotations are taken from Keatinge's translation.

vian Brethren, finished his *Great Didactic* in 1632 in troubled times. How often, he reflects, has the world thus fallen away from God; how often has God again renewed it. 'Perchance even now, after such a bloody war and after such devastation, the Father of mercy looks upon us graciously; how thankfully should we approach him.' The hope must lie in the new generation, 'the children of Christians . . . the little brothers and sisters of Christ,' growing up now 'like a forest which no one plants, waters, cuts, or keeps in order.'

'All alike, boys and girls, rich and poor . . . should be sent to school. . . . All . . . have been born with the same end in view . . . that they may be . . . rational creatures . . . and the images of their Creator. . . . If, while we admit some to the culture of the intellect, we exclude others, we commit an injury . . . against God Himself.' 'If any ask, "What will be the result if artisans, rustics, porters, and even women become lettered," I answer, "They will learn to see, to praise, and to recognize God everywhere."'

Comenius, then, is designing an education for the whole people, and amongst his own little community he spent his life in carrying it out. He feels one Power working through the whole universe, in rich man and poor, in natural and supernatural, in the growth of a mind and the growth of a tree, and his precepts for teaching alternate continually with analogies from 'Nature.' In Nature, matter precedes form; therefore we must teach things before words, science before languages, reading before grammar. Nature concentrates on one thing at a time—so must we. Natural processes begin with what is easy; therefore the vernacular should come before the foreign language; and in learning the foreign language the child should learn first to understand, next to write, and last to speak; and sense-knowledge should come before all. Nature becomes fruitful and strong through constant movement; therefore we must alternate

reading with writing, learning with teaching, listening with repeating. Above all, natural growth proceeds from within. If understanding is assured, memory and expression will follow. Children should learn to investigate things for themselves, not rest on other people's observations, as if a tree decked itself with branches from other trees.

Yet when we come to Comenius' directions for actual school management, it is difficult to keep this precept fully in sight. Like other reformers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Brinsley, for instance, and the Jesuits before him), he introduces class teaching as a great improvement on the customary haphazard dealing with individuals or with little groups; and he maintains that, as the sun lightens the whole earth (Quintilian's analogy), a teacher should be able to teach several hundred scholars at once. He must 'stand on an elevated platform, and, keeping all the scholars in his sight at once, allow none of them to do anything but attend and look at him.' He must 'imbue them with the notion that the mouth of the teacher is a spring from which streams of knowledge issue and flow over them, and that, whenever they see this spring open, they should place their attention, like a cistern, beneath it, and thus allow nothing that flows forth to escape.'

Throughout this process, the teacher must make his talk entertaining and interesting; must illustrate with sense-objects; must drop on individual scholars to repeat what he has just said; must never repeat a question; and so on with numberless practical precepts that are rediscovered in every age when a teacher has to instruct large classes on the cistern plan. Let him set a monitor over each group of ten —the monitors will hear lessons and inspect books, the teacher will be super-inspector, and 'by hearing a few . . . can rest assured that he has the whole class under his control.'

In selecting our matter, we must concentrate and economize

at every step. 'Everything is unnecessary that is productive neither of piety nor of morality, and that is not essential for the cultivation of the mind.' But the last clause seems to give wide enough room, for 'to be a rational creature is to name all things, and to speculate and reason about everything that the world contains . . . to know how the world was made and the operation of the elements . . . the circuits of years and the positions of stars; the natures of living things . . . and the reasonings of men. . . . To man belong the knowledge of handicrafts and the art of speaking, lest (as says the son of Sirach) anything should remain unknown.'

Very important is the careful and liberal equipment of the school. Let plenty of good textbooks and other requisites be supplied, to save the teacher's labour and to avoid disorder and waste. In particular, provide for things to be presented to the senses. All books should be illustrated, and the school should have copies or models of everything about which the scholars are to learn. 'He who has once seen a rhinoceros (even in a picture)' can remember it more easily 'than if it had been described to him six hundred times. . . . Whoever has once seen a dissection of the human body will understand the position of its parts with far greater certainty than if he had read the most exhaustive treatise.'

The modern reader notices the limits within which imagination can step beyond the practice of its time. These object lessons are a great advance on lessons without an object, but the use of the senses is recipient only; the pupil watches what the teacher shows and does. When he comes to doing on his own account, Comenius says explicitly that 'a definite model of that which has to be made must always be provided. This the student should . . . imitate, as though he were following in the footsteps of a guide.' There is no setting of practical problems except in this way.

In all instruction the teacher must study order and leisurely thoroughness. Explain causes; begin with the most general principles; teach everything in its context; compare and contrast; make sure of each point before you go on to the next. 'Practice should commence with the rudiments and not with ambitious works.' Sometimes these rules are applied very well; sometimes less well; as when the rudiments which must precede composition-writing are found to be the collection of synonyms, adding of epithets, antithesis, periphrase, substitution of figurative words, figures of speech. 'When thoroughly versed in all these several points, and not sooner, he may proceed to the composition of a complete discourse.' We think now that the complete discourse should begin in the infant school. But such differences, based on different interpretation of 'rudiments' and 'groundwork,' are of small importance compared with the conviction that there *is* a right order, and that no beginner should be plunged into the midst of all difficulties at once.

From six years old to twelve all boys and girls should attend a common vernacular school. There they will learn (1) to read, write, count, measure, and sing; (2) psalms and hymns, catechism, Bible stories, and principles of morality; (3) as much economics and politics as is necessary to enable them to understand what they see daily; with world history and physical geography; (4) the most important principles of the mechanical arts. Some will also learn a modern foreign language. The contrast with Brinsley's programme for the same age is sufficiently striking.

There will be six classes in the vernacular school, each using one textbook which contains all that this class needs to learn in the year's work, and at the end of the year they should know the book by heart. 'Care must be taken to suit all these books to the children for whom they are intended; for children like whimsicality and humour. . . . If the whole

school be compared to a garden, the book of the lowest class might be called the violet bed; that of the second class, the rose bed . . . and so on.' Such books were prepared and published by Comenius himself.

A weaker part of the scheme, derived from less experience, is the Latin school which follows when the pupils are twelve. Every reformer is tempted to claim that his new plan, if properly managed, need sacrifice none of the advantages of the old. Comenius crowds into the Latin school everything already taught in the schools of his day, with the addition of everything else which he thinks ought to be taught. Attacking one language at a time, the pupils are to learn Latin in two years, Greek in one year, Hebrew in six months. Beginning from the bottom, the six classes will specialize successively in Grammar, Natural Philosophy, Mathematics, Ethics, Dialectics, and Rhetoric. Since everything must be begun at its beginning, the thirteen-year-old students of Natural Philosophy will begin with 'the science of first principles commonly called metaphysics. . . . This science embraces the primary . . . principles of existence, dealing with the essential hypotheses on which all things depend, their attributes, and their logical differences; and includes the most general definitions, axioms, and laws of nature. . . .' After 'this grounding in first principles' the children may proceed 'to deal with the visible universe.' So treacherous seems the philosophy of language, when one remembers Comenius' earlier advice—that reading should come before grammar, things before words, and sense-knowledge first of all. In the Dialectic class (age 16-17) 'the pupils should go over the whole field of natural philosophy, mathematics, and ethics, and carefully investigate any weighty points that are usually discussed by learned men.' At the University (which should have a strict examination for entrance) each student normally should specialize. But 'those of

quite exceptional talent should be urged to pursue all the branches of study, that there may always be some men whose knowledge is encyclopædic.' Comenius longs, like Bacon, for a central college of research; 'a kind of workshop' to other schools, 'supplying blood, life, and strength to all,' and spreading the light of wisdom throughout the human race.

The chapter last but one in the Didactic is a marvellous comparison of the new method of education to the art of the printer. 'We might adapt the term "typography" and call the new method of teaching "didachography." Instead of paper, we have pupils whose minds have to be impressed with the symbols of knowledge. Instead of type, we have the class-books and the rest of the apparatus. . . . The ink is replaced by the voice of the master, since this it is that conveys information from the books to the minds of the listener, while the press is school-discipline, which keeps the pupils up to their work and compels them to learn.' 'As soon as the type has been set up, the paper is flattened out and laid ready to hand. Similarly, a teacher should place his pupils in front of him that he may see them and be seen by all.' 'The paper is damped and softened, that it may be better fitted to receive the impression of the type. Similarly the pupils . . . must continually be urged to attend.' And so on. Every point in the comparison is worth noting. Yet in spite of all this, Comenius was one of the pioneers of modern education; and a prophet.

Two great experiments in universal schooling—the elementary schools of Saxe-Gotha, and the American Common School—were set on foot in Comenius' day, and probably by men who had felt the influence of his works. Beyond this, what remained was not the effect of the educational treatises (which were forgotten for two hundred years) but his textbooks; and of these particularly the introductions to Latin, which were an immense improvement on anything

that had appeared before. His textbooks of science had not the same success, and perhaps it was as well. Every reformer stands on the shoulders of his own age, and can reach no more than one man's height above it.

Comenius, like Vittorino da Feltre, was one of the saints of his profession—a sadder, more strenuous saint, with failures to chronicle as well as successes. There is not much place for gaiety in his world—the nearest emotion is that grave delight in the wonders of the universe which he would lead the children to share. It is a world in which 'the little brothers and sisters of Christ,' exiles perhaps for their parents' faith, or barely saved in the cruel wars of the time, must learn to 'speak little,' to occupy themselves constantly, to guard against temptation. For 'the world is nothing but our nursery, our nurturing place, and our school, and there is therefore a place beyond, whither we shall be transferred when we are dismissed from the classes of this school and are sent to that university which is everlasting.'

CHAPTER IX

THE EDUCATION OF A GENTLEMAN: SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES

I

Of the two books studied in the last chapter, the one showed the current school practice of its time, whilst the other showed the birth of a new criticism having two separate ideas in mind —the interest in physical science, and the desire for an education of the whole people, rich and poor. These ideas were not for many years yet to have any marked effect on the schools. But certain other critics of current practice, with a different point of view and a different field, could experiment more easily.

The Middle Ages had separated the education of the knight from that of the clerk or scholar; the Renaissance had united them again. But as the Renaissance studies hardened into pure classical scholarship, the man of the world began to feel that this was still clerks' business, and not what he needed for his son. Latin and Greek indeed were ornaments for a gentleman, and should be retained; but a soldier ought to know also some practical mathematics, and a statesman or diplomatist should have languages, modern history, and geography; and some knowledge of the new Science might be useful as well. Further, a gentleman's son ought still to learn to ride and dance and fence and shoot as his grandfather had done—as the classical schools were forgetting to teach his fellows to do.

Such things could at first be taught by private tutors as a

supplement to, or substitute for the ordinary school education. Some of them could be taught by one gentleman to another. In France, towards the end of the sixteenth century, persons of birth and acknowledged standing began to direct schools of arms and horsemanship, which presently added other subjects to their curriculum. In 1638, under the king's patronage, the Oratorians opened the Académie Royale near Paris. The scholars learnt physical science, mathematics, geography, heraldry, and French history; and Italian and Spanish as well as Latin and Greek. The lowest class definitely studied the mother-tongue. This study was carried further in the schools of the Gentlemen of Port Royal (1637-1661), where earnest religious training was combined with the courtly instruction. Drawing, music, dancing and riding were emphasized in the 'Academies,' and mathematics, for which Descartes did so much, had a special place in France. Under French influence some academies were founded in Germany before the Thirty Years War (1618-1648), and others after its close, and these Ritterakademien educated German nobles and officers till the middle of the eighteenth century.

Milton's *Tractate* (1644) is a scheme for an English academy. He writes early in the Civil War, and plans an education to produce something better than the 'poor, shaken, uncertain Reeds' and 'empty and unrecruitable Colonels' that he finds so far on the Parliamentary side. 'I call therefore a complete and generous education, that which fits a man to perform justly, skilfully, and magnanimously all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war.' He makes the scheme out of his own head, in a letter invited by his friend Samuel Hartlib. 'To tell you what I have benefited herein among old renowned authors, I shall spare; and to search what many Januas[1] and Didactics, more than ever I shall read,

[1] The *Janua Linguarum Reserata* was one of Comenius' best known text-books.

have projected, my inclination leads me not. But if you can accept of these few observations which have flowered off, and are as it were the burnishing of many studious and contemplative years . . . I here give you them to dispose of.'

The school is to contain some hundred and twenty students of ages 12-21, who (like the scholars in Comenius' Latin school) are to learn all the old subjects and all the new. 'We do amiss to spend 7 or 8 years merely in scraping together so much miserable Latin or Greek, as might be learned otherwise easily and delightfully in one year.' Milton's constructive suggestions for learning it 'otherwise' consist (1) of shortening the vacations, (2) of postponing composition to the age of twenty, (3) of having 'some chosen short book lessoned thoroughly to them,' (4) of eloquence on the part of the teacher. 'The main skill and groundwork will be, to temper them such lectures and explanations, upon every opportunity, as may lead and draw them in willing obedience, inflamed with the study of learning and the admiration of virtue; stirred up with high hopes of living to be brave men, and worthy patriots, dear to God, and famous to all ages. That they may despise and scorn all their childish and ill-taught qualities, to delight in manly and liberal exercises, which he who hath the art and proper eloquence to catch them with, what with mild and effectual persuasions, and what with the intimation of some fear, if need be, but chiefly by his own example, might in a short time gain them to an incredible diligence and courage, infusing into their young breasts such an ingenious and noble ardour, as would not fail to make many of them renowned and matchless men.'

Inspired by this ardour, the boys who have begun Latin at twelve will leave its grammar behind them at thirteen, with arithmetic and geometry, and proceed to Latin books

on agriculture, followed by the use of the globe, and 'all the maps,' and a manual of natural philosophy. In the same year they begin Greek. At 14-15 they read natural history and science in Latin and physiology in Greek: and add trigonometry, followed by engineering and other applied sciences, and Anatomy. And so on, with Italian, Hebrew, and mental and moral science: technical subjects from special teachers; classical drama and poetry; political history and the history of law. After supper, and on Sundays, they study Scripture and Divinity: and there are daily intervals for hearing and learning music (before and after dinner), fencing and wrestling (1½ hours), and the work of cadets and Officers' Training Corps (2 hours). In springtime, after they are about fifteen years old, they will make school journeys 'to all quarters of the land.'

We need not deny that this is a generous education with good ideas in it; nor that much of it corresponds to ground covered by the young Milton himself, seeking play for his genius within and without the curriculum of St. Paul's and Cambridge: nor even that he covered a good deal of it with the selected boys he consented to teach in his own small school. Nevertheless, the present writer confesses to finding the *Tractate* singularly irritating, and provocative by contrast not only of affection for Comenius whom Milton did not read,[1] but even of some sympathy for the professional schoolmasters who took no notice of either.

II

For in the regular schools, the regular classical instruction went on. Charles Hoole, teacher in Rotherham and in London, published in 1660 *A New Discovery of the old Art*

[1] Perhaps Milton was making fun of Hartlib's enthusiasm for Comenius and other reformers.

of Teaching School, which in its actual directions is scarcely more than Brinsley's book over again. Hoole, like Brinsley, is a kindly master, with more sympathy than Milton had for the childish and untaught qualities which Milton would have his boys despise. 'There is a great difference,' writes Hoole, 'betwixt a man that teacheth and a Child that is to be taught. . . . Forasmuch as a child is tender, a man must abate of his roughness: seeing a child is slow of apprehension, he must not be too quick in his delivery: and seeing a child is naturally awkward to his work, he must not be too passionate, if he do amiss.' 'How have I delighted to see an Artist (I mean a watchmaker or the like) spend an hour or two sometimes in finding a defect in a piece of work, which he hath afterwards remedied in the turning of a hand: whereas a more hasty workman hath been ready to throw the thing aside, and to neglect it as good for no use. Let the Master ever mind where a child sticks, and remove the impediments out of his way, and his Scholar will take pleasure, that he can go on in learning.'

A child in the Petty School should read English by seven or eight, and should then go on to the Grammar-school for Latin. Latin at eight is apparently a law of the universe, though Hoole is sorry to notice 'a great disproportion betwixt a child's capacity and the Accidence.' 'Children are led most by sense, and the Grammar-rules, consisting in general Doctrines, are too subtle for them: Children's wits are weak, active, and lively, whereas Grammar notions are abstractive, dull, and lifeless: boys find no sap nor sweetness in them, because they know not what they mean: and tell them the meaning of the same rule never so often over, their memories are so waterish, that the impression (if any were made in the brain) is quickly gone out again.'

Even Brinsley, it seems, made little impression on the customs of his age, and the method of Spondeus is much the

same as before he came to consult Philoponus half a century ago: with the same results following:

'The commonly received way to teach children the first Rudiments of Latin-Speech is, to put them to read the Accidence once or twice over, and then to let them get it without book by several parts, not respecting at all whether they understand it, or not. Thus they spend two or three years (for the most part) in a wearisome toil to no purpose, not knowing all the while what use they are to make of their book, nor what the learning of such a multitude of Rules may tend to, and in the interim of getting the Accidence by heart (if great care be not taken) they lose that ability of reading English, which they brought from the Petty-School; and this makes the Parents cry out against learning Latin.'

Hoole's own chief amendment, he says, has 'seemed to some a mere Paradox.' It is, 'that either a child may be able to write before he be put to the Grammar School, or else be put to learn to write so soon as he comes thither.' 'Then . . . they may be exercised in writing out Substantives, and Adjectives, and forming the degrees of comparison, with which work they will be exceedingly much delighted when once they can write, and by once writing, they will better discern what they do, than by ten times telling over. . . . They that can write, shall be sure to profit in Grammar learning, whereas they that cannot, will do little but disturb the School and hinder their fellows, and bring a shame upon their Master, and a blame upon themselves because they do not learn faster. And, alas, poor child, how should he be made to go that wants his legs? if he go upon crutches, it is but lamely.'

The Latin School cannot be changed for gentlemen's sons: but Hoole, moved by the spirit of Comenius (one of whose textbooks he translated) or by the spirit of the Commonwealth, conceives of another kind of school which might

meet the needs of the body of the nation. He would give Latin if it were possible to every child, rich or poor. 'But if not . . . it were good if they were put to a Writing School, where they might be, First, helped to keep their English, by reading of a chapter . . . once a day: and second, taught to write a fair hand: and thirdly, afterwards exercised in Arithmetic, and such preparative Arts, as may make them completely fit to undergo any ordinary calling. . . . And instead of the Accidence . . . they may be benefited in reading Orthodoxal Catechisms and other books, that may instruct them in the Duties of a Christian . . . and afterwards in other delightful books of English History: as, The History of Queen Elizabeth: or Poetry, as Herbert's Poems, Quarles' Emblems: and by this means they will gain such a habit and delight in reading, as to make it their chief recreation, when liberty is afforded them. And their acquaintance with good books will (by God's blessing) be a means so to sweeten their otherwise sour natures, that they may live comfortably towards themselves and amiably converse with other persons.'

Perhaps, after all, opinion had moved between 1612 and 1660.

III

Milton gave us the education of a gentleman as sketched by the brilliant amateur; Hoole gave it as known by the professional schoolmaster. Certain other schoolmasters of the next generation were strangely pushed into a liberty of experiment, for legislation under Charles II expelled many Nonconformist teachers from the Universities and grammar schools, and some of these earned their living thenceforth by conducting private schools for the children of their co-religionists. Such schools worked under special disadvantages and varied greatly in merit, but they taught mathematics and science and modern studies at a time when the established

institutions did not teach them. The squire and the nobleman, however, were not Nonconformists, and if they wanted for their sons an education which was not exclusively classical they turned in England not to schools but to the private tutor.

One such tutor is noteworthy for other reasons than his teaching. John Locke's writings affected education not only directly by their precepts but more broadly through their influence on the general philosophy of the age. His respect for fact, his common sense and cool reasonableness, and his distrust of fancy and of over-systematization, all spread widely through the England of the eighteenth century. The *Essay concerning Human Understanding* was published in 1690, *Some Thoughts concerning Education* in 1693, and *Of the Conduct of the Understanding* in 1706 after the author's death.

Locke's advice on the bringing up of small children, with its stress on light loose clothing, plain food, regular habits, and plenty of sleep, all helped to give a philosopher's sanction to the common-sense hygiene which was slowly making its way. For the older child, he is sure that a good training is to be had only at home; not in the contemporary public schools. 'How anyone's being put into a mixed herd of unruly boys, and there learning to wrangle at trap, or rook at span-farthing, fits him for civil conversation or business, I do not see.' 'You must confess, that you have a strange value for words, when preferring the languages of the ancient Greeks and Romans to that which made them such brave men, you think it worth while to hazard your son's innocence and virtue for a little Greek and Latin.' Give the boy a private tutor, and let the tutor be a person of 'breeding, and knowledge of the world.' Too often 'Latin and learning make all the noise; and the main stress is laid upon his proficiency in things, a great part whereof belong not to a

gentleman's calling; which is to have the knowledge of a man of business, a carriage suitable to his rank, and to be eminent and useful in his country, according to his station.' Let the boy learn in the first place, to read, write, and speak English well. Vernacular study should come first, and drawing; then French; then, for a gentleman's son, Latin. This should be sensibly and economically taught, with conversation if possible; but there should be no verse-writing in any language. 'If he have a poetic vein, it is to me the strangest thing in the world that the father should desire or suffer it to be cherished or improved. If he proves a successful rhymer, and gets once the reputation of a wit, I desire it may be considered what company and places he is like to spend his time in, nay, and estate too; for it is very seldom seen, that any one discovers mines of gold or silver in Parnassus.'

Dancing should be learnt, for it 'gives graceful motions . . . and . . . manliness, and a becoming confidence to young children.' But music is more doubtful. 'Music is thought to have some affinity with dancing, and a good hand upon some instrument is by many people mightily valued. But it wastes so much of a young man's time to gain but a moderate skill in it: and engages often in such odd company, that many think it much better spared: and I have, amongst men of parts and business, so seldom heard any one commended or esteemed for having an excellency in it, that amongst all those things, that ever came into the list of accomplishments I think I may give it the last place.' Horsemanship and fencing are good for health, and much thought of, though the first may be overdone, and the second has considerable disadvantages. There are no such objections to learning a craft, or indeed two or three. Carpentering, turning, gardening, working in iron, are all health-giving and worth having for their own sakes. And an admirable employment for leisure is provided by a knowledge of fine

mechanical arts—perfuming, engraving, delicate metal-work, or the cutting and polishing of optical glasses or precious stones.

In the time saved from the old wasteful methods of Latin-teaching, the boy may 'have his mind and manners formed, and be instructed to boot in several sciences, such as a good part of geography, astronomy, chronology, anatomy, besides some parts of history, and all other parts of knowledge of things, that fall under the senses, and require little more than memory.' Geometry should be added. Locke makes an excellent defence of a wide 'smattering' curriculum. 'Who expects, that under a tutor a young gentleman should be an accomplished critic, orator, or logician? go to the bottom of metaphysics, natural philosophy, or mathematics? or be a master in history or chronology? though something of each of these is to be taught him: but it is only to open the door that he may look in. . . .' 'Whenever either spare hours . . . or an inclination to perfect himself in some parts of knowledge, which his tutor did but just enter him in, set him upon any study, the first rudiments of it which he learned before will open the way enough for his own industry to carry him as far as his fancy will prompt, or his parts enable him to go.'

Nor must we exaggerate the value of what we might teach him if we took the time; in 'natural philosophy,' for instance. 'Though the world be full of systems of it, yet I cannot say I know any one which can be taught a young man as a science, wherein he may be sure to find truth and certainty. It is necessary for a gentleman, in this learned age, to look into some of them to fit himself for conversation: but . . . I think the systems . . . are to be read more to know the hypothesis, and to understand the terms and ways of talking of the several sects, than with hopes to gain thereby a comprehensive, scientifical, and satisfactory knowledge of the

works of nature.' 'Natural philosophy, as a speculative science, I imagine we have none, and perhaps I may think I have reason to say we never shall be able to make a science of it.'

(This is partly the reaction of a sane and cautious mind against the systematizing of the seventeenth century. But the more intense and brilliant intellect of David Hume showed not long afterwards how near Locke's caution was to the sceptical philosophy which dissolves the world into powder.)

Anyhow, the main thing is not learning but character: the ideal character of the age of common sense. 'Of good-breeding, knowledge of the world, virtue, industry, and a love of reputation, he cannot have too much: and if he have these, he will not long want what he needs or desires of the other.'

IV

The critics of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were attacking the education of the later Renaissance as it was preserved in the schools. In the Universities they had still to deal with the education of the Middle Ages.

In Universities, as elsewhere, the new subjects and methods were finding a place outside the official system. At Oxford and Cambridge, as time went on, private instruction could be obtained in almost everything, by such students as 'made no scruple of diverting from the common road of studies . . . to any part of useful learning.'[1] But in the common road and official scheme, Milton complains that a purely linguistic school education was suddenly changed at the University to 'the most intellective abstractions of logic and metaphysics,' otherwise 'ragged notions and babblements.' And the old ways were only strengthened by the general wave of conservatism which came with the Restoration.

[1] John Wallis, describing his University work of 1632–7. Quoted by Adamson: *Short History*, p. 186.

We have protests from disciples of science and mathematics: from Joseph Glanvill, for instance, who is known to most of us in a different aspect through *The Scholar Gipsy*.

'"Tis these ungracious Disputations that have been the great hindrance to the more improvable parts of Learning: and the modern Retainers of the Stagirite [1] have spent their sweat and pains upon the most litigious part of his Philosophy: while those, that find less play for the contending Genius, are incultivate. Thus Logic, Physics, and Metaphysics, are the burden of Volumes, and the daily entertainment of the Disputing Schools: while the more profitable doctrines of the Heavens, Meteors, Minerals, Animals: as also the more practical ones of Politics, and Economics, are scarce so much as glanced at. And the indisputable Mathematics, the only Science Heaven hath yet vouchsafed Humanity, have but few votaries among the slaves of the Stagirite.' [2]

Mathematics, at any rate, presently made way at Cambridge. Dr. Law describes their promotion in the early eighteenth century by some of his friends who were disciples of Descartes and Newton, and who wished to substitute for the 'pedantic jargon' and 'dull crabbed system' of Aristotle's logic a study which should really train close and accurate thinking in their pupils, fitting them for the pursuit of natural science. The promoters little imagined, he says, 'that in a short time these same assistants, these comparatively meagre instruments, should, like Pharaoh's kine, eat up all that was good and well-favoured in the sciences themselves; that they should usurp the place of those very sciences to which they were originally designed to be subservient, and for which station they were sufficiently qualified.' [3]

[1] Aristotle.

[2] Joseph Glanvill: *Scepsis Scientifica* (1665).

[3] Quoted by Mullinger: *Cambridge Characteristics in the Seventeenth Century*, p. 197.

Cambridge also used in its philosophical course Locke's *Essay concerning the Human Understanding*, which Oxford discouraged on account of its alleged tendencies to deism. Its influence contributed from another side to the modification of the old Logic teaching.

But the history of Logic in the Scottish universities in the later eighteenth century is perhaps the most illuminating of all. Seldom since the days of early Christianity has the study been condemned in such unqualified terms as we find in the works of its Scottish critics, who laid most of the faults of mediæval Europe at its door.

'The slow progress of useful knowledge,' says Lord Kames,[1] 'during the many ages when the syllogistic art was most highly cultivated as the only guide to science, and its quick progress since that art was disused, suggest a presumption against it; and this presumption is strengthened by the puerility of the examples which have always been brought to illustrate the rules.' 'When we compare this mockery of science (i.e. Aristotle's logic) with the unrivalled powers of the inventor, it is scarcely possible to avoid suspecting, that he was anxious to conceal its real poverty and nakedness under the veil of the abstract language in which it was exhibited. . . . When we translate any of Aristotle's demonstrations from the general and enigmatical language in which he states it, into more familiar and intelligible terms, by applying it to a particular example, the mystery at once disappears, and resolves into some self-evident or identical puerility' (Dugald Stewart).[2] 'The method of proving by syllogism appears, even on a superficial review, both unnatural and prolix. . . . The whole bears manifest indications of an artificial and ostentatious parade of learning, calculated for giving the appearance of great profundity, to what in fact is very shallow'

[1] *Sketches of the History of Man*, Bk. 3, ch. 4.
[2] *Philosophy of the Mind*, Part II, ch. 6 (1813).

(George Campbell).[1] 'In my reveries, I have more than once compared Aristotle's logic to a bubble made of soap-water for amusing children; a beautiful figure with splendid colours; fair on the outside, empty within' (Lord Kames).[2]

And there were worse faults still.

'It is to be observed . . . that the school-logick was found to be a good support to the Romish religion, and was by the church of Rome patronized accordingly. For this logick, by confining men's minds within the narrow circle of its own rules, and making them more attentive to words than to things, and totally regardless of nature, checked all freedom of inquiry; and, by promoting a habit of arguing against one's belief as well as for it, had a tendency to prevent serious thinking, to harden the heart, to pervert the understanding, and to make men indifferent about the truth' (James Beattie).[3]

One result of these views was the introduction of Locke and Bacon into the courses of Scottish universities, and the subordination of the Aristotelian system. But changes were often more radical than this, and Dr. Jardine's account of their beginning at his own university is amusing reading.[4]

The traditional course of the 'first philosophy class' at Glasgow had, at any rate, the merit of being comprehensive. From the beginning of the session, about October 10, to the end of that month, the professor lectured on the Memorabilia of Socrates; from November to February, on Aristotle's logic; from February to the middle of April he dealt with metaphysics, and finally concluded the session with ontology. This class was contentedly attended by every one till 1750, when Adam Smith was appointed professor: and Adam Smith happened to be prevented from putting his lectures

[1] G. Campbell: *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, Bk. I, ch. 6.
[2] *Sketches*, Bk. 3, introduction.
[3] J. Beattie: *Elements of Moral Science*, Part IV, ch. 2.
[4] George Jardine: *Outlines of Philosophical Education*.

into Latin. 'Being rather unexpectedly called to discharge the duties of his office,' he found it necessary to give an old set of lectures in English. His successor followed his example, and by the time of Dr. Jardine's appointment in 1774 the consequences had become momentous.

'The conviction of the general uselessness, and even positively hurtful consequences, of spending six or seven months in the study of logic and metaphysics, was not confined to the youth within the walls of the college. From the time that the lectures began to be delivered in English, the eyes of men were opened to the unsuitable nature of the subjects of which they treated; and the defects of the system . . . became every day more striking. . . . It was observed . . . that the subjects introduced in the logic class, even when perfectly understood, had little or no connexion with that species of knowledge which was necessary to prepare the student either for the speculative pursuits of science, or for the active business of life. . . . Intelligent persons, who sent their sons to the logic class . . . could not fail to observe that the subjects to which their attention was directed, had no relation to any profession or employment whatever; that the discussions connected with them had no analogy to those trains of thinking which prevail in the ordinary intercourse of society: and, in short, that nothing could be derived from prelections on such topics, which was likely in the smallest degree either to adorn conversation, or to qualify the student for the concerns of active life.' [1]

The Scottish philosophers did their best. At Glasgow, besides inductive logic and psychology, they introduced Rhetoric, viz. English composition and literature. In Aberdeen they 'unanimously agreed to employ much less time . . . in the Logic and Metaphysics of the Schoolmen, which seem contrived to make men subtle disputants—a profession

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 25–26.

justly of less value in the present age than it has been in some preceding ones; and to employ themselves chiefly in teaching those parts of Philosophy which may qualify men for the more useful and important offices of society.'[1] At Edinburgh the course concluded with a 'view of the Theory of Language, or Principles of Universal Grammar.' In 1833 Sir William Hamilton remarked, 'In Scotland, the Chairs of Logic have for generations taught anything rather than the science which they nominally profess.'

V

But all was part of one long movement of rebellion against authority. From the seventeenth century onwards men felt themselves in a new world, not fitted by any mere repetition of what satisfied the old. The seventeenth century indeed had questioned and replied so bitterly and bloodily, in England and Europe, that a temporary exhaustion followed, and the eighteenth seemed on the surface a quiet conservative time.

Enlightenment, and an aristocratic freedom from bondage to tradition, became itself a tradition of good form. The custom of travel had come back with peace: great lords and rich squires from England made the Grand Tour, and mixed with the nobility of France and Italy. They had good breeding, knowledge of the world, and a love of reputation, as Locke had desired, and some of them certainly had virtue and industry as well. Wit adorned their conversation, and constant practice qualified them for the concerns of their life. 'They look down on us, these fortunate beings, from the canvases of Gainsborough and Reynolds, with a self-satisfaction triumphantly justified.'[2] The age had produced these, yet it could not rest. Under the surface of society the forces went on gathering, and the conversation of society

[1] Rashdall: *Universities*, Vol III, p. 312 n.
[2] G. M. Trevelyan.

itself gave them room. A gentleman might criticize and question anything, and toy in polite company with the idea of a 'natural' condition which might be even more interesting than the eighteenth-century world. About 1760, a few books connected with this subject struck the general imagination with extraordinary force. They came from a somewhat lower cosmopolitan level, being the work of a rather disreputable Swiss from Geneva, living in France, who happened to have genius.

CHAPTER X

ROUSSEAU, AND THE EDUCATION OF THE NATURAL MAN

I

JEAN-JACQUES ROUSSEAU gained his first great success with *Julie or The New Heloise*, a novel of sentiment which thrilled his generation and heralded the Romantic Revival. Its drama of love and conflict leads up to the picture of a sunny country home where the former lover is a guest welcomed by the heroine and her husband; and the upbringing here by Julie of her little sons gives Rousseau's ideal of early training. The description has a curiously modern, even 'Montessori' atmosphere, with its account of the happy, eager little ones, absorbed in the manifold interests of house and garden, beside their peaceful mother. 'I was astonished at the way in which, loving her children so tenderly, Julie worried over them so little.' 'One never sees her hastening to make them talk or to make them be silent, to tell them to do this or not to do that. She never disputes with them. You would say that she was content to see them and love them, and that her duty as mother is performed when they have passed the day beside her.' The lover almost grudges the absence of that superfluous activity which 'becomes maternal love so well. I should have liked to attribute to her care everything good that I saw in her children . . . I could almost have wished them to have faults, to see her more concerned with correcting them.' But Julie explains to him the

silent watchfulness which makes this peaceful life seem to come of itself, and the ideal in her mind and her husband's. 'Our children are not to be shaped by us into an external and artificial form; they are to develope according to their own nature.'

La Nouvelle Heloise was finished in 1759 and published in 1761. In 1762, Rousseau published two books—*Le Contrat Social*, memorable in the history of social philosophy, and *Emile, ou de l'Education*.

Emile grew, Rousseau tells us, out of an attempt to give advice sought by a mother. We find it a complete work; a philosophic reverie; a fairy-tale. The question propounded is not, How shall we produce a learned man, or a soldier or a lawyer, or a man of the world? but, How shall a child be helped to become, first the child that Nature had meant him to be, and then the boy, and then the man. Ranks and professions and stations in the world are uncertain; 'the profession I would teach him is to live.' And let him live first as a child. 'Of all the children that are born, half at most reach adolescence, and it is probable that your pupil will not reach manhood. What can we think then of that barbarous education which sacrifices the present to an uncertain future, which lays a child under every kind of restraint and makes his early life miserable, to prepare him for a pretended happiness which there is every reason to believe he may never live to enjoy?'

Rousseau contemplates himself in charge of such a child. There must be only one, because he cannot imagine taking charge of more than one; and parents would be irrelevant and are dismissed. So he clears the stage and concentrates the light. Locke's wise and kindly tutor, now named Jean-Jacques, is transported with his charge to a desert island, or rather to a woodland château in France, where servants and gardeners and the little village boys may all be nothing but machinery under his complete control.

It is quite wrong, Rousseau says, to impose the same training on different temperaments, or 'to claim that we can model different minds by a common standard. . . . Before developing character we must study it; we must wait quietly till it reveals itself and refrain from all action rather than act amiss.' As there is only one pupil, we have no development of the first part of this thought—Emile is not much more than *the* child, often very attractively pictured, yet fundamentally as much an abstraction as the Economic Man. But the second part, the study of childhood and the waiting on natural development, is a keynote of the whole work. This is Rousseau's own, whilst other elements come rather from a rigidly logical working-out of current ideas of his time. The Age of Enlightenment has rejected dogma and authority for itself, yet has imposed them on the children—Emile shall be free except from the laws of nature. Philosophic society believes in an idyllic state of nature antecedent to conventional society, and discusses exploration, and extols the noble savage, free and unprejudiced and courageous—Emile shall spend his childhood in such a state, and grow up to be such a being, and more.

Many of the precepts on method are excellent. 'The apparent ease with which children learn operates to their prejudice. . . . The delicate texture of their brains reflects like a mirror every object which is presented to them; but nothing penetrates or is left behind.' 'A child retains the words, but the ideas are reflected back; the hearer may understand, but he himself understands nothing.' 'They reason excellently on matters with which they are acquainted and which concern their present and obvious interest. It is in the extent of their knowledge that we deceive ourselves; we attribute to them knowledge which they do not possess and set them to reason about things which they cannot understand.' Wait; be patient and leisurely; do not force growth; do not thrust on them knowledge for which they

are not ready and which they cannot assimilate. Do not hurry them into book-learning—when they genuinely feel the need of reading they will learn to read, meanwhile they may be fully employed without it. 'Their whole environment is the book from which, without conscious effort, they are constantly enriching their memory against the time when their judgment will be able to profit by it.' When Emile comes to an age for science, he is not to be taught it dogmatically, but helped to find it out, using his own reason to solve problems; practical problems whenever possible. 'From this continuous exercise must result a vigour of mind like that which is gained by the body from work and fatigue. . . . Moreover, when the mind fully digests its acquisitions before committing them to memory, whatever it draws from that source afterwards is properly its own.' Lead him to feel the value of what he learns: do not merely tell him that it is valuable. He will respect astronomy and geography if they have helped him out of the forest and home to his dinner.

II

In his discussion of sense training in particular, Rousseau is much ahead of his contemporaries and of many of his successors, for he thinks of the senses not as a mere gateway for impressions but as part of the apparatus of action, of adjustment to the world and management of the world. 'Man's first study is a sort of experimental physical science relative to self-preservation'; as a cat, the first time it comes into a room, 'is not still a moment until it has carefully examined everything.' 'Our first instructors in science are our feet, hands and eyes.' Rousseau would keep them our chief instructors, all through, without much assistance. 'The more ingenious our instruments, the more dull and incapable become our organs; by collecting machines about us, we lose those that are within us.' Let our apparatus be home-made. 'When we use for the construction of these instruments the

skill which would take their place, we gain without losing anything.'

This distrust of apparatus is only partly educational. It belongs partly to a general reaction against elaborateness. Such a reaction is apt to occur, whether superficially or deeply, in certain members of a certain kind of society; society that is highly developed in its own way, yet sharply sundered from the necessary life of the greater part of the community. Not only for this reason in itself, but from the underlying causes of which this is a mark, these persons come to feel their world unnatural, artificial, cramping or deluding. They may seek to return to Nature not by widening such a life but by deserting it. In some passages the voice of Rousseau seems for a moment to be that of a later prophet in a similar stage of history—Leo Tolstoy.

Consider, for instance, some of the medley of arguments with which Rousseau supports his precept that Emile should learn a trade. Locke has recommended making a hobby of some mechanical art, but Rousseau demands not a hobby but a real trade, with an apprenticeship as real as can be satisfied by giving it two days a week. 'Of all the occupations which furnish subsistence to mankind, that which approaches nearest to a state of nature is manual work: of all conditions of life, the most independent of fortune and man's caprice is that of the artisan.' 'You trust to the present order, forgetting . . . that you can neither foresee nor prevent what may affect your children. . . . We are approaching a period of crisis, an age of revolutions. Who can assure you what will be your lot?' 'The man who consumes at leisure what he has not earned is a thief; and a pensioner, who is paid by the State for doing nothing, differs little in my eyes from a brigand, who lives by plunder on the highway.' 'I would have him learn a trade less for its own sake than to overcome the prejudices which despise it. You will never

be reduced, you say, to work for your bread. So much the worse for you; I say, so much the worse. But no matter; if you do not work from necessity, work for glory. Stoop to the station of an artisan that you may rise above your own.'

The idea of using manual work as a part of education is old, but some of these arguments are new, and there is a new vehemence in all. Rousseau was not born among the cultured persons who heard him with so much interest. He was an artisan's son; a runaway apprentice; a man 'who had been a servant, who had wanted bread, who had been befriended by rough men and rougher women . . . and who never tried to shut these things out from his memory.'[1] He is a man who notes elsewhere, 'The populace compose the bulk of mankind; the rest are so few that they are hardly worth counting. . . . If all the kings and philosophers were removed, they would scarcely be missed, and things would go on just as well.' Thirty years later France removed them; though Louis XVI had made himself an admirable locksmith.

III

In commenting on the extravagances in *Emile*, it is not fair to read the book in the same tone which we should use in reading Brinsley or Hoole, Locke or Comenius. If we may compare smaller things with greater, the analogy is rather with Plato's *Republic*. Rousseau is no Plato, and his book is not the chiselled product of many years of patient thought, but he, like Plato, is dreaming a dream, and setting it down in splendid prose for his generation to make of it what it can. He is an imaginative romantic seeing himself as a tutor; a day-dreamer riding a new hobby-horse. (Sometimes, as in his Treatise on the Government of Poland, he rides quite a different horse into the same subject, inventing a completely public,

[1] Morley: *Life of Rousseau*, Vol. I, p. 68.

State-supervised, Spartan system of training.) He sees vividly and describes delightfully the kind of boy that Emile is to be at twelve, at fifteen, at nineteen; the foundation an idealized Swiss peasant lad with all the handicaps of peasant life removed; the outcome a youth whom any rank would be glad to welcome. The details of the means for producing what he wants are sometimes of interest to him and sometimes not. He tells us much of the garden plot which will ground Emile in economics, and the woodland walks which will teach geography, but when he comes to discuss the relative educational values of Livy, Plutarch, and Thucydides, he is not held back by any need to explain how and when his pupil is to learn Latin or Greek. In Book V he has to produce a bride for Emile and to describe her upbringing—he writes the account 'in a profound and delicious solitude, in the midst of woods and streams, with the fragrance of the orange-flower poured around him, and in continual ecstasy,' [1] and he deserts without scruple every principle of upbringing that he has ever explained. 'The fifth book of Emilius,' says Lord Morley, 'is not a chapter on the education of women, but an idyll'; a French eighteenth-century idyll, scented with orange-flower.

IV

Some of the eccentricities of Emile's training follow from the ruthlessness with which his creator has cleared the stage. Julie's son has been deprived of mother and father and brother and girl cousin, and is left alone with Jean-Jacques. Julie and her husband had other things to think of than their children—they were good heads of a large household, wise and efficient managers of an estate, kindly helpers to a whole country-side. Life in such a home might well educate a boy every hour, not only without his being

[1] Morley, Vol. II, p. 249.

conscious of it himself, but without anybody else being incessantly conscious of him. Jean-Jacques has no occupation but his care of Emile. The situation has been so simplified that the most elaborate machinery has subsequently to be introduced to make it move at all. Bribery and intrigue have to come in to make Emile learn to run. The tutor has to pretend inability to draw and keep up a graduated pretence for months, in order that the boy may have a rival and companion in his progress. The educative forces in this emptied life have all to be supplied or arranged by a solitary man, and he must arrange them in secret. 'Let your pupil always believe himself to be master, and always be master yourself. . . . The poor child, who knows nothing, who can do nothing, who is acquainted with nothing, is surely at your mercy. . . . He should do only what he wishes, but he should only wish what you desire, he should not take a step which you have not foreseen nor open his lips to speak without your knowing what he is about to say.'

A second series of oddities follow from the consistency with which Rousseau worked out certain current ideas of the time and combined them with his own. One must wait upon development; not appeal to capacities that are not yet there, or force experience for which the child is not ready, since Nature means children to be children before they become men—this is his own principle, and a good one. The mind is made up of separate faculties which develop at different times; and a faculty is either there or not there; it exists full-grown or not at all—these are current assumptions in the psychology of his day. Combine the two thoughts, and you make a time-table for the educator. For instance, 'reason and the social emotions must each arise at a definite period; he took twelve and fifteen as the respective ages; and, assuming that a boy is irrational till twelve and unsocial to fifteen, he will not allow him to be acquainted with any-

thing which involves the use of reason or social feelings till these ages.'[1] He cannot indeed carry this out quite perfectly, since the contrary facts are so strong. ('Children reason excellently,' he grants, 'on matters with which they are acquainted and which concern their present and obvious interest.') But he does his best. Under twelve years old, 'give your pupil no lesson in words; he must learn only from experience. Inflict on him no kind of punishment; for he does not know what it means to be in fault. . . . As he is devoid of all morality in his actions, he cannot do anything morally wrong or deserving of punishment or censure.' At twelve, if you speak to Emile of duty or obedience, 'he does not know what you mean. Command him, he will take no notice; but say, "If you will do me this favour, I will repay you some time," he will fly immediately to oblige you: for he desires nothing more than to extend his power, and to acquire over you claims which he knows to be inviolable.' At fifteen, he 'is virtuous in everything relating to himself. To possess the social virtues also, he only needs to learn the relations which require them.' The proper sequence is upheld even where one might think that the facts most flagrantly defied it. Since children between five and twelve have no sentiment, there can be no expression in their speech or their singing.

One remarkable feature results from Rousseau's faithfulness to the sequence he has assumed. Himself a first-born son of the romantic movement, a man of fervent imagination and sensitive to every shade of natural beauty, he assigns to the years of boyhood an inner life as prosaic as any opponent of sentiment could have prescribed. We might acquiesce in Emile's noble-savage attitude (between twelve years old and fifteen) towards the prettinesses of civilization. 'He regards iron as far more precious than gold and glass than diamonds.

[1] Professor Archer's preface to his *Rousseau on Education*, to which I owe much.

. . . A pastry cook is a person of singular importance in his eyes, and he would give the whole Academy of Science for the meanest confectioner. Goldsmiths, engravers, gilders, and embroiderers appear to him as triflers who amuse themselves in perfectly useless employment.' But his austerity goes much further. Except for a casual mention of 'taste for the beauties of Nature' in connexion with drawing lessons (which seems to be a slip), Emile is apparently precluded from enjoying any beauty at all. The country for him is a healthy place in which to take exercise. If they stand together on a hill-top at dawn, the flaming east may thrill the teacher but not the pupil. 'A child sees the objects, but cannot see the connexions which bind them together; he cannot hear the sweet harmony of their concert. It needs experience which he has not attained and sentiments which he has never felt.' 'It is by their obvious relations to his own convenience, security, preservation, and happiness that he should estimate all the forces of Nature and all the works of man.'

Yet one boy at any rate could bear witness to relations less obvious:—

> Ye Presences of Nature in the sky
> And on the earth! Ye visions of the hills!
> And Souls of lonely places! can I think
> A vulgar hope was yours when ye employed
> Such ministry, when ye through many a year
> Haunting me thus among my boyish sports,
> On caves and trees, upon the woods and hills,
> Impressed upon all forms the characters
> Of danger or desire; and thus did make
> The surface of the universal earth
> With triumph and delight, with hope and fear
> Work like a sea! . . .
>
> . . . How I have felt,
> Not seldom even in that tempestuous time,
> Those hallowed and pure motions of the sense
> Which seem, in their simplicity, to own

An intellectual charm; that calm delight
Which, if I err not, surely must belong
To those first-born affinities that fit
Our new existence to existing things,
And, in our dawn of being, constitute
The bond of union between life and joy.

Yes, I remember when the changeful earth,
And twice five summers on my mind had stamped
The faces of the moving year, even then
I held unconscious intercourse with beauty
Old as creation, drinking in a pure
Organic pleasure from the silver wreaths
Of curling mist, or from the level plain
Of waters coloured by impending clouds.[1]

V

The effect of Rousseau's work, whether for stimulus and guidance or for provoking opposition, was extraordinarily widespread. People talked about it; thought about it; wrote about it; and wrote books suggested by it, for the benefit of parents or of children. Rousseau himself had said that he hated books, and he would give children as few of them as possible; but the flood of improving stories was not to be held back. Arnaud Berquin wrote *L'Ami des Enfans*,[2] with its little gentlefolk not indeed running wild in the woods but still living virtuous lives in the country, and despising gold watches and learning gardening and plain sewing, and being kind to the poor and respecting honest labour. We must be glad that their counterparts enjoyed these delightful tales in the short time of tranquillity that their lives were to know. In England, with more time to spare, the heavier-handed Thomas Day wrote *Sandford and Merton*. Richard Edgeworth and his daughter wrote both for children and for parents; the father correcting Rousseau with sound English

[1] Wordsworth: '*The Prelude.*'

[2] Crowned by the Académie Française in 1773 as the most useful work of the year.

common sense ; on the question, for instance, of his desire that Emile should 'form no habits except the habit of forming none.' 'Emilius would have been a strange being,' Edgeworth points out, 'had he literally accomplished his preceptor's wish. To go upstairs would have been a most operose, and to go downstairs a most tremendous affair.' Common sense is perhaps made unnecessarily explicit in the same writer's *Poetry Explained for the Use of Young People.* 'In poetry, words are not used literally; that is to say, they are not to be understood exactly in the usual manner: for example, when we say the "golden sun" we do not mean to say that the sun is made of gold.' '"*Does to the moon complain*"—it is here meant, that the complaining notes of the owl seem to be addressed to the moon, as there is no other striking *general* object, to which the owl might be supposed to address herself. Probably the notes of the owl are uttered to call her companions.' In spite of many good and useful suggestions in *Practical Education*, it is not to Mr. Edgeworth that we can look for the correction of anything prosaic in Emile's mind.

But poets also were interested. To Cowper, writing *Tirocinium* in 1784, Rousseau is chiefly a deliverer of children from the miseries and wastefulness of a public school. He pictures

> A father blest with an ingenuous son,
> Father, and friend, and tutor, all in one.
>
> . . . . .
>
> To lead his son, for prospects of delight,
> To some not steep, though philosophic height,
> Thence to exhibit to his wondering eyes
> Yon circling worlds, their distance, and their size;
>
> . . . . .
>
> To show him in an insect or a flower
> Such microscopic proof of skill and power,
> As, hid from ages past, God now displays,
> To combat atheists with in modern days;

To spread the earth before him, and commend
With designations of the finger's end,
Its various parts to his attentive note,
Thus bringing home to him the most remote;
To teach his heart to glow with generous flame,
Caught from the deeds of men of ancient fame;
And, more than all, with commendation due,
To set some living worthy in his view,
Whose fair example may at once inspire
A wish to copy what he must admire.

Such knowledge, gained betimes, and which appears,
Though solid, not too weighty for his years.

. . . . .

Would make him—what some lovely boys have been,
And more than one perhaps that I have seen—
An evidence and reprehension both
Of the mere schoolboy's lean and tardy growth.

Coleridge, on the other hand, writing thirty years later (1815-16), is in arms against all schemes of the Edgeworthians—

modes of teaching, in comparison with which we have been called on to despise our great public schools, and universities.

in whose halls are hung
Armoury of the invincible knights of old—

modes, by which children are to be metamorphosed into prodigies. And prodigies with a vengeance have I known thus produced—prodigies of self-conceit, shallowness, arrogance, and infidelity. . . . These nurslings of improved pedagogy are taught to dispute and decide; to suspect all but their own and their lecturer's wisdom; and to hold nothing sacred from their contempt, but their own contemptible arrogance.[1]

VI

But by far the most interesting criticism, or development, of Rousseau's teaching may be found in Wordsworth's writings between 1799 and 1805, chiefly in *The Prelude*. For Wordsworth's childhood had much in it which conformed, not with Rousseau's extravagances or pedantries, but with his best mind. Rousseau would send children to the open fields and

[1] *Biographia Literaria*, ch. 1.

outdoor freedom. Wordsworth remembers how often, at five years old, he

> Made one long bathing of a summer's day;
> Basked in the sun, and plunged and basked again
> Alternate, all a summer's day, or scoured
> The sandy fields, leaping through flowery groves
> Of yellow ragwort; or when rock and hill,
> The woods, and distant Skiddaw's lofty height,
> Were bronzed with deepest radiance, stood alone
> Beneath the sky, as if I had been born
> On Indian plains, and from my mother's hut
> Had run abroad in wantonness, to sport
> A naked savage, in the thunder shower.

His mother, too early lost, might have her portrait hung beside that of Julie.

> This was her creed, and therefore she was pure
> From anxious fear of error or mishap,
> And evil, overweeningly so called;
> Was not puffed up by false unnatural hopes,
> Nor selfish with unnecessary cares,
> Nor with impatience from the season asked
> More than its timely produce; rather loved
> The hours for what they are, than from regard
> Glanced on their promises in restless pride.
> Such was she—not from faculties more strong
> Than others have, but from the times, perhaps,
> And spot in which she lived, and through a grace
> Of modest meekness, simple-mindedness,
> A heart that found benignity and hope,
> Being itself benign.

And though Emile's Sophie is not very like the 'Young Lady who had been Reproached for Taking Long Walks in the Country,' Rousseau would surely have recognized the fitness of this different type to be companion for his ideal man.

> Dear Child of Nature, let them rail!
> —There is a nest in a green dale,
> A harbour and a hold;
> Where thou, a Wife and Friend, shalt see
> Thy own heart-stirring days, and be
> A light to young and old.

There, healthy as a shepherd boy,
And treading among flowers of joy
Which at no season fade,
Thou, while thy babes around thee cling,
Shalt show us how divine a thing
A Woman may be made.

Apart from certain pedantries and limitations in the description of Emile at twelve years old, Wordsworth could have accepted it; and Rousseau might equally have accepted Wordsworth's memory-picture of his school-fellows in the little country grammar-school, though its colours are more subtle than those that Roussea uses.

A race of real children; not too wise,
Too learned, or too good; but wanton, fresh,
And bandied up and down by love and hate;
Not unresentful where self-justified;
Fierce, moody, patient, venturous, modest, shy,
Mad at their sports like withered leaves in winds;
Though doing wrong and suffering, and full oft
Bending beneath our life's mysterious weight
Of pain, and doubt, and fear, yet yielding not
In happiness to the happiest upon earth.

But the English boy was no solitary Emile. Parents indeed he knew too little, but he had playmates, and brothers, and a younger sister who interfered terribly with Rousseau's time-table of orderly development; who gave him not only the 'eyes' and 'cars' to which he was entitled but

humble cares, and delicate fears;
A heart, the fountain of sweet tears;
And love, and thought, and joy.

Wordsworth defies the time-table, and all the proper sequence of experiences which Emile is allowed.

Who shall parcel out
His intellect by geometric rules,
Split like a province into round and square?

> Fair seed-time had my soul, and I grew up
> Fostered alike by beauty and by fear.
>
> Dust as we are, the immortal spirit grows
> Like harmony in music. . . .

Nothing could be truer than the *incidentalness* with which, in Wordsworth's descriptions, the more subtle experiences come to children. They are not introduced to these effects by lectures from a tutor; nor is he describing quiet guarded little students, but boys who 'ran a boisterous course':

> From week to week, from month to month we lived
> A round of tumult, . . .
> . . . 'mid that giddy bliss
> Which, like a tempest, works along the blood
> And is forgotten; even then I felt
> Gleams like the flashing of a shield—the earth
> And common face of Nature spake to me
> Rememberable things.
>
> Oh, ye rocks and streams,
> And that still spirit shed from evening air!
> Even in this joyous time I sometimes felt
> Your presence, when with slackened step we breathed
> Along the sides of the steep hills, or when
> Lighted by gleams of moonlight from the sea
> We beat with thundering hoofs the level sand.
>
> When I have hung
> Above the raven's nest, by knots of grass
> And half-inch fissures in the slippery rock
> But ill-sustained, and almost (so it seemed)
> Suspended by the blast that blew amain,
> Shouldering the naked crag, or, at that time
> While on the perilous ridge I hung alone,
> With what strange utterance did the loud dry wind
> Blow through my ear! the sky seemed not a sky
> Of earth—and with what motion moved the clouds!

With such experiences behind him, Wordsworth (who knew and possessed *Emile* as well as knowing Rousseau's successors) turns to consider the plan of the guarding tutor. The poet

of a generation earlier, Cowper, had looked on such oversight as the help and salvation of boyhood:

> So numerous are the follies that annoy
> The mind and heart of every sprightly boy
> Imaginations noxious and perverse,
> Which admonition can alone disperse.
> Th' encroaching nuisance asks a faithful hand,
> Patient, affectionate, of high command. . . .
> . . . . .
> E'en in his pastimes he requires a friend,
> To warn and teach him safely to unbend;
> O'er all his pleasures gently to preside,
> Watch his emotions, and control their tide;
> And levying thus, and with an easy sway,
> A tax of profit from his very play,
> To impress a value, not to be erased,
> On moments squandered else, and running all to waste.[1]

This is Wordsworth's comment on such guardians:

> These mighty workmen of our later age,
> Who, with a broad highway, have overbridged
> The froward chaos of futurity,
> Tamed to their bidding; they who have the skill
> To manage books, and things, and make them act
> On infant minds as surely as the sun
> Deals with a flower; the keepers of our time,
> The guides and wardens of our faculties,
> Sages who in their prescience would control
> All accidents, and to the very road
> Which they have fashioned would confine us down,
> Like engines; when will their presumption learn,
> That in the unreasoning progress of the world
> A wiser spirit is at work for us,
> A better eye than theirs, most prodigal,
> Of blessings, and most studious of our good,
> Even in what seem our most unfruitful hours?

And the most striking point is the nature of the illustration which immediately follows. He describes a boy breaking up the peace of a twilight valley by hooting at the owls until

[1] Cowper: *Tirocinium.*

they answer him with 'long halloos and screams,' and continuing till he can get no more noise out of them.

> Then sometimes, in that silence while he hung
> Listening, a gentle shock of mild surprise
> Has carried far into his heart the voice
> Of mountain torrents; or the visible scene
> Would enter unawares into his mind,
> With all its solemn imagery, its rocks,
> Its woods, and that uncertain heaven, received
> Into the bosom of the steady lake.

'I can never repeat too often,' wrote Rousseau, 'that true education must be negative. Prevent the growth of vices and you will have done enough for virtue.' Wordsworth's is a different version of negativity, but Rousseau in some moods would surely have understood it.

Wordsworth's chief criticisms indeed are not directed against Rousseau himself but against his more earnest and methodical disciples, the trainers of the 'prodigies' against whom Coleridge rails. Some of the comments of both are perhaps a little unfair—the complaint seems sometimes to be merely that these children behave too well and are too much interested in their lessons:

> he must live
> Knowing that he grows wiser every day
> Or else not live at all.[1]

But no doubt it is true that some enthusiastic educators were keeping children over-focussed, over-conscious, unchildlike in a way directly contrary to the real spirit of Rousseau.

> Meanwhile old grandame earth is grieved to find
> The playthings, which her love designed for him,
> Unthought of: in their woodland beds the flowers
> Weep, and the river sides are all forlorn.
> Oh! give us once again the wishing cap

[1] *The Prelude.*

> Of Fortunatus, and the invisible coat
> Of Jack the Giant-killer, Robin Hood,
> And Sabra in the forest with St. George!
> The child, whose love is here, at least doth reap
> One precious gain, that he forgets himself.[1]

'Mrs. Barbauld's stuff,' wrote Charles Lamb to Coleridge in 1802, 'has banished all the old classics of the nursery. . . . Think what you would have been now, if, instead of being fed with tales and old wives' fables in childhood, you had been crammed with geography and natural history.' But here indeed there is a real clash with Rousseau himself. Emile is allowed *Robinson Crusoe*—good fare if a little meagre—but the allowance is justified by the ground that 'the most sure means of rising superior to prejudice and of basing his judgments on the actual relations of things, is to assume the character of such an isolated being, and to judge of everything, as a man in such circumstances would, by its real utility.' Beyond this, Rousseau quite definitely holds that a child's imagination should be kept dormant. Only thus can the growth of vice be prevented; only thus can he be guarded from desire and fear. 'If Emile falls into unexpected situations, he will be less perplexed than other boys; and if there be danger, less frightened. As his imagination remains still inactive and nothing has been done to arouse it, he only sees facts; he estimates danger at its true value; and always remains cool.' Wordsworth can counter this, curiously enough, with the exactly opposite safeguard. When a drowned man rose bolt upright in Esthwaite Lake, 'a spectre shape of terror,'

> No soul-debasing fear,
> Young as I was, a child not nine years old,
> Possessed me, for my inner eye had seen
> Such sights before, among the shining streams
> Of faery land, the forest of romance.

[1] *The Prelude.*

Rousseau looked into his own life and judged, wrongly indeed but sincerely, how other boys must be guarded from growing to be men like himself. 'Tedium drove me at an early age to books,' he writes in a letter.[1] 'At six I happened to light on Plutarch; at eight I knew him by heart; I had read all the romances; they had drawn from me floods of tears before the age when the heart has awakened to an interest in romance. From this source sprang my taste for the heroic and romantic, which has never ceased growing to the present time, and has ended by blunting my taste for everything which does not resemble my day-dreams.'

> With what, and how great might ye are in league,
> Who make our wish, our power, our thought a deed,
> An empire, a possession—ye whom time
> And seasons serve; all Faculties to whom
> Earth crouches, the elements are potter's clay,
> Space like a heaven filled up with northern lights,
> Here, nowhere, there, and everywhere at once.[2]

It is because Rousseau knew this as keenly as Wordsworth that he would shut out these mighty powers from their share in forming Emile's childhood. But it is Wordsworth's bolder faith that has survived.

[1] To M. de Malesherbes, 1762.
[2] *The Prelude.*

CHAPTER XI

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY IN ENGLAND

I

In spite of poets' complaints, the Edgeworths and their like were real and important reformers of home education. Public interest was caught; parents became more commonly inclined to make a hobby of the early training of their children, and had access to more detailed advice and better apparatus than they had had before With wiser upbringing at home, a boy when he went to school was a more sensible, thoughtful, and self-controlled little person, and the schools had a better chance.

The change was part of a general movement towards a more serious and careful life. The forces working through the eighteenth century brought revolution in France and a subsequent violent reaction in England, yet in both countries, and over most of Europe, the new spirit had much in common with Plato's sense that the 'uncriticized' life—haphazard life without a philosophy or principle—was not worthy of human beings. On all hands a philosophy was shaping itself, though its various forms might stand in keenest opposition. It was no longer something to be tossed about in witty disputation, but something to be deeply felt and carried into action. The Wesleyan movement gained ground in one part of the British nation; the English Church revived with a new spirit in other parts of it. 'It was a wonder to the lower orders,' says the *Annual Register* for 1798, 'to

see the avenues to the Churches filled with carriages. This novel appearance prompted the simple country people to inquire what was the matter.' Idealism came back into part of our politics. 'The hold of Wilberforce and the anti-slavery movement on the solid middle class in town and country was a thing entirely beautiful. . . . For a whole generation, the anti-slavery champion was returned at every election for the great popular constituency of Yorkshire. . . . When on Sunday (at election time) the vast floor of York Minster was packed with the freeholders of the three ridings, 'I was exactly reminded,' writes Wilberforce, 'of the great Jewish Passover in the Temple, in the reign of Josiah.'[1] One part of life, the political and economic order of our own country, certainly remained uncriticized enough, after the shock of the object-lesson in France. Wilberforce helped to pass the Combination Laws which made trade unions illegal. The churches preached to the poor, in the words of Arthur Young, 'the doctrine of that truly excellent religion which exhorts to content and submission to the higher powers'; and Hannah More, bringing education to the Mendip miners, desired them to 'observe the benefits flowing from the distinction of rank and fortune, which has enabled the rich so liberally to assist the low.'[2] Yet in spite of this, national life as a whole was tinged with a new thoughtfulness.

II

The new spirit showed itself within the Universities, which had stood in great need of it. From the Civil War onward for a hundred years they had scarcely had a chance. The disturbances of the seventeenth century laid a heavy handicap on the eighteenth, and left many political distractions still dragging on. A progressive decay from sheer lack of inspira-

[1] G. M. Trevelyan: *History of the Nineteenth Century in England*, pp. 52–25.
[2] *Final Report of Adult Education Committee*, 1919, pp. 11–12.

tion went on in the schools from which the Universities were fed, and in the mid-eighteenth century Oxford and Cambridge counted scarcely more than half of the students they had had in the early seventeenth. 'Instead of being the national centres of learning and instruction, they were little more than comfortable monastic establishments for clerical sinecurists with a tinge of letters; while young men of family, between Eton and the Grand Tour, and a number of more ordinary individuals designed for the Church, spent their time there very pleasantly, some with a great deal of drinking and cheerful noise, and some with a little reading of books.' [1] 'Early in the reign of George III a foreign visitor witnessed with amazement the Oxford examination as it was then conducted: The Presiding Examiner, the Candidate for a degree and the three Opponents came into the Schools and amid profound silence passed the statutory time in the study of a novel or other entertaining work.' [2] Yet gradually the sounder life was returning. In Oxford towards the end of the eighteenth century, while the University as such was still torpid, Mr. Godley holds that college life had already greatly changed; that a wide gulf separated the resident Fellows of 1780 from those of 1720. Cambridge, the University of Newton, in the later eighteenth century was getting some work done in mathematics, and inventing the method of written examination (instead of the old disputation) to test it. In 1800 a minority of zealous tutors brought this kind of examination into Oxford, and a minority of students began to work for it. University progress, though slow, has been almost unbroken from this time up to our own day.

From the Universities new life passed into the public schools. The earliest reform to take effect was an improvement in that teaching of the classics which still formed almost

[1] A. D. Godley: *Oxford in the Eighteenth Century.*
[2] G. M. Trevelyan, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

the whole of the school work. Butler of Shrewsbury (1793-1836) was at once an excellent scholar and an admirable teacher. He introduced periodical examinations, promoted boys by attainment rather than by age, and diminished the customary grind of learning the Latin grammar by heart in Latin. Under the influence of his successors and disciples in different schools, better textbooks began to appear. Arnold of Rugby (1827-1842) began to teach the classics in a new spirit; for nineteenth-century Liberals had found another object-lesson besides the terrifying one of France; they could turn to the democratic communities of ancient Greece and Rome. In Arnold's words, 'Aristotle and Plato, and Thucydides, and Cicero, and Tacitus . . . are virtually our own countrymen and contemporaries. . . . Their conclusions are such as bear upon our own circumstances, while their information has all the charm of novelty, and all the value of a mass of new and pertinent facts, illustrative of the great science of the nature of civilized man.' The classics were thus for him a means to something much wider than Latin and Greek. 'Surely the one thing needful for a Christian and an Englishman to study is Christian and moral and political philosophy.' If Greek poetry thrilled him, it was not only by its beauty of language but by its depth of idea, and his love for history, poetry, and philosophy was communicated to many pupils. Classical teaching of this kind is something very different from that described in Cowper's appeal to fathers in 1784:

> And is he well content his son should find
> No nourishment to feed his growing mind,
> But conjugated verbs, and nouns declined?
> For such is all the mental food purveyed
> By public hackneys in the schooling trade;
> Who feed a pupil's intellect with store
> Of syntax, truly, but with little more.[1]

[1] *Tirocinium.*

III

The *Tirocinium* provides other descriptions by which we may estimate not only the intellectual widening since Cowper's days, but the general humanizing of school life without which the intellectual change could never have taken place:

> Would you your son should be a sot or dunce,
> Lascivious, headstrong, or all these at once;
> . . . . .
> Train him in public with a mob of boys,
> Childish in mischief only and in noise,
> Else of a mannish growth, and five in ten
> In infidelity and lewdness men.
> . . . . .
> The rude will scuffle through with ease enough,
> Great schools suit best the sturdy and the rough.
> . . . . .
> Why hire a lodging in a house unknown
> For one whose tenderest thoughts all hover round your own?
> . . . . .
> The indented stick, that loses day by day
> Notch after notch, till all are smoothed away,
> Bears witness, long ere his dismission come,
> With what intense desire he wants his home.

We cannot, of course, judge implicitly by any single account, and Cowper's lines might be paralleled in descriptions of some much more modern schools. But the evidence is overwhelming that a gulf lies between 1784 and (say) sixty years later. Eighty years earlier, in the days when Locke thought very ill of public schools, most of the boys still lived at home or in lodgings; the boarding system arose with the coming of the stage coach, improved roads, and general easing of travel. It was probably intended for improving discipline, but in fact it made matters worse, and the early nineteenth century found that great personalities were needed to break very strong bad customs. It seems clear that one of the greatest and most opportune, for school life in general as

well as for classical teaching, was Arnold of Rugby. Arnold did not invent prefects, but he used a way wholly new in public schools of treating them as the head master's allies and friends, and he communicated to them his own fervent spirit of reform. The changed Universities were able to help on the work by sending into the schools a new type of assistant master, intelligent, friendly, and keen. The new plans had been tried first in the best private schools, but Arnold was able to set them in sight of the whole nation.

The very necessary improvement of material conditions, with the correspondingly civilizing effect upon the mind, came by slow degrees. The heroic name here is perhaps that of Thring, head master of Uppingham from 1853, who spent himself to get civilized surroundings, and to spare flesh and blood any burden which bricks and mortar might bear instead. 'Never rest,' he urged, 'till you have got all the fixed machinery for the work the best possible. The waste in a teacher's workshop is the lives of men.'

IV

The widening of the curriculum was another change which came very slowly, by experiments tried in private schools long before they passed into the public schools. Mathematics, French, modern history and geography were admitted little by little, in very small quantities at first; and except perhaps for mathematics, where the pioneer work had been done at Cambridge, they were for a long time badly taught. The better methods had not yet been worked out, and the natural resort was found in rote memory. The same bar of inexperience and conservatism, with the additional obstacle of a theological conflict, long held fast against the introduction of natural science. Science entered the new universities before the old, and the humbler schools before those which were famous; and its introduction was helped by certain incidents

of our history. Queen Victoria married a very able and well-educated young German to whom England appeared a very slack and ill-educated country. In the face of great opposition he organized in 1851 an International Exhibition of artistic and industrial products, which proved a great success. This was followed immediately by the establishment of a government department for Science and Art, and this department for fifty years conducted examinations to stimulate scientific teaching. The examining and the teaching were as bad at first as may be imagined, but gradually the new subjects, with the help first of the new universities and then of the old, worked out their methods and won their way.

The nineteenth century was over, however, and the work of the Department was done, before Art began to win a place at all comparable with that of Science. The chief change in the last twenty-five years has been our growing recognition of the place of æsthetic and manual work in a liberal education. To learn to make and to love beautiful things—to learn to understand and to make useful things—to learn intelligently and not merely by rote how to work with things that are seen and touched and heard, not only with those that are written in books—with all this we and our children are progressing. The movement began, of course, far more than twenty-five years ago, even if we leave out of account the familiarity of the idea among the Greeks and its revival in the earlier Renaissance. Ruskin and William Morris stand amongst its nineteenth-century heroes, and political and social ideals helped it as well as those of the artists and the leaders of industry. But the present century has seen its working-out on the larger scale.

V

So gradually we pass from the almost unbroken classics of 1800 to such a curriculum as that of Oundle in 1920, where

Sanderson had reached the idea that every boy ought to be treated as an individual and have a curriculum designed for himself; where history had its library for research, and biology its magnificent provision of laboratories, gardens, and farms; where modern languages had far outrun the original French; where the school not only had engineering shops but applied the co-operative workshop method in as many subjects as possible; where music and art were honoured and practised; and where the head master's ideal was to fill the school with everything that could interest and inspire, so that no germ of life in any boy might perish. Or, turning to a newly-founded public school,[1] we hear of guilds of gardeners, woodworkers, and toymakers; of a printers' guild which produces the school newspaper; of a society of boys and masters for the study of local history, which has published a survey of the history, geology, and natural history of the neighbourhood. In such accounts, we notice not only the wide range of subjects, but the abandonment of all idea that all pupils must learn the same. With adolescence at any rate an increasing opportunity is given for each to follow his special interests and gifts. We notice, further, in many schools the ingenuity of organization which, under such names as Dalton Plan or Howard Plan or under no name at all, tries to make it possible for each pupil to arrange his work as best suits him, to proceed at the pace which best suits his ability, and to take an increasing responsibility for his own progress. The pioneers in such methods were not the schools for adolescents but rather the teachers of small children, among whose recent names Dr. Montessori's stands out as that of a kind of patron saint, even for those who would modify the details of her rulings.

Lastly, in the classroom and outside it, we observe the

[1] Bembridge School, see, e.g., the *Report of the Tenth Annual Conference of Educational Associations*, 1922, pp. 139–156.

increased distinctness of two ideas which have never been absent in the best schools but which now are unusually widely spread and deliberately worked at. One is the desire that the school should form as really as possible a part of the larger world—both in the communion of thought, leading its pupils to share as far as possible, even in their school days, the larger interests of their time; and also in action, helping them to share in the activities of their neighbourhood and thus to enlarge their own sympathy. The other is the hope of making the school itself a better-organized world, by taking some step even beyond that prefect system with which, and for which, the nineteenth century did so much. Such distribution of responsibility and freedom as we see among the guild-workers mentioned above, or in the novel and inspired work of the Boy Scouts or the Woodcraft Chivalry, or in the gradual introduction of a better kind of government and discipline in the elementary schools, or in such bold and striking experiments in self-government amongst reformatory boys and girls as have been seen in the George Junior Republic in America and in the Little Commonwealth in England—if we can make good the best part of these attempts, our generation will not have failed to print something worth keeping on the history of education.

VI

Certain improvements and experiments are tried most easily in new conditions and among new buildings. It is only fair to end this brief summary on a note in which the old has the greater advantage—a passage complementary to Cowper's, by a man remembering forty years later his schooldays of 1879-1883:

'It is impossible for any writer who is not inspired, and difficult even for him, to convey by words to those who do not know it the inner spirit of Winchester as Lionel and I

felt it. A love for every stone, a reverence for its tradition, a feeling of building into oneself as a κτῆμα ἐς ἀεί Meads, School, Hills, and the whole school life—these are all rather the externals and trappings. The inner feeling is a passionate devotion of service as of Dante for Beatrice, as of Sir Galahad for the Holy Grail, as of an Englishman for his fair England, with a sense of peace, of security beyond expression, of a spiritual home and membership of a great family stretching back five centuries.' [1]

If we could gain for all our scholars a life thus rooted and grounded in love, and could then widen that devotion and strengthen the thought behind it till in after life it matched the needs of the larger community and the more complex service, we should not be far from Plato's ideal of what education should do. But Plato—and Sanderson—knew the distance that lies between the first step and the last. 'Patriotism is not enough.'

[1] Earl Russell: *My Life and Adventures.*

PART II

EDUCATION FOR ALL

CHAPTER XII

THE EXTENT OF EDUCATION, TO A.D. 1700

I

HITHERTO we have dwelt chiefly on the content of education as it was given in each period at its best; as those boys received it whose parents could choose freely for them, or whose gifts attracted such notice that they gained the best opportunities. We have now to ask, though it is often very difficult to answer, what proportion of the whole people found such opportunities open to them. Half the population at any rate—the girls and women—were apt to be excluded as a matter of course from the chief intellectual pursuits and the chief physical training of their generation. But for the present we will put that very important point on one side, and ask only how far education was given to the poor as well as the rich, and to the common man as well as to the priest or the leader.

The more primitive and scanty the training, the less in one respect we shall need to ask the question, for what is only just sufficient for anyone must necessarily be imparted to all. In periods when the content was increasing suddenly and rapidly, as in Greece in the time of the Sophists, or in Rome when she was learning from Greece, one of the com-

plaints against the new learning was that it made a gulf between rich and poor. This happens not only because the poor cannot give time enough to learning, but because the new subjects pass beyond the parental or amateur teaching, and involve professional teachers who must have fees. On the other hand, there is also an influence working more slowly in the opposite direction, for an increase of wealth anywhere will *tend* eventually to raise the standard of life for all. When a chief's son has been well trained for war he may come to desire, and procure, better military training for the boys who grow up to fight beside him. When written communication and record become common, it is convenient that even the poor man should be able to read and write. The 'just sufficient' moves upward on the scale. This is the broad process, disguised and overlaid by many accidents, such for instance as the relation of a governing class to serfs and slaves. Spartan education was gratuitous, but the Helots could not share it. Imperial Rome, on the other hand, found profit in educating some of her slaves elaborately and hiring them out as professional teachers.

Traditional education in Greece generally, as it comes into the light, must have been a resultant of the traditions of all the various elements in the community; for both races and classes had mingled by the time the fifth century begins. Economic revolutions in the two preceding centuries brought new families to the top—one ruler of a city probably began as leader of the miners in the hills, another as a manufacturer of wraps and drinking vessels, another 'until he reached maturity continued to receive the nurture and education natural for the son of a butcher.' 'In the good old days,' laments a sixth-century descendant of Homeric nobles, such persons 'knew nought of rights or laws, but wore goatskins on their backs and herded outside the city like cattle. But now they are gentlemen, while they that before were of

high estate are now brought low. Who could endure the sight of this?'[1] But a century later it was too late for such laments, and the sons of noble, burgher, and artisan, provided they were free-born citizens, could follow much the same education so long as they could afford to do so. Even slaves, in a kindly State, might often learn a good deal.

The Greek cities on the whole provide us with an exceptionally good example of an educated community.[2] In Athens the law commanded that boys should learn to read. A modern is disposed to wonder how far, with no attendance officers and no school registers, this could be really enforced; but custom seems to have supported the law to a surprising extent. 'So much did the Hellens regard education as a necessity for their boys, that when the Athenians were driven from their homes by Xerxes, and their women and children crossed over to Troizen, the hospitable Troizenians provided their guests with schoolmasters, so that not even in such a crisis might the boys be forced to take a holiday. And when Mitulene wished to punish her revolted allies in the most severe way possible she prevented them from teaching their children letters and music.'[3] Physical training was universally needed because all citizens might be called to serve in the Army or Navy; and the great public gymnasium was open to the poorest Athenian. The only expenses were those incurred in buying an oil flask and scraper. The rich might pay a trainer for special coaching, but the poor could learn most things by looking on. Further, the whole city was interested in the youth of that city, from the time that the great festivals and competitions began. Rich citizens were made chargeable for the expenses of the lads of their tribe who were training for the torch race; and free instruc-

[1] Theognis, quoted by Ure: *The Greek Renaissance*, p. 122.
[2] Always provided that (outside Sparta) we ignore the women.
[3] Freeman: *Schools of Hellas*, p. 61.

tion in chorus-dancing and singing was provided for a great number of boys since the choregos appointed for the year had to produce a chorus belonging to his tribe, paying all the expenses of teaching and training them.

All this was largely an education that could be carried on out of doors and by word of mouth. When the increase of knowledge and interest ran out into collections of books and the organization of research, it met for the time (and for a long time) a strong check to its spread. Primarily the check lay in the absence of printing, or rather in the undeveloped state of printing (since stamps and seals, which are a form of print, have been used as far back as history goes). The greater reason behind it was probably the scarcity and the defects of the material, whether papyrus or parchment, upon which the printing or the writing must be done. The spread of books, and the extension of thought which depended on this, had to wait many centuries for the bringing of paper from the East.

So in 300 B.C. at Alexandria, however fine the work done in the Library or the Museum, there was no chance of making it known to the main body of the Western world. A certain number of students might be drawn to spend years at Alexandria or Athens, hearing lectures and reading manuscripts, and buying the indispensable notebooks at the city bookstalls; but if too many had come, or if other cities had tried to rival these cities, the papyrus would have run short. The obstacle was not overcome till after many other causes had limited education, and learning had almost disappeared for a time from the Western world, and then slowly returned again.

II

Education in Rome, after its expansion from the old home training which was much the same for all, was not only

poorer in quality than the Greek, but of much less value to the bulk of the nation. The political and economic situation had changed. Rhetorical education, says Wilkins, 'was intended either as a training for political life or as an amusement for leisure hours, and from neither point of view was it of any service to the great masses of the population.' This was true, in the days of Rome, though both points of view would have interested the cobbler or the maker of pots at Athens. Physical training and entertainments were different from the Greek—Rome wanted the specialized fighter, not the athlete, and the public festival was not an inter-city competition in games, but a gladiatorial show. For religious ceremonies, where the Greek had dances and dramas with all the youth of the neighbourhood pressed into service, the Roman had the thing done properly by professional priests, and the people's part was to keep silence. The same might be said of political and civic life, where indeed affairs had become too complicated, their administration too centralized, and their scale too large, for uneducated men to understand them. So such men dropped out, and their knowledge and training became less still. 'National education did exist in a sense in some of the Greek states, if we do not include the slaves in the nation. There was never anything approaching it at Rome.' [1]

The nation which had the nearest approach to it at that period was probably the Jewish. In A.D. 64 an edict of the High Priest required one or more elementary schools to be established in every community, and elementary education for boys seems to have been almost universal still earlier. Whilst the Roman religion was growing more and more professional, the Jewish was becoming less so—any competent male worshipper might take honourable part in the synagogue services and teaching, and the motive to qualify

[1] Wilkins: *Roman Education*, p. 37.

was strong. The education was not only religious but intellectual and civic, in its own way. A Roman procurator, says Josephus, must have a regular lawyer to guide him, but 'if any one should question one of us concerning the laws, he would more easily repeat all than his own name.'[1]

This Jewish education survived, and something of it has remained to our own day. Outside Jewry, it was Christianity which spread over the Western world such education as was still possible. Missionaries scattered, and taught, and trained up others to scatter and teach in their turn; not teaching a great deal, perhaps, but still spreading some sort of history, some sort of philosophy, something intelligent in the attitude to life. The difficulties were enormous. The threshold of book-knowledge was Latin, not the mother-tongues of northern Europe; and the making of books was harder than ever when the Arab conquest of Egypt had cut off Europe from the papyrus supply. Yet that general instruction of the masses of the people in some common ideal, a task which the Roman Empire did not attempt, was somehow and to some extent achieved. By the eleventh century, in spite of immense ignorance still, men knew themselves as members of Christendom.

III

The flowering of the Middle Ages in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries meant better chances for the scholarly mind in all classes, and a richer content in the best education, rather than an increase in the number reached by the educational elements. But presently one great barrier broke down. Good paper was made in Italy in the later thirteenth century, in Germany in the fourteenth. By the end of the fourteenth century it was abundant enough and cheap enough to make

[1] Josephus c. Apion ii. 19. Quoted by W. Fairweather: *The Background of the Gospels*, pp. 25–26.

printing possible. Books were multiplied, and were made far easier to read, and the reading public grew. It became worth while to print books in other languages than Latin, and thus a second barrier fell, as the local dialects were developed into standard Italian or English or French or Spanish, and the language familiar from infancy became one to be written and read.

At the same time the new wealth, material and mental, was raising the general standard. Industrial and commercial society in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries began to need a larger number of persons who could read and write their mother-tongue and be generally serviceable, and schools for producing them came into existence side by side with the older Latin schools. At Florence in 1338, with a population of about 90,000, eight to ten thousand boys and girls were said to be learning to read. At Lubeck in 1418 the Town Council employed schoolmasters 'to instruct children in writing and reading, and to teach them good manners, that they may receive reward from God therefor, and the city of Lubeck honour and worship from the world.' In 1422 private schools in Hamburg were being set up 'daily.' In England, priests endowed to say masses for the dead were directed to teach children in their free hours.[1] It was a business-like age, and no doubt, then as now, motives were mixed, and the desire to do people good was partly a desire to make them more useful and less annoying. Bishop Reginald Pecock pleads for the publication of 'a short compendious logic for the common people.' 'For then they should thereby be put from much rudeness and boisterousness which they have now in reasoning. . . . And then should they not be so obstinate against clerks and against their

[1] The belief in the value of prayer has benefited education financially in more ways than one. Chaucer's poor clerk could make by his prayers a definite repayment to those who gave him 'wherewith to scolaye.'

prelates, as some of them now be, for default of perceiving when an argument proceedeth into his conclusion and when he not so doeth but seemeth only so to do.' [1]

IV

The revival of the study of classical letters had little bearing on the education of the mass of the people. The Reformation wakened the ideal that as many as possible should be able to read the Bible in their own tongue; but religious changes were often bad in their first effect, since they opened the way to the confiscation of church endowments which had served education. Elizabeth's reign did something to replace these by new gifts. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries liberal ideas were growing. Adherents of the New Philosophy often held that education should not be withheld entirely from any rank of life. Private persons did what they could; and governments or municipalities acted here and there, but there were great obstacles in the political state of Europe. Only in the last twenty years of the seventeenth century were three great philanthropic movements set on foot, independently in France, Germany, and England. The English history from that point onwards will be taken up in the next chapter.

[1] Reginald Pecock: *The Represser of Overmuch Blaming of the Clergy*, c. 1449, Part I, ch. 2.

CHAPTER XIII

ENGLAND, AND THE GREAT SOCIETIES

I

THE first attempt on a great scale to educate the children of the poor in England began at the very end of the seventeenth century. That century had discovered an idea—the idea of the joint stock company—which by our own time was to transform the world of industry, property, and commerce into something hitherto unknown in history. Power, it was found, could be multiplied indefinitely at any one point, if a number of persons put together their small sums of money and handed over the management to a chosen few. Regions of impossibilities were suddenly brought within human range. Might it not be possible, some good people asked, to combat by this means the mass of carelessness, ignorance, and irreligion which they saw in the poor? Many Religious Societies, and Societies for the Reformation of Manners, came into being in England, but all have been overshadowed by the greatest, the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge.

The S.P.C.K. was founded in 1698 by a clergyman, two lawyers, a nobleman, and a country gentleman. Under its general title, its objects in principle were multifarious, including the provision of schools and libraries in England and the Plantations, the stimulation of the clergy to efforts of all kinds, and the 'reduction of the Quakers to the Christian Faith.' The minutes of the early committee meetings are

varied by (e.g.) 'George Keith's Letter read relating to his Success in his Attempts upon the Quakers' (15 June, 1699), and correspondence from Mr. Arthur Bedford of Bristol, remarking on the subtlety of the Quakers there in defeating Mr. Keith's attempts, 'especially by helping new Converts to good Matches.' In another letter Mr. Bedford 'proposes the promoting the Study of the Hebrew Language, the neglect whereof hath given the Jews occasion to undermine Christianity, and to buy up all Books of Oriental Learning that we might be destitute of weapons to use against them. He proposes likewise the suppressing the profane songs and ballads, and dispersing Hymns with Tunes composed to them.' The minutes of other meetings preserve some note of the doings of obscure heroes. On March 8, 1700, 'Mr. Jos. Margetts, of Kempston, shews his Resolution to surmount the difficulties he daily meets with, and remembers the public Services of John Pierson and John Reynolds. The former teaches gratis 15 or 16 poor Children to read, and instructs them in the Church Catechism without Exposition, and twice in the week meets another Company of adult persons (about 8 in number) in the Town, and hears them read, and trains them up in Bp. Williams' Exposition of the Church Catechism. The Latter Instructs Gratis another Company every night at his House, in the Catechism, in Reading and Serious Principles, and endeavours to bring them to an awful sense of God and man.' As becomes pioneers in a scientific age, the committee make note of inventions for forwarding the improvement of the young (21. Sept. 1699. 'That Mr. Symms, the schoolmaster at Cripplegate, has discovered a secret by which he can teach twenty or thirty boys the alphabet in a day's time') or the improvement of their elders:—(22. Feb. 1700-1. Mr. Gordon from on board H.M.S. *Salisbury*. 'As to the Reformation of the Seamen, he Recommends the Gift of a little Tobacco to be joined to give advice and Instruction:

which being done with a due air of Concern, he says will have wonderful effects.')

But the great work of the Society began with the subscription list for parish schools:

The form of Subscription to ye Charity Schools erected or promoted by the Honble. Society, &c:—

WHEREAS it is evident to common observation, That the growth of vice and debauchery is greatly owing to the gross ignorance of the principles of the Christian Religion, especially among the poorer sort. And also whereas Christian vertue can grow from no other root than Christian Principles, we whose names are underwritten, inhabitants of the Parish of in the County of , being touched with zeal for the honour of God, the salvation of the souls of our poor brethren, and the Promoting of Christian Knowledge among the poor of this Parish, do hereby promise to pay yearly during pleasure, by four equal quarterly payments, viz. at Michaelmas, Christmas, Lady-Day, and Midsummer, such respective sums as we have hereunto subscribed for and towards the setting up of a School within this Parish for teaching poor children (whose parents are not able to afford them any education) to read and write, and to repeat and understand the Church Catechism according to the Rules and Orders lately printed and published by the direction of the Honble. Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge.

As witness our hands this day of Anno Domini.

Zealous friends, of whom an extraordinary number were found, supplemented their subscriptions by other help and found money by other means. In some places the clergy taught the children without fee. In others, a man was made parish clerk on condition that he taught a certain number. Elsewhere, collecting boxes, or statues of charity children with suitable texts of Scripture, invited alms at the church door. Now and then the parents made a levy on themselves: in the account for 1717, 'At Winleton in the County of Durham, the workmen of an ironwork, who are about 480 or 500, allow one farthing and an half per shilling, per week, which together with their master's contribution, maintains their poor, and affords about £17 per annum for

teaching their children.' In small villages where it was impossible to collect enough money for a teacher's salary from the beginning, one other plan could be tried. A discreet and sober person living in the parish might be found, who would wait to be paid by results. So soon as a child could name and distinguish all the letters in the alphabet, the teacher would receive 2*s.* 6*d.*; with another 2*s.* 6*d.* when the child could spell well; and 5*s.* more when he could read well and distinctly, and say the Church Catechism. 'By which means Poor Children may be taught to read for Ten Shillings; and the additional Charge for Books will be very inconsiderable.'

Of the schools guided by the S.P.C.K., some gave education only, but many provided a distinctive dress on Christ's Hospital lines; some gave meals, and some residence. By the middle of the eighteenth century some thirty thousand children were being instructed. After this date the history is one of decline, both in extent of influence and in the kind of education given. But many of the schools survive to-day, some as elementary schools within the national system, some as secondary schools (usually for girls), and a few as charitable foundations on the old plan.

II

The next great movement made smaller demands on the time of the 'labouring poor' in an age which was going deeper into the abysses of the Industrial Revolution. A man might be out of work, but his children could always be employed. Any teaching that they needed might most conveniently be given them on Sundays. The organized Sunday School movement was begun in the West of England, by Robert Raikes, editor of a local paper in Gloucester. After some experimenting at his own cost in Gloucester slums, the plan of Sunday Schools in charge of paid teachers, who would

teach children reading and a knowledge of the Bible, was made widely known through his paper and caught the public imagination. 'The Society for the Establishment and Support of Sunday Schools throughout the kingdom,' was founded in 1785, with local committees which were to consist, at the outset, half of Churchmen and half of Nonconformists. (Raikes himself was a Churchman.)

The typical Sunday School, whether its teacher were voluntary or paid, was a charity-school held on Sundays; but some, especially among the Nonconformists, might have a different tone. 'Many of the more self-respecting of the new proletariat,' writes Mr. Trevelyan, 'found in the Baptist or Wesleyan chapel the opportunity for the development of talents and the gratification of instincts that were denied expression elsewhere. The close and enthusiastic study of the Bible educated the imagination . . . and in the chapel life working-men first learnt to speak and to organize, to persuade and to trust their fellows. Much effort that soon afterwards went into political, trade union and Co-operative activities, was then devoted to the chapel community. It was in Little Bethel that many of the working-class leaders were trained. In a world made almost intolerable by avarice and oppression, here was a refuge where men and things were taken up aloft and judged by spiritual and moral standards that forbade either revenge or despair.'[1] So we have, for instance, about 1820 in the Sunday School at Bamford, near Rochdale, a product of the vigorous life of the Independent chapel. The minister's crippled son, spending the week in learning the trade of a shoemaker, spent his Sundays in teaching the Sunday School 'very regularly and with great energy,' and his superfluous time and bodily strength in organizing choral meetings and co-operative gardening, and joining rambling expeditions over the moors with chapel

[1] G. M. Trevelyan: *History of the Nineteenth Century*, p. 160.

colleagues and friends.[1] A school with such roots reminds us more of the 'common school' of a democratic community than of a work of charity from above.

III

But these reformers were attempting national education on a larger scale than had ever been tried before, and every difficulty of organization was therefore met with on a larger scale. The two which stood out were finance on the one hand, and internal management on the other. No nation has enough faithful enthusiasts to staff a national system of schools unpaid, and no nation has enough born teachers to justify the hope that an untrained staff, inadequate in numbers, will keep such a system efficient. Expansion could only make the difficulties greater. The more resourceful the school, the more surely it must fall back on the expedient, centuries old, of setting children to teach one another; and the next heroes of popular education in England are the two men who independently worked up this 'mutual instruction' into a system.

In 1787, Andrew Bell, a young Scotchman in Episcopal orders, and graduate of St. Andrews, went out to India as a lecturer in science. To this profession he added the chaplaincies of British regiments, holding as many as seven such posts at once; till in 1796 he was able to return home, 'the rapidity with which he had accumulated money being almost unparalleled under his circumstances.'[2] He had held one other post which brought in no money, but laid the foundation of the rest of his life's work; he had been Honorary Superintendent of the Military Male Orphan Asylum at Madras.

When Dr. Bell took on this superintendence, he found one master and two ushers employed in teaching less than

[1] F. Smith: *Life of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth*, pp. 3–7.
[2] Southey's *Life of Dr. A. Bell.*

twenty boys. One lesson a day was as much as this staff was able to exact from the pupils: sometimes only one in two or three days. The masters themselves had everything to learn, in the eyes of a Scot; yet 'whenever he had succeeded in qualifying a man for performing his business as an usher in the school, he had qualified him for situations in which a much higher salary might be obtained with far less pains.' Nor were they willing to qualify. Passing a Malabar school, Dr. Bell observed the children writing with their fingers in sand. He gave immediate orders (his habit through life) that the usher of the lowest class in the Orphanage was to teach the alphabet by that means. The usher declared it impossible. Dr. Bell put the alphabet class into the charge of one of the boys, John Frisken, aged about 8, and commanded him to follow his instructions. Frisken carried them out with success, and was appointed permanent teacher of the class. The way now opened out. Other boys were appointed assistant teachers to some of the lower classes, with Frisken as superintendent. A general monitorial system was gradually developed, for conduct as well as instruction, rendering the boys 'inoffensive towards others and towards themselves.' At the age of 11, during a staff interregnum, Frisken was in charge of one-third of the school. In 1797, after his return to Great Britain, Dr. Bell published *An Experiment in Education.*

In 1801, Dr. Bell became rector of Swanage in Dorset. He was now 48 years old, but his energy was in its prime. He introduced straw-plaiting, and vaccination; (in 1806, 'I have now almost finished my fourth annual vaccination for the cow-pock, amounting in all to 658 subjects from 78 years of age to 12 months'); but chiefly he introduced the monitorial system, first into Swanage, and then, as the *Experiment in Education* became more widely known, by invitation into other parts of England.

We ought to count amongst heroes of education some of the boys and girls who were sent out in these early days to help spread the mission. Consider, for instance, three crowded years in the life of Lewis Warren of Swanage. Having acted as assistant in the Swanage Sunday School, he was sent in 1806, at the age of 13, to introduce the system into a school in Whitechapel. Its chairman writes to thank Dr. Bell 'for the confidence he had placed in them in sending so promptly that interesting and intelligent lad.' Whitechapel boys proved harder than those of Dorset for 13 years old to keep in order; and the Whitechapel schoolmaster seems not to have been whole-hearted in giving his support. The famous Mrs. Trimmer visited the school, and wrote to Dr. Bell that she had been pleased with much that she had seen, but there was more noise than she expected. Dr. Bell and a grown-up assistant had to come to London for a month to conquer the schoolmaster and set things in the right way. But henceforth Lewis worked unaided, and we have glimpses of him in the letters of many correspondents of Dr. Bell. 'I must not lose a moment in telling you that Dr. Andrews, who has just left me, wants a Lewis Warren (or, if it could be, one looking more like a master) for the school at St. James.' 'Lewis Warren has now been with me one month, and has conducted himself . . . in a manner creditable to himself, and satisfactory to me. The boys' Sunday School has made so good progress on Dr. Bell's plan as to give me the greatest pleasure, and to enable me to show it to many people as a fair specimen of the excellence of the system.' 'I have great pleasure in stating that the children here . . . seem to be rapidly improving. . . . Our little instructor seems very well calculated for his office; he carries authority with him, and makes boys twice his own size stand in awe of him, but out of school is as much a child as any of them.' 'Since I had the pleasure of addressing you,

Warren has been employed at the day school at Lane-End, and the Sunday schools of Hanley and Stoke. In the two latter nearly four hundred children are instructed, and I am informed by the respective clergymen, that the plan answers extremely well.'

The final act, as recorded in Southey's *Life of Dr. Bell*, was a greater adventure still. Under a scheme of the Bishop of London's, Lewis sailed for the West Indies in the autumn of 1808, to introduce the Madras system for the benefit of the negro slaves. 'I pray God to prosper his voyage and his mission,' writes the Bishop to Dr. Bell. 'If he succeeds, he will . . . make his fortune, and immortalize his name. He will be ranked among the greatest benefactors to mankind, and . . . will be doing as much good in the Atlantic Ocean, as Buonaparte is doing mischief on the Continent of Europe.' But the West Indies held opponents of innovations who were more powerful than the Whitechapel schoolmaster. The planters pronounced the scheme to be 'impracticable —impossible'; 'wanton and cruel'; 'ruinous to the masters and harmful to the slaves.' The attempt came to an end.

IV

Meanwhile in England Dr. Bell was not the only inventor of a System. The *Star* in 1807 contained the following advertisement:

'Joseph Lancaster, of the Free School, Borough Road, London, having invented, under the blessing of Divine providence, a new and mechanical system of education for the use of schools, feels anxious to disseminate the knowledge of its advantages through the kingdom. By this system . . . above one thousand children may be taught and governed by one master only. . . .'

In the same year, Mr. Whitbread in Parliament remarked, referring not to Bell but to Lancaster, 'I cannot help noticing

to the House, that this is a period particularly favourable for the institution of a national system of education, because within a few years there has been discovered a plan for the instruction of youth, which is now brought to a state of great perfection; happily combining rules by which the object of learning must be infallibly attained with expedition and cheapness, and holding out the fairest prospect of eminent utility to mankind.'

'So far back as the year 1798,' reports a witness before Lord Brougham's committee in 1816, 'Joseph Lancaster taught a few poor children in the Borough Road. . . . His parents were in low circumstances, but he seemed to be actuated by a benevolent disposition and to possess great talents for the instruction of youth. He was countenanced and supported by a few benevolent individuals, and as the subscriptions were most limited, he was obliged to devise a most economical plan. Upon Lancaster's plan a single book was found sufficient for a whole school, the different sheets being put upon pasteboard and hung upon the walls of the school. . . . He taught arithmetic from lessons which he had constructed for the purpose, whereby a monitor might correctly teach the principles, even if he were not fully acquainted with them himself. In this case also one book of arithmetic served for the whole school. . . . Our venerable sovereign condescended to give him a personal interview, and was so much impressed with the value of this simple and economical plan and the probable benefits which the country and the world might derive from it, that he became an annual subscriber . . . and recommended the Queen and the other branches of the Royal Family to become subscribers to a considerable amount.' His Majesty's words as reported by another historian were, 'Lancaster, I will subscribe £100 annually,' and, addressing the Queen, 'You shall subscribe £50, Charlotte; and the princesses, £25 each,'

and he added, 'Lancaster, you may have the money directly.' To which the Quaker Lancaster replied, 'Please, thy Majesty, that will be setting thy nobles a good example.'[1]

The differences between Lancaster's system and Bell's were not very great. Bell's was rather simpler and more adaptable, with fewer monitors and larger classes under each. Lancaster, like Bell, had his young missionaries. The *Philanthropist* in 1811[2] relates how 'in Shropshire and Staffordshire in the space of only eight months a boy scarcely 17 has lately organized schools and instructed scholars for above 1,000 children. The affectionate and mild but firm conduct of this amiable lad rendered each school a scene of pleasure and delight, in which his steady application of the system of order proved its utility and excellence. When he took leave of one school, in order to open another at a different place, it was a most delightful sight to behold the whole school of children lamenting his departure, as they would the loss of their nearest friend.'

But the two leaders and their disciples despised one another heartily. One of Bell's teachers in 1808 reports to a friend, on a Lancasterian school he has visited: 'I approve of it no better than of a school conducted on the old plan (allowing the boys on the old plan were in classes). It is mere formality, and I will readily venture to say that cruelty is learned in his schools. . . .' A friend of Bell's writes to him in 1814 conveying the report of another friend: 'He said he had visited the Lancasterian school in the borough, and was disgusted at the pertness and self-sufficiency of the teachers, which he could not help contrasting with the unassuming modesty of those in our school.' Other friends, remembering always that Lancaster was a Dissenter, saw much more than this. 'The further I have looked into Lancaster's

[1] Corston, quoted by Salmon: *Joseph Lancaster*, p. 19.
[2] Quoted by Salmon, p. 8.

work,' writes Mrs. Trimmer to Dr. Bell, 'the worse opinion I have of his views and intentions.' 'I must now tell you, that I have *in a corner* a wise and experienced friend, who has seen, with his own eye, the sad effects of generalizing plans[1] on the Continent. . . . This gentleman sees the matter in the same light as I do—as a *perversion of your excellent plan*, for purposes *deeper than meet the eye*.' And Samuel Coleridge writes to Bell in 1808, 'The more I think, the more do I accord with Daubeny and Mrs. Trimmer (though, Heaven knows, far enough from assenting to all their arguments and notions) that Lancaster's schools are a very dangerous attack on our civil and ecclesiastical establishments, at a time when they want all that support, which, before God the Omniscient, I declare that, in my belief, your system would give, beyond any plan conceivable by me.'

Two new societies were inevitable. The 'Royal Lancasterian Association' was founded in 1810, becoming 'The British and Foreign School Society' four years later. In 1811 a meeting of members of the S.P.C.K. with the Archbishop of Canterbury in the chair, founded 'The National Society for the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church.'

[1] Viz., undenominational teaching.

CHAPTER XIV

'THE EDUCATION OF THE LOWER ORDERS,' 1815–40

I

In the year after Waterloo, some people gave thought to national education as we did at the end of the Great War. A committee was appointed, under the chairmanship of Lord Brougham, to investigate the Education of the Lower Orders in the Metropolis, a reference extended later to the whole kingdom. Some extracts from the questions and answers will provide a brief survey of the position in 1816-1819 and the years immediately preceding.

'What is the general state of the children in St. Giles?' 'In a very dreadful state, I am afraid.' 'Do you apprehend there are many children of very bad character?' 'I do indeed.' 'Do you apprehend there would be any improvement in those children if more pains were taken with their education?' 'I have no doubt of it.' 'Does it fall within your knowledge that a great number of children are gambling and behaving in a very riotous manner in the fields on a Sunday afternoon?' 'I have seen a great many.' (Mr. F. A. Earle, p. 10.)

'In what state are those children generally as to education?' 'Entirely ignorant and destitute of any information whatever.' 'In what state are they with respect to their morals?' 'Most depraved; they are exposed to every species of vice with which the streets abound.' (Mr. T. A. Finnegan, p. 1.)

(P. 36. Mr. Thomas Biggs, secretary of the Lancasterian Association.) 'How did you proceed?' 'From house to house and in many instances from room to room. We found a great number of the children in that place in extreme wretchedness. Wretchedness and filth were in the extreme. A great number (of the women) subsisted by making clothes for the soldiers; many, who after they had been employed a whole day about a coat, get fivepence for it; their husbands were gone for soldiers, and that was the only employ they had to subsist themselves and family upon.' 'Were they closely packed?' 'Exceedingly so; in every room of the house was a different tenant, from the ground floor up to the garret.'

(P. 208. Mr. John Daughtrey, steward of the Spitalfields Benevolent Society.) 'What effect has been produced upon the minds of the poor, by being visited by those benevolent institutions?' 'I think a most salutary effect.' 'Have you any reason to believe that in the present distress which prevails in Spitalfields the poor have submitted to their circumstances in quietness, in consequence of the benevolent aid of those societies?' 'That is, I believe, the opinion of the very best informed persons, manufacturers and others, who have long resided in Spitalfields, and are well acquainted with the temper of that immense mass of poor. These gentlemen, I know, ascribe their present peaceable temper to the moral influence which has been diffused among them by means of the Sunday and other schools, visiting societies, etc., and to the relief which the benevolent public have afforded them under their various distresses.'

'You have stated that the best effects have resulted from the efforts of the Spitalfields Benevolent Society. What is the general condition of the poor in Spitalfields at present?' 'They are still in a most destitute condition.'

(P. 233. The Rev. Joshua King, of Bethnal Green.) 'Is your workhouse crowded with juvenile objects?' 'Yes.'

Do they receive any education in the workhouse?' 'They are taught to read, but their education is very badly attended to.' 'Is there a regular schoolmaster?' 'There is a pauper in the House who is called schoolmaster.' 'Is particular attention paid to the morals of these juvenile objects in the workhouse, by the matron or other person?' 'I have not an opportunity of forming an opinion, for by the time they are capable of perpetrating crimes, they are sent down to the country to be employed in manufactures.'

(P. 282. Rev. Daniel Wilson.) 'Do you conceive that the two things united, reading and religious instruction, ever make the poor discontented in their stations, or less obedient to their superiors?' 'Unquestionably not. The direct tendency of the two, when united, is to produce those principles that lead to submission, contentment, humility, and in fact to all those dispositions and duties to which they are chiefly about to be called in the stations where Providence has placed them. We let nothing form any part of the knowledge we communicate, which tends to foster pride or self-elevation. The very first thing we teach the female children especially is to correct the love of dress, and to lead them to aim at that respect every person acquires who behaves well in their station; and to avoid, on the other hand, the contempt to which they will expose themselves, by aspiring to that which they can never attain, and which only draws upon them the displeasure of others and the anger of God.'

II

One point which stands out in these early surveys is the extreme difficulty of ascertaining how much provision for schooling really exists. The Rector of Bethnal Green reports, for instance (p. 232), 'In our immense population, which consists of nearly 40,000, we have only two schools under the Establishment; in the one there are 70 girls and boys educated,

in the other school there are 50 that are educated and clothed. I believe the Methodists are educating a very considerable number, what number I cannot say; but theirs are principally Sunday Schools.' 'Do you know how many schools the Methodists have?' 'I do not.' 'Does any other religious denomination exert itself in education there?' 'I do not think they do particularly. There is a Lancasterian school in an adjoining parish, in Spitalfields,' 'Do many of your children go to it?' 'I believe many of them, but I do not know what number; it is a penny-a-week school.' 'Do you conceive that, after all, a very large proportion of children are uneducated?' 'Very large indeed.' 'Can you state what proportion?' 'It is impossible.'

Sunday School instruction, at any rate, reports another witness (p. 85), 'is very much wanted in the parish of Bethnal Green; our school is not sufficient to hold half the number of children that would apply. The Lancasterian institution is not half filled, because the children in that parish are employed at a very early age in the silk-manufacturing business, as early as the age of 5 or 6 years.' This witness superintends a Sunday School for 850 to 1,000 children of all religious persuasions, with 60 teachers giving their services free.

It is almost equally difficult for the investigators to discover how much a school, where there is one, can rightly be expected to do. On page 38 we have an old-style witness, master of the Bluecoat School, Westminster, where 52 boys and 34 girls are clothed and educated from 7 to 14. 'Do they take seven years to learn to read, write and account?' 'Some do not and some do.' 'Are they taught arithmetic?' 'Yes, the first four rules; that is the limit; we go no further.' Whilst on page 31 is a follower of Dr. Bell. 'How many can one master superintend, according to your system?' 'I conceive I do not exaggerate when I say 1,000.' 'What

would be the expense?' 'The room being given, the expenses are, salary to the master, and the expense of books, which is a mere trifle; say £80 a year. The room being given I conceive 4*s*. 2*d*. a head abundantly sufficient for 500 children.' 'What is the longest time that you take a boy for education?' 'I should conceive two years abundantly sufficient for any boy.'

'What is the time it takes to educate a master?' this witness is asked; and the answer is, 'If a man is clever and active, about six weeks or two months.' Mr. John Pickton from the Lancasterian training school requires a little more: 'I should think twelve months' practice; by this I mean that he should not only have a complete knowledge of the principles and the details, but also have acquired complete expertness in every branch of the school itself.' 'Have you known young boys undertake the management of large schools upon the new system?' 'Lads from 16 to 18 years of age have taken the management of schools from 100 to 400 boys.' 'What is the youngest boy you ever knew teaching a school?' 'About 15.'

Finally a witness of critical mind and famous name makes clear how hard it is to discover facts that will really stand a test. Francis Place gives evidence (p. 267): 'Have you seen the accounts given in of the expense of education on the new plans?' 'Yes.' 'Do you hold that those estimates are accurate?' 'I know that the accounts that have been given of the Lancasterian schools are all incorrect.' 'In what manner do you think the estimates are incorrect?' 'I was appointed with three others to inquire as to the actual expense of educating the children of the Lancasterian schools in London, and we found that the school in North Street, which was said to be a school for 1,000 boys, could not admit more than 560 at one time; the master stated that the average number which attended for the last twelve months

was 350, that was his estimate and not the number actually ascertained by counting them out at one time. We found the number under 300, at three several countings on different days; and from the items of expense we obtained from the secretary, the actual charge was 16*s*. per head for those who did attend the school. The lowest estimate would be at the rate of 12*s*. per head per annum.' 'Upon what number?' 'Upon about 500.' 'What should you take the expense to be for a school of 200 or 300 only?' 'It would be prodigiously increased.'

The committee members are interested in the 'New Plan' of education, and generally ask whether a school is using it. One (p. 219) seems to have 'Hamlet' without the Prince. 'Dr. Bell's method is adopted excepting as to the point of monitors; we have not monitors in the way they have at the National School.' 'What has been your reason for departing from that part of Dr. Bell's plan?' 'I thought that the children who were monitors acquired a very disgusting degree of self-importance. I thought there was a want of exactness, particularly in the pronunciation, that crept in by that means; and there was often a partiality which the monitors manifested towards their favourites. The plan which I adopted was to change the monitors every day.' The Sunday School superintendent with the unpaid staff (p. 35) thinks the method 'not adapted for Sunday School instruction, as it precludes a number of respectable persons from being teachers.' Robert Owen (p. 239) makes an unexpected objection to it which yet is very suggestive: 'I consider the facility by which children acquire the common rudiments of learning, an unfortunate result of the new system: for as they are now practised, the children too rapidly become possessed of learning, and they have not time to acquire those habits and dispositions which have always appeared to me to be of more importance. . . .'

III

Robert Owen himself, while the Committee was sitting, was carrying out a wonderful piece of pioneer work in education. Brought up in a Welsh village, he became, before he was 30, manager and part owner of the cotton mills of New Lanark in Scotland. From the ordinary condition of a factory of that date, he transformed it into something we might be proud of even now, with moderate hours, good pay, healthy conditions and education for the children. 'I had to seek among the population,' he writes in his autobiography, 'for two persons who had a great love for and unlimited patience with infants, and who were thoroughly tractable and willing unreservedly to follow my instructions. The best . . . I could find . . . was a poor simple-hearted weaver, named James Buchanan, who had been previously trained by his wife to perfect submission to her will, and who could gain but a scanty living by his now oppressed trade of weaving common, plain cotton goods by hand. But he loved children strongly by nature, and his patience with them was inexhaustible.' For assistant he had Molly Young, aged 17, 'who of the two, in natural powers of mind, had the advantage over her new companion in an office perfectly new to both.' James Buchanan stayed long enough to be succeeded in office by a boy who had gone through the New Lanark schools, who 'was full of faculty for the employment, and at 16 years of age was the best instructor of infants I have ever seen in any part of the world.'

With such instruments, Owen produced beautiful effects. 'Truly those who were trained from infancy through these schools were by far the most attractive, and the best and happiest human beings I have ever seen.' 'The total absence of all fear, and full confidence in and affection for their teachers, with the never-ceasing expression of perfect happiness, gave

these children of working cotton-spinners a character for their age superior to any I have yet seen—but yet not nearly equal to that which will be *universally* produced, when the surroundings before and after birth shall be made rational for the formation of character and the conducting of society.' 'I said to the public, "Come and see, and judge for yourselves." And the public came—not by hundreds but by thousands annually. I have seen as many at once as seventy strangers attending the early morning exercises of the children in the school. At this period the dancing, music, military discipline,[1] and geographical exercises, were especially attractive to all except "very pious" Christians. Yet even these last could not refrain from expressing their wonder and admiration at the unaffected joyous happiness of these young ones.' 'This institution for the formation of character, with the establishment of New Lanark generally . . . attracted the attention of the governments and priesthoods of the world.'

Owen's schools kept children up to 12 years old, but it was in the infant schools that the imaginative insight of his pioneer work had the greatest effect. These schools were fortunate in having his ideas to supplement those of Dr. Bell, who writes for the benefit of a Scottish town his sketch of a curriculum for infants in a higher rank of life. 'When I shall have heard that in either of your schools, a class of children at 4 or 5 years old, shall in one year have learned an appropriate series of religious exercises, and to read and write, and to go through the initiatory lessons of the elements of arithmetic, and the accidence of the rudiments of the Latin and English grammar; I shall then know that the master has adopted the new system in good earnest, and to good purpose, and that he has deserved well of my native city.'[2]

[1] I.e. physical training.

[2] Letter to Professor Alexander at St. Andrews. Southey's *Life*, Vol. III, p. 360.

Bell was no reformer in the matter of subjects to be taught; only in method and organization. In actual teaching and management of children it is clear that he was gifted as well as enthusiastic. 'Here would he often come,' writes the founder of Gower's Walk School, 'and, humbling himself to the capacity of a little child, would take a class, and prove his power by drawing out the infant mind, and giving invaluable lessons to teachers and visitors—he wanted neither cane nor rod, and nothing excited his indignation more than the ignorance or obstinacy of masters, who, in spite of his just and merciful system, would persevere in the use of either.'

He writes again and again to a favourite young teacher, James Wilmont (the same who condemned the Lancasterian school for cruelty) to exhort him to a greater kindliness of manner. Unfortunately he was unable to apply his excellent precepts to his own management of schoolmasters.

Till almost the end of his long life Dr. Bell acted as a kind of general inspector of schools connected with the National Society.[1] 'Last year, by my servant's account (for I have no time to keep any myself), I rode my hobbyhorse 1,282 miles; and this summer I have already dispatched 1,228.' ('Perhaps,' says a candid disciple, 'it had been better for himself and the cause in which he was engaged either to have confined his instructions to fewer places, or to have communicated them with more grace.') 'I have just finished a tour of three months in my native country, to visit friends—not its curiosities, interesting scenery, or natural beauties, but its scholastic institutions. Nothing is curious, or interesting, or beautiful in my eyes, but the face of children—

[1] The British and Foreign Society had been obliged to sever itself from Lancaster, whose power of getting rid of money, like Bell's power of accumulating it, was almost unparalleled under his circumstances.

but the infant mind—but the spiritual creation.' On a visit to Liverpool, 'The Blue-coat delights me, and I am busy with it. . . . The Welsh school greatly improved. The Ladies' scolded, and greatly improving. The Moorfields' school insufferably bad. The Irish school bad; the master president of a debating society; what better can be expected of such a man? The bishop has consecrated St. George's of Etherstone, a most beautiful new church; others are rising up. It is delightful—it will be—to see churches and schools go hand in hand.' He would have teachers paid a low salary, to be increased if and when good results were shown. 'I consider a salary given, independent of success, as a premium for neglecting duty. I wish to secure success if I can, and, on this head, I shall be thought very unreasonable. Nothing less will satisfy me than to see every child completely busied, earnest, and happy, every moment spent in school and always advancing in a judicious course of study.' 'If the master do not immediately adopt the new system in all the departments of his school, especially by teaching every letter, monosyllable, and the syllabic lessons of the spelling-book (No. 3 of the National Society's Common Spelling-book), by writing them on the slate, I shall entertain no good hope. Let him talk to me for ever of difficulties, want of room, etc. etc. etc.—he will talk in vain. *I will not* listen to him.'

There is no doubt that the improvement of method was real and important, in the time to which it belonged. The same critical disciple (Bamford) who records that amongst the teachers Dr. Bell 'was almost universally dreaded and disliked,' records also from his own experience, 'Any school . . . when the Madras system is carefully administered, and its practices undeviatingly executed, soon emerges from that lethargic dullness, and torpid inactivity, which pervade and characterize the charity schools on the old *habit*, for the

appellation of system it never merited. The application of the Madras system is like producing light from darkness —like steel striking a dull piece of flint, and emitting sparks from which a fire may be kindled.'

IV

Meanwhile the miserable reaction and oppression of the years following the war had lightened, and public opinion had improved. Lord Brougham's committee in 1819 had recommended public help for education, but nothing was done. In 1832 came the Reform Act, and the new Parliament late in its first session, in August, 1833, made the first Government grant for building schools. Only seventy-six members were present in the House, and the vote (of £20,000) passed by a majority of twenty-four. As there was no Government machinery for its administration, the National Society and the British and Foreign School Society were invited to divide it between them. The grant was quickly exhausted, but was renewed annually for the next six years.

Henry Dunn, secretary of the British and Foreign Society, giving evidence before the Select Committee on Education in 1834, shows the still continuing difficulty of ascertaining what is actually being carried out.

'If you were told that in a certain district there were 1,000 or 1,500 children attending daily schools, you would not infer from that that anything like competent instruction was given to those children.' 'Not in the least. I should, in the first instance, endeavour to ascertain the ages of the children; then whether all those children received daily instruction; for we have found that in statistical reports, Sunday schools and infant schools are not unfrequently mixed up with day schools for children from 7 to 14 years of age. I do not know any way in which I could positively ascertain the quality

of the instruction given except by a personal investigation. It is not easy to average the amount of knowledge that the majority acquire, for the greater part pass out within the twelve months. In country schools they generally remain longer. I may refer to the report of a school in Suffolk where I find they have remained two years, and to another in Bedfordshire, where they have remained rather more than two years. In the large manufacturing towns, I do not think that they stay more than a year and a half; in London they do not generally remain more than a year.' 'At what age do they come?' 'At all ages between 6 and 12.' 'And they usually leave from what age?' 'In the same way.' 'Can you suggest any mode of our acquiring a definite conception of the extent of education in England and Wales at present?' 'I should distrust almost any method short of a personal investigation of the schools. I think there is no subject on which there has been more mystification, and respecting which the country has been so completely kept in ignorance as on the extent of education.'

Both the great Societies undertook some training of teachers from the beginning, in their Central Schools. This was always a difficult part of the work, especially when the teachers were sent from country schools to be trained. In early days a letter to Dr. Bell reports: 'We came to a resolution, on account of Grover's reporting that the masters and mistresses were, in many instances, unable to write, and in some even to read, that either a certificate of their having these qualifications must be required, or an examination by us take place before they are admitted to be trained; and, when found incompetent, that they be sent to an adult school first.' Even in 1821, after several improvements, the teachers in training were thought to be 'the only unhappy beings in the school.' By 1834 the work has become rather easier, as the new schools are now able to produce scholars of their

own to be trained as teachers. Henry Dunn describes, before the Select Committee, the training given to the British and Foreign novices at Borough Road.

'They are required to rise every morning at 5 o'clock, and spend an hour before 7 in private study. At 7 they are assembled in a Bible-class and questioned as to their knowledge of the Scriptures; from 9 to 12 they are employed as monitors in the school, learning to communicate that which they already know or are supposed to know; from 2 to 5 they are employed in a similar way; and from 5 to 7 they are engaged under a master who instructs them in arithmetic and the elements of geometry, geography and the globes, or in any other branches in which they may be deficient. The remainder of the evening is generally occupied in preparing exercises for the subsequent day. Our object is to keep them incessantly employed from 5 in the morning until 9 or 10 at night. We have rather exceeded in the time devoted to study the limit we would choose, on account of the very short period we are able to keep them, and we have found in some instances that their health has suffered on account of their having been previously quite unaccustomed to mental occupations.' 'Do you find that the character of the schoolmaster in society has risen within these last few years?' 'I think that it has decidedly risen within the last few years; it is a point to which we have directed much attention; one great difficulty in the way of obtaining good schoolmasters has arisen from his office having generally been looked upon with a good deal of contempt.' 'Do you not consider the due estimation of a schoolmaster to be of absolute necessity to his efficiency?' 'Unless he be a man of very noble mind. Taking men as they ordinarily are, a teacher becomes depressed if he finds that he is slighted and neglected because he may be a schoolmaster.'

v

A working schoolmaster in the eighteen-thirties had other reasons for depression. The schools might be built with help from the Government, but their maintenance was weighed down by the most terrible financial difficulties. A school might be built in a wave of local enthusiasm; then subscribers would lose interest, leave the neighbourhood, or die, and the school was left to be supported by a few faithful, or by the clergyman alone, or sometimes to be closed altogether. The supply of pencils, maps, reading-books, presented recurrent dreadful problems. Staff and apparatus were curtailed until the efficiency of the school shrunk correspondingly, and then the numbers of fee-paying pupils shrunk also. It was becoming clear that, if the nation wished its children to be educated, it must be prepared officially to provide more money, and to exercise more guidance.

Meanwhile in the same decade, under a Government department, an official system in a limited sphere had actually been growing up. Only less famous than the Reform Act of 1832 is the New Poor Law of 1834, and the latter as well as the former was followed by a small step in education. The first set of regulations published by the new Poor Law Commissioners decreed that children in workhouses were to be instructed for at least three hours every day. A doctor from Manchester, James Phillips Kay (afterwards Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth) became an Assistant Commissioner for the Eastern Counties, and turned his attention to the instruction given there. In 1837, with his colleague Tufnell, he visited a model school in Edinburgh and brought thence a young master to organize the workhouse teaching. 'This enthusiastic Scotch youth, brimful of elementary technical knowledge . . . was a phenomenon in these small workhouse schools. It was impossible to resist his energy. . . . When he left

one workhouse to proceed to another school he left behind him deep traces of his influence. The masters and the scholars alike had been awakened from a torpor into which they could not at once sink back.' [1] Under Dr. Kay's influence, the improvements were carried beyond the small workhouses; and important experiments were tried in a private establishment at Norwood which took 1,100 pauper children from London. In East Anglia, Kay had already encouraged the official recognition of an elder boy here and there who had shown himself a promising assistant to the workhouse teacher. This was now tried on a larger scale, selected boys at Norwood being made 'pupil teachers,' regularly examined as to progress in teaching and study, and entrusted with increasingly responsible duties. Boys were also received experimentally from other workhouse schools and apprenticed for five years. Presently youths who were not paupers were sent from the country to be trained in the same way. A landowner proposing to establish a school on his estate might send its prospective teacher for a few months to Norwood, instead of sending him to the Central School of one of the Great Societies. Under the Poor Law, a State system was beginning.

But at this point, under a Government concerned for elementary education in general, movement on the other line began. By an Order of Council in 1839, a special Committee of the Privy Council was created to administer whatever money Parliament might assign to popular education from time to time. A small staff of permanent officials was appointed, and Kay was made secretary of the new committee.

[1] F. Smith: *Life of Kay-Shuttleworth.*

CHAPTER XV

1840–1900. LIGHT AND DARKNESS

I

It seemed to Kay-Shuttleworth, and to the new Committee under his guidance, that the central need for public education was better teachers and more of them. The plan of setting little boys and girls to teach other little boys and girls had been a great improvement in the days when very few good teachers could be hoped for and few of any level could be paid for; and it had bridged an appalling gap. But the practical limitations soon became obvious. Even in 1799 a master in the Isle of Man had written to Dr. Bell that 'the partial attendance of scholars in this place is a capital hindrance to the improvement that might be expected. . . . I can scarce ever find a boy fit to conduct a class that attends here above two or three days a week.'[1] And forty years later the Committee on the Employment of Children (1842-3) hears evidence from the Potteries district:[2] 'Boys, as well as girls, as soon as they arrive at 8, 9, or 10 years of age, are sent to work; these monitors are very young, and possess only the ability to read "a bit" themselves. Parents . . . have a strong objection to pay the weekly 2*d.*, 3*d.*, or 4*d.* for their children to be made the monitors of others, or to their receiving instruction from others as such; see the evidence of James Hulme, who, although he could not read, was one of the most

[1] Southey: *Life of Bell*, Vol. II, p. 56.
[2] Evidence of Samuel Scriven.

intelligent lads that I have met with; he depones "that they put lads over me that could na' read better than meesel, and when I came to a hard word they used to say, 'Go on, go on, put it off, put it off'; so I did na' loike that; I told my father, and he took me away."'

The defect indeed went deeper than incidental hindrances. The teaching of children by children has real use and interest, and serves certain routine and mechanical purposes well, but it can never fulfil the central idea of a school—the care of a mature mind for the immature, guiding it to better thought and will. A master superintending great numbers of children, with assistants of 10 and 11 years old, is taken up with superintending; and lessons to be given by children must be mechanical lessons.[1]

Kay-Shuttleworth conceived therefore of the future weight of public education as resting not on children but on grown-up teachers, trained for their work and adopting it as a skilled profession. They might begin as boys—there was a good deal of difference, as he had found in the workhouse schools, between 11 and 13—but if 13 years old were trusted to teach under supervision, the work must be part of an apprenticeship which should make in the end a fully qualified teacher. The 'earmarking' of future teachers at an early age, so much complained of now, began as an immense improvement on the staffing of the profession by children who would leave it when they left school.

Hence the first desire of the new Secretary was fixed on a State Training College for teachers. It was to be a better Norwood, with model day schools attached; an authoritative

[1] Incidentally, they are likely to be noisy lessons. Here is a reminiscence of a Lancasterian school in 1841. 'Round the room were 600 or 700 boys in little drafts, singing "L-e-a-p, leap, to jump." The babel was such that I remember on one occasion trying if I should be heard singing "Black-eyed Susan." I sang and no one noticed me. . . . I was Monitor of Order at the time.' (Quoted by D. Salmon: *Joseph Lancaster*, p. 10.)

demonstration of the best ways of teaching the children of the poor. It would take the apprenticed teachers, not for a few weeks or months of system-learning (like the Central Schools which had hitherto sufficed) but for a course of years, fitting them in every way for a vocation of public service. The college and its schools would have undenominational religious instruction, with opportunities for denominational teaching by ministers of religion. The proposal was brought before Parliament in 1839 at the height of the Anglican revival, and such a storm was raised that the year's whole vote for education was nearly lost. This apostolic Civil Servant, then in the first year of his new appointment, began to do the work himself. At the joint financial risk of himself and Tufnell, Kay-Shuttleworth in 1840 opened a Training School in the old Manor House at Battersea. For two years he lived there himself and shared in the teaching, while his mother and sister guided the household. Staff and students had meals together. The lads at Battersea were to be trained for missionary work; 'fitted for the labour of reclaiming the pauper youth of England to the virtues, and restoring them to the happiness of her best-instructed peasantry.'

At first there were two classes of students in the college; apprenticed pupil teachers between 14 and 21, and students between 20 and 30; but by 1843 only the elder class remained. The age of admission came to be 18 upwards, and the course normally lasted two years. 'The schoolmaster,' wrote Kay-Shuttleworth, 'ought to be prepared by thought and feeling to do the peasant-father's duty, by having sentiments in common with him, and among these an honest pride in the labour of his hands, in his strength, his manual skill, his robust health, and the manly vigour of his body and mind.' Therefore the students made their own beds, scrubbed floors, prepared vegetables, and cleared the garden in which they

grew them, and tended the live stock of the community. In study hours they learned everything which might help and interest the sons and daughters of the poor. Mensuration and land surveying were included, geography, elementary science, account-keeping; with drawing and singing. 'The entire day is occupied,' says the Report of 1841,[1] 'with a succession of engagements in household work and outdoor labour, devotional exercises, meals, and instruction. Recreation is sought in change of employment. These changes afford such pleasure, and the sense of utility and duty is so constantly maintained, that recreation in the ordinary sense is not needed. Leisure from such occupations is never sought excepting to write a letter to a friend, or occasionally to visit some near relative. The pupils all present an air of cheerfulness. They proceed from one lesson to another, and to their several occupations, with an elasticity of mind which affords the best proof that the mental and physical effects of the training are auspicious.'

The founders could not maintain the college indefinitely, and at the end of 1843 it was handed over to the National Society. But by this time friends and rivals were starting colleges all over the country. The Church training colleges in 1845 numbered twenty-two, with 540 students. Kay-Shuttleworth had begun a phase of educational history of which we do not yet see the end.

There is every evidence that his students were happy, but those who were glad to be trained in the spirit of service by one who was the first of servants himself must sometimes have smarted under what was expected of them by other authorities in their professional life. Mr. Tufnell writes at the end of 1843 on the troubles of two old Battersea pupils who were working nine hours a day at the Parkhurst Reformatory for £20 a year, under a chaplain who kept a

[1] Kay-Shuttleworth: *Four Periods of Public Education*, p. 336.

register of their faults. 'The chaplain showed me a list of forty-six cases of neglect against. . . . Of these forty-six cases eleven referred to errors in leading the singing. Others referred to little neglects in the duty of *head housemaid*, which ought never to have been imposed on him. . . . One case was coming into morning service with slippers, an error which any Oxford or Cambridge man would readily pardon, where the same excuse could not be alleged as here, since the Parkhurst masters can only find time to write letters or get up their lessons by sitting up half the night.' Another ex-Battersea student, teaching in a village school, is the subject of a letter to Kay-Shuttleworth from the Duchess of Sutherland. She fears he may be led into temptation by his attendance at the cricket club on Wednesday evenings. 'Could anything be said to him about the importance of his wife *not* being smart—the example will be important—and she had very playful ringlets.'[1]

II

Meanwhile other work was going on. The Committee of Council asserted control over the planning of any new schools for which grants were asked; and they took power also to make such grants to schools built by other bodies than the two Societies. The Bell-and-Lancaster plan of one great room containing all the classes was to cease. New schools must have provision for classrooms which could be separated by partitions. Grants began to be given for the building of houses for the teachers, and for the provision of school furniture and apparatus, as well as for the building of training colleges. And after years of effort, in 1846, Kay-Shuttleworth got grants given towards teachers' salaries. Pupil teachers were to be apprenticed at 13 for five years; the teachers who took charge of them were to be paid

[1] F. Smith: *Life of Kay-Shuttleworth*, pp. 131–132 and 208–209.

for the work; and both were to have grants direct from the State.

'This extension of the Government grants,' writes Sir Graham Balfour, 'apparently marks the resignation of the State to accepting as permanent the denominational system of education. In the first instance, the whole scheme of education was regarded as a temporary and provisional expedient, but as the system became consolidated and assumed larger proportions than had seemed possible, it was thought unfeasible to change it. It was afterwards compared by Mr. Lowe to a man who went to call on a friend and stayed for over thirty years.'

Kay-Shuttleworth himself seems to have approved it on the whole, in spite of the fearful struggles with which it filled his official life. 'Exaggerated notions have existed,' he is constrained to remark, 'of the amount of dogmatic instruction which can be imparted to children within the elementary school age. . . . Conviction on such subjects is rarely attained in the day school.' He desired to secure State inspection and public control of schools, but he valued their connexion with religious congregations, at any rate enough to wish not to break it off suddenly. Writing to the Independent community at Bamford, whose vigorous Sunday School he remembers from his youth, he notes that it has 'borne its natural fruit, a congregational day school. . . . The day school will, I hope, always retain the object of bringing up youth religiously, but it will also be adapted to the political wants of the State, and to the civil rights of the minority. We do not make revolutions in England, but our institutions grow and spread like our oaks. So this school system, which has had a congregational origin, will grow, change, and spread until it is national.'

Such reflections may have helped him to bear with denominational battles on every hand, and with such school managers

as Archdeacon Denison, who wrote to the Government Inspector, 'My dear Bellairs, I love you very much; but if you ever come here again to inspect, I lock the door of the school, and tell the boys to put you in the pond.' But ten years of immense work and incessant difficulty shattered Kay-Shuttleworth's health, and he was obliged to retire at the end of 1849. England owes him more than could ever be paid; but he was to live to see his work half broken.

III

From 1858 to 1861 a Commission sat under the chairmanship of the Duke of Newcastle, 'to inquire into the present state of popular education in England, and to consider and report what measures, if any, are required for the extension of sound and cheap elementary instruction to all classes of the people.'

Among the most important institutions for promoting the education of the poor the Commissioners noted the National Society, the British and Foreign School Society, the United Committees of the Wesleyan Conference, the Roman Catholic Poor School Committee, the Congregational Board, and the London Committee of the British Jews. 'The general object of these societies is the same, namely, the promoting of local efforts for the establishment and maintenance of schools, by grants of money, by training teachers, by providing school-books and apparatus at a cheap rate, by inspecting and organizing schools, and by forming centres of communication for those who are interested in these and similar undertakings.' The schools thus provided, helped by the Government grants, were now the backbone of the national system. But plenty of education still went on outside.

All over the country, for instance, there were dame schools for small children. 'Women are always the teachers. They are generally advanced in life and their school is usually their

kitchen, sitting and bedroom. . . .' 'The usual scene of these schools,' says Mr. Winder, 'is a cottage kitchen, in which the mistress divides her time between her pupils and her domestic duties. The children sit round the room, often so thickly stowed as to occupy every available corner, and spend the greater part of their time in knitting and sewing. At intervals the mistress calls them up, one or two at a time, and teaches the alphabet and easy words, the highest efficiency attained being the power of reading a little in the New Testament.' 'The dames most commonly have only one room for every purpose and their scholars may often be seen sitting round the sides of a four-post bed.' 'The room is often so small that the children cannot stand in a semi-circle round the teacher. Indeed, I have seen the children as closely packed as birds in a nest, and tumbling over each other like puppies in a kennel' (p. 29). Then there are numberless private schools for the rather older children (p. 94). 'The teachers of private schools have rarely been in any way trained to their profession and they have almost always selected it for the cause that they have failed in other pursuits, or because they have been unexpectedly left in a state of destitution.' 'When other occupations fail for a time, a private school can be opened, with no capital beyond the cost of a ticket in the window. Any room, however small and close, serves for the purpose; the children sit on the floor, and bring what books they please; whilst the closeness of the room renders fuel superfluous, and even keeps the children quiet by its narcotic effects. If the fees do not pay the rent, the school is dispersed or taken by the next tenant.'

Again, there are schools with endowments of their own. 'Of these,' says Dr. Hodgson (p. 461), 'my impression is far from satisfactory; I have found a general dullness and want of life to be their general characteristic, and even the best among them are seldom equal in the elements of instruction

to a well-conducted or even average National or British and Foreign School.' 'The chief quality developed in the children,' says Mr. Goode (p. 461), 'is a habit of servility, enforced under the name of respect for their benefactors and superiors.' 'These institutions,' reports Mr. Foster (p. 464), 'were once valuable means of education, but now the halt, the maimed, the drunken, even the idiotic, are promoted to the enjoyment of these funds; the tender charity of the trustees deeming it prudent to appoint "lads" of such infirmity that there was no other way of "keeping them off the parish." These seem to have no idea of a schoolmaster's duties except to hear certain lessons, and to beat those who fail.'

But in reading the evidence, apart from the Report itself, we realize the inadequacy of multitudes of the current parish schools. The efficient school with certificated head and pupil-teacher staff was still very far indeed from representing the mass of English public education. 'In one case,' writes Mr. Fraser (Vol. II, p. 90), 'it was convenient to the school manager that the schoolmistress should be the wife of his coachman; in another, the wife of the gardener. The conjugal relation was rarely so happily adjusted that both husband and wife suited. Sometimes teachers are appointed because they are pious people; sometimes because they can do nothing else . . . sometimes because it is very erroneously supposed that a person in too weak health for ordinary employments is strong enough to keep a school. . . . In one large parish the master just appointed was said to be a man of notoriously bad character . . . in another, a carpenter, "as good a schoolmaster," the neighbours said, "as ever put foot to ground," but occupied more than half his time with his more profitable handicraft, as his wretched salary was but £12 a year; in another, a Scotchman . . . who . . . informed me that I should find the teachers in England generally very incompetent, though his own school was one scene of disorder,

and . . . his orthography anything but according to received usage. In many public schools, the mistress is still nothing but a mere dame of the old style, with no pretensions to mental culture.'

Whilst alike for efficient and inefficient schools every witness remarks on the outstanding handicaps of irregular attendance and short school life. 'The weekly payment has this difficulty about it. . . . If a child is unavoidably kept from school at the beginning of the week, the parent does not think it worth while to pay the fee . . . so that if a child is absent on Monday or Tuesday, it is ten to one if the master sees his face again till the following Monday' (II, 68). 'In agricultural parishes the attendance of the older children is so much interrupted, that a great part of the time during which they are in school is spent in recovering the power of reading, etc., which they possessed the year before' (II, 163). In the western counties 'you must not expect to be able to keep boys under instruction after ten.' In Bradford and Rochdale 'it was quite common to find children of 10, 11, or 12 years of age, who had just come to school for the first time, or after an interval of months or years.' In the Midlands, 'the attendance of a child, destined to be a small ware potter, at a day school after 7 or 8 years of age is, in the present legal position of the trade, a fact never witnessed, and not to be expected' (II, 46, 190, 285).

The Commissioners, however, look on the bright side. They report at the end of their survey, 'The means for obtaining education are diffused pretty equally over the whole face of the country, and the great mass of the population recognizes its importance sufficiently to take advantage to some extent of the opportunities thus afforded to their children.' They are sure that it would be wrong and un-English to require by law that such advantage should be taken—'a measure which would entail so much difficulty and danger

and give so great a shock to our educational and social system' (p. 200). They consider that the lack of satisfactory infant schools is important and should be remedied, and they warmly recommend the extension of the newly arisen evening schools. 'If the education of the country were in a good state they would be nearly universal, and would serve to compensate the scantiness of the instruction given in day schools.'

In the day schools, the new system of staffing was found to have proved its worth. The investigating inspectors were unanimous as to the superiority of schools with pupil teachers over schools with monitors, and most of the witnesses were of the same opinion. Yet the faults found formerly in teachers who began at 8 years old had unfortunately not wholly disappeared in those who began at 13. Mr. Procter, curate at Devonport, 'who had given much consideration to the subject,' reported that the pupil teachers required constant watchfulness on behalf of the clergy or other school-managers, in default of which many of them became 'inflated with self-importance, overbearing towards the younger children, contemptuous towards their social equals . . . very dressy out of school, and forward and deficient in outward tokens of respect towards their betters' (p. 103, and Vol. III, p. 132). An inspector, after praising their capacity, observes that 'they are often too pedantic and too mechanical and too much lost in the routine of school work,' and that 'they are apt to fall into the faults of meagreness, dryness, and emptiness, or the opposite and not less mischievous evils of presumption and ostentation' (p. 103).

We may find some possible causes of some of the meagreness and emptiness if we study Mr. Procter's description of a girl pupil teacher's life (p. 104). 'Ordinarily, she is the daughter of a handicraftsman, or a labourer, or a domestic servant, or a farm servant. Her parents earn from 30*s*.

down to 12*s.*, or it may be less, a week. . . . She ought to bear her part of the family house-cleaning, the family washing, and the family clothes-making and clothes-mending. . . . These home duties claim at least on an average an hour a day of her time. Next . . . she may have charge of a section of forty children. She must be engaged in *teaching* daily for not less than 5½ hours; and in preparing the school for her class, and putting things away, etc., for about another half-hour daily. . . . Again, those school managers who have the interests of their female apprentices really at heart, and the interests of the children who are already so much influenced by their example . . . require the female apprentices, with the assistance of the elder girls and monitors, to do sometimes all the household work of the school premises, sometimes all this, except scrubbing the larger and rougher floors. They also require them to visit, to inquire after absent children, dividing this duty between them and the principal teacher. . . . These school duties . . . claim on an average another hour a day. . . .

'But there is yet a claim on their time for one and a half hours daily. They have to spend an hour and a half . . . in the class with the mistress; when she is to revise and correct the exercises they have written at home; to hear them the lessons they have prepared for her at home; to submit them to written examinations; to direct them as to what they are to study by themselves . . . to instruct them in the art of teaching; to make up with their assistance the voluminous school registers and school accounts; and to give them such admonitions as occasion may require.

'This makes nine and a half hours a day for five days in the week.'

The Committee think that this witness's view of the subject is not free from exaggeration, since several of these duties provide healthy bodily exercise. 'But after making these

deductions from the value of Mr. Procter's statements, we must admit that they are not without foundation.'

Some pupil teachers after this apprenticeship go on to a Training College, and a description of one such college (p. 141) indicates the life there:

'The hour for rising is in summer at half-past five, in winter at six o'clock. A bell is rung by a monitor as the signal for rising, and half an hour afterwards it is rung again, when the students assemble for roll call; then follows an hour of private study; then chapel and breakfast. At nine o'clock lectures commence, and continue till twelve. The hour of dinner is one, and the afternoon course of lectures commences at half-past two and continues till half-past four. At six o'clock the students meet for evening service in chapel. At half-past six they have tea, at seven o'clock they sit down to private study, and continue thus employed till half-past nine when they prepare for bed. This is the regular routine, and except that Wednesday and Saturday are half-holidays, there is no deviation from it. It will be seen that a system like this makes considerable demands on the time and powers of the students, and leaves little opportunity for indulgence in frivolity or dissipation.'

On the possible defects of the teacher who emerges at the end the Commissioners make some remarks which are very true, even if they are not exactly what we should think the relevant comment on the foregoing:

(P. 132) 'The faults that are usually, though somewhat vaguely, ascribed to certificated teachers, and which are supposed to arise from too high a training, are, in fact, to be ascribed to the opposite cause. . . . The use of ambitious language, vain display of knowledge, the overlooking what is essential and elementary, a failure to see what it really is which perplexes a child, are the faults which an educated person avoids, and into which an uneducated person falls.

So far as they are connected with training, they are to be attributed to its insufficiency. . . . The effect of discontinuing the efforts made by the training colleges to raise the general mental level of the students, and to excite the higher powers of their minds, would not be to make them simpler and more practical, but to leave them in the state of helplessness and conceit which is natural to a person who has learned routine and nothing else, and never been taught to appreciate the existence of a higher standard than his own.'

But the most momentous passage of the Newcastle Report, as events proved, was none of these. Somehow, the Commissioners found, in spite of all the money and trouble spent on them, the mass of the children of England were not really masters of reading, writing, and arithmetic. What should be the final step for making them so?

(P. 157) 'There is only one way to secure this result, which is to institute a searching examination by competent authority of every child in every school to which grants are to be paid, with the view of ascertaining whether these indispensable elements of knowledge are thoroughly acquired, and to make the prospects and position of the teacher dependent, to a considerable extent, on the results of these examinations. If teachers had a motive of this kind to see that all the children under their charge really learned to read, write, and cypher thoroughly well, there can be little doubt they would generally find means to secure that result, and the presence of such a motive would do more towards the production of the required effect than any remodelling of the training college system. It must always be a matter of speculation whether a lad who learns Latin in a training college will teach little children to read better or worse than a lad who learns chemistry. But there can be no sort of doubt, that if one of the two finds that his income depends on the condition that his scholars do learn to read, whilst the other is paid equally

well whether they do so or not, the first will teach more children to read than the second. The case is one in which the question of power is subordinate to that of will. The teachers sent out from the training colleges are quite good enough; and, to use Dr. Temple's forcible expression, the nature of their duty "is so continually dinned into their ears, that they can hardly forget it." The object is to find some constant and stringent motive to induce them to do that part of their duty which is at once most unpleasing and most important. Every security is at present taken to enable them to do it, and to show them that it ought to be done, but sufficient effort is not made to ascertain that it really is done. The alterations which we recommend will, we trust, supply this omission.'

Payment by results is a familiar idea. It sometimes works well in industry, provided, amongst other things, that all the employees are working on identical material under identical conditions, that the product is capable of exact and easy measurement, and that the work has no other important qualities which might be neglected by a worker aiming at maximum output. Examinations, in the middle of the century, were growing in use and esteem every year. They had been instituted for the Indian Civil Service half a dozen years before the Newcastle Report, with famous results; and half a dozen years after that Report an inspector was writing, 'The studies of the classroom must be those wherein progress can be definitely measured by examination. For examination is to the student what the target is to the rifleman; there can be no definite aim, no real training without it.' [1]

Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth wrote from his retirement, striving to bring home to Parliament and public the human realities of the schools which he had done so much to create.

[1] *Taunton Report*, IV., p 60, quoted by Sir Graham Balfour: *Educational Systems of Great Britain*, p. 17 note.

'When schools were planted twenty years ago in towns, villages, and rural parishes, almost the only teachers were either untrained men . . . or self-taught Sunday School teachers, trained for three or six months in some central Model School. They had to struggle, aided only by monitors under 13 years of age, with the untamed brutishness of the wild or pauperized immigrant population—with the semi-barbarism of children from coarse sensual homes—with the utter want of consciousness in the population that humble learning could do their children any good—with the then extravagant and harsh claims of an unorganized system of manufacturing and mining labour—with the absence of previous training in the home or infant school—with the late age at which children with no school-habits, savage, ignorant, incapable, wayward, or wild, came under their care—with irregularity of attendance—short school attendance in each year, and brief school time altogether—constant migration of families—and overwhelming ill-paid duties.

'To grapple with this evil, the Government resolved to create a new machinery of public education. This new trained machinery of apprenticed pupil teachers, assistant and certificated teachers, has come into existence chiefly since 1847. . . . This corps of teachers has been like the raw recruits of an army suddenly raised—brought into the field in successive battalions, on the verge of an immature manhood, and placed, as soon as drilled, in the front of difficulties and dangers. . . . They have been the pioneers of civilization. Fourteen years have barely elapsed since their first companies took up their position, and their ranks are still full of the last batches of raw recruits. . . . The teachers have had to contend with all the obstacles which defeated their untrained predecessors. If some of these hindrances be examined in detail, it will become apparent that the proposition of the Commissioners, that it is reasonable to expect that three-fifths of the

scholars should now have the attainments required by them, is a fallacy.' [1]

The battle between the supporters and opponents of the new proposals was a fierce one, but the business men won. By the Revised Code of 1862 an end was put to all the grants that had been made for school buildings and apparatus, books and maps; for hiring field gardens, erecting workshops, and providing school washhouses and kitchens, and for salaries to teachers and pupil teachers. The new arrangements allowed one grant only, paid to the managers, and not exceeding 12*s.* a year for each child. Four shillings was to be paid on the average attendance, and the other eight shillings on the results of an annual examination in reading, writing and arithmetic; one-third of it being withheld for each subject in which a child failed.

These regulations in their strict unmodified form endured only for a short time, but their principle, of individual examination and grant dependent on results, endured for more than thirty years. The Government had no doubt been right in wishing to increase the central control over the schools; a process which Kay-Shuttleworth had begun. They did something to stamp the three R's on the public imagination as an accepted necessary minimum for the poorest.[2] But beyond these two points there seems little good to be said.

The classic description of 'the deadness, slackness, and discouragement' brought about by the new system is preserved

[1] Letter to Earl Grenville (Nov., 1861), given in *Four Periods of Public Education*, p. 58.

[2] Dr. Furnivall remarks in 1867, in his preface to *The Babees Book*, 'how the old spirit still lingers in England, how a friend of my own was curate in a Surrey village where the kind-hearted squire would allow none of the R's but Reading to be taught in his school; how another clergyman lately reported his Farmers' meeting on the school question: Reading and Writing might be taught, but Arithmetic not; the boys would be getting to know too much about wages, and that would be troublesome.'

in Matthew Arnold's Reports. It is tragic that such a man should have spent his years of inspectorship in such a time. He notes how even the business aim of surveying the whole groundwork was not being accomplished; since in 1867, for instance, more than 49 per cent of the children in his schools had no share in the examination, some of them being under 6 years old, and most of them not having attended often enough to qualify. Yet meanwhile, for the sake of the examination, 'the better instructed top class who became when they left school a little nucleus of instruction and intelligence in their own locality has, for the most part disappeared.' The inspector can no longer either test or stimulate the general life of the school, since almost his whole spare time, and almost all the school's interest, is absorbed in the examination; and this is a game of mechanical driving in which 'the teachers will, in the end, beat us.'

Another inspector[1] who knew the system in the 'eighties found the game well developed. The Code syllabuses now included subjects other than the three R's, but they were necessarily limited in each subject; the inspector's stock of questions was not inexhaustible, and it might sometimes be the easiest plan to make children learn by heart the answers to all of them. In some districts all the questions asked in any school were carefully collected and circulated amongst all the teachers. This could not be called dishonest, but it did not foster enlightened teaching. Yet one could not wholly rely on the best-drilled scholars. Examinations, remarks Mr. Newton, are uncertain things, and specially uncertain when the examinees are very young and the inspector has to work against time. When a child of 7 is too shy to open his mouth before a stranger, to proceed therefore to refuse him his grant seems to Matthew Arnold 'to be going beyond the intention of your lordships.' A kindly lady in a country

[1] Mr. A. W. Newton. See his book on *The English Elementary School.*

house writes to a friend, 'I am in an agitation about the examination of our school-children, which comes off at eleven to-morrow morning, and they are always so nervous, poor little things, that they do their very worst as a matter of course, and the mistress works herself into a fever, and so do I, and I shall be thankful when it is Saturday. I had my class up here yesterday afternoon for a couple of hours, and they are coming again to-day to read poetry. I have given them simple little things to read which they can understand. I found the poems in the regular schoolbook quite too difficult for me to explain, full of "terrestrials" and "ethereal firmament," and words and things I myself don't clearly understand. If the inspector insists on their reading to him out of the regulation lesson-book we shall be done for, and disgrace ourselves.' [1]

But in most schools the regulation lesson-book was the sheet-anchor. The inspector could not demand a test in any other book, and this one could be read throughout the year until nearly every child could repeat it by heart. So a factory girl even in the twentieth century, apparently unable to read, could insist indignantly that she could read very well if only the inquirer would give her the little red book that they had at school.

A Commission with Lord Cross as chairman which sat 1886-8, 'felt bound to consider the important evidence that though the results of the inspection and examination may appear satisfactory, many of the children lose, with extraordinary rapidity after leaving school, the knowledge which has been so laboriously imparted to them.' 'We are unanimously of the opinion that the present system of "payment by results" ought to be modified and relaxed.' After the Cross Report more emphasis was progressively laid on inspec-

[1] Mrs. Sartoris (Adelaide Kemble). Given by Lady Ritchie in *From Friend to Friend*, p. 75.

tion and less on individual examination. The change was good so far as it went. But the principle of payment by results still worked disappointingly even when 'results' were more intelligently interpreted. A low grant might stimulate the able but lazy teachers, but these are not very common. Far more common are those who fail through lack of training, or intelligence, or vitality; and the lowering of a grant supplies none of these. If the weakness of a school was due to lack of staff or apparatus, these were intensified by the punishment. Nor were bad managers stimulated—so long as they kept above the very low standard which must be reached if grant was to be earned at all, it paid them to starve their schools, for the cost of better staff and better apparatus would be much more than the difference between a bad grant and a good one.[1]

The last remnants of the scheme disappeared in 1897. 'But,' writes another former inspector,[2] 'we had sojourned too long in the Land of Bondage. . . . To pass from it was not the work of a day, or a year.'

[1] See A. W. Newton: *Op. cit.* p. 35, etc.
[2] Edmund Holmes: *In Quest of an Ideal*, p. 67.

CHAPTER XVI

THE REFORM OF THE MIDDLE SCHOOLS

I

'ENGLISH education,' writes Professor Archer,' has developed from its two poles. It began, at the one end with the two universities and a few public schools, at the other with the monitorial schools of Bell and Lancaster. The middle was filled in last.'

The public schools to begin with had been grammar schools like scores of others (Eton and Winchester alone were boarding-schools from the first), but most grammar schools declined so much after the middle of the seventeenth century that those which became large and famous were sharply marked off from the rest. The distinction between them was well established by the end of the eighteenth century. Of the smaller schools we have glimpses in history; one of the pleasantest being that of the little grammar school at Hawkshead, with its boys lodged in the cottages round.

> Easily, indeed,
> We might have fed upon a fatter soil
> Of arts and letters—but be that forgiven.[1]

We have other glimpses in the evidence given before Lord Brougham's committee, 1816-18, and some gloomy notes in the Report of the Newcastle Commission in 1861. But the first systematic account is that of the Schools Inquiry Com-

[1] Wordsworth: *The Prelude.*

mission which reported in 1868. This commission was expressly appointed to investigate the middle level of schools, leaving 'popular education' to the Newcastle commissioners and the public schools to a commission which reported in 1867. The Schools Inquiry was carried out by a very able body of persons who called very good witnesses, and the twenty volumes of report and evidence provide most interesting reading.

One difficulty as usual was that of discovering what was actually being done; a difficulty which explains the overlapping with the 1861 report. 'One school describes its course,' writes Mr. Fitch, 'as "Greek, Latin, English, French, mathematics, geography, and history." Another "English, classics, and mathematics." Yet both proved on examination to be elementary schools of the humblest class, and nothing beyond reading, writing, and arithmetic was taught in either of them. In Yorkshire and Durham alone I have counted 38 schools which credited themselves at the end of 1864 with an ample and varied curriculum, including Greek and Latin, and other advanced subjects; but in which, on examination in 1865, it was found that no scholars were learning the subjects so described.'

Often, however, the school was obliged to teach Latin by the conditions of its endowment, and the witness just quoted holds that the effect is often very bad. 'On the whole, the classical learning prescribed by statute in the large majority of the grammar schools may be safely pronounced a delusive and unfruitful thing. It is given to very few in any form. It is not carried to any substantial issue in the case of 5 per cent. of the scholars. It is so taught in the majority of cases that it literally comes to nothing. Finally, it furnishes the pretext for the neglect of all other useful learning; and is the indirect means of keeping down the general level of education in almost every small town which is so unfortunate

as to possess an endowment.' Yet if a school gave up classics, the scholars were cut off thenceforth from entrance to the Universities; and the schools clung to the possibility of such entrance even if not one scholar were sent up in five years. Other witnesses urged again as the public schoolmasters were urging, that Latin was the easiest thing to teach. 'For one man who can take a play of Shakespear or the *Paradise Lost* as a class book, there are ten who can carry boys very respectably through Cæsar and Virgil' (Derwent Coleridge). And another witness (Canon Blakesly), seeing education as 'the social bridge which unites all classes of society in England above the mere day labourer,' holds that 'the cement of this is furnished directly or indirectly by the Latin language.'

Where other subjects were attempted they are not often very successful. In mathematics, the Commissioners 'think it is well worth consideration whether Euclid be the proper textbook, and whether boys should not commence with something easier and less abstract.' In natural science, they report 'want of competent elementary teachers, of suitable elementary books, and of apparatus.' For modern languages, T. H. Green writes on Staffordshire and Warwickshire, 'I set or saw translations from French into English at all the schools, where I understood it was made much of; and if twenty were taken as the number of these in all the schools who could translate a passage from an ordinary French writer for themselves, so as at all to understand it, the allowance would be a liberal one.' On the three R's, Fitch reports, 'Three-fourths of the scholars whom I have examined in endowed schools, if tested by the usual standards appropriate to boys of similar age, under the Revised Code, would fail to pass the examination either in arithmetic or any other elementary subject.' The comparison may not be as bad as it sounds, since a considerable proportion in the elementary schools were also failing to pass. But in one Yorkshire town at any rate,

Skipton-in-Craven, it was 'not an uncommon thing for a child to be sent to the Grammar School for a time and then transferred to the National School, for the last year of his education, to finish.'

Some of the endowed schools, of course, were much better than the average described; and here and there in unexpected places a teacher would be found doing admirable work on his own lines, which would never have been possible in a school under the 'Code.' At Bispham, a little village on the Lancashire coast, Mr. Bryce found such a school held in a room so small and unventilated that the visitor could scarcely bear to stay in it. The elementary subjects were only fair, but 'the wretched room was filled in every available corner' by objects of natural history. The children knew all the local plants and their structure, the rocks and their geological history, and the creatures of the seashore, and farmers' boys of 17 or 18 would come back to school in the winter to increase their knowledge. Yet the mastership of an endowed school did not everywhere mean freedom of action. The head of the West Lavington Grammar School in Wiltshire was appointed by the lord of the manor, who 'intimated to him through his agent, at the time of appointment, that the course of instruction to be followed was to interfere as little as possible with the profitable occupation of the children in agricultural employment.' The average leaving-age for grammar-school boys in West Lavington is given as $9\frac{1}{4}$.

The worst of the endowed schools were evidently terribly bad. At Blackdown near Broadwindsor in Dorset 'the schoolroom is . . . about 7 feet high, flagged with stones worn and uneven; in some places the bare ground was visible, the walls were green with damp, the fire-place ruinous, the desks old and mangled. There was no playground.' At Drighlington in Yorkshire 'the school is in a pitiable state

of squalor, disorder, and ignorance.' The head master is the parish clergyman, who presides with a crippled assistant over nearly sixty children. 'In the lowest class, consisting of thirteen boys, it seems to be the custom to pass a dirty spelling-book from hand to hand, for exercise in learning their letters. They do not, however, know them.' 'I could not find one redeeming feature in this school.' It exercises 'degrading influence on the whole of the district.'

An energetic school of the poorer sort would adapt itself to elementary work and ask for Privy Council inspection and grants; whilst others which were capable and ambitious would manage to take advantage of the examinations and grants of the Science and Art Departments. But some governing bodies were by no means well disposed towards change. At Haworth Grammar School Mr. Fitch 'found thirteen boys, so ill instructed that I shall have . . . to describe the school at length as a type of the worst schools in the district.' It was resolved at a subsequent meeting: '1. That the trustees consider the present state of the school adapted for all classes of society in the township of Haworth. 2. That the trustees are satisfied with the present state of the school, and do not contemplate any plans for its improvement.'

II

The best middle-class education at this time was probably being given in the best of the private schools, though the average of these may have been no better than the average of the endowed schools. Girls' schools were practically all private—private even in the further sense that information about them was sometimes not to be had. The investigators presented their questionnaire with all the tact they could summon, but Mr. Stanton reports on Devon and Somerset, and especially on Bath, that 'the advances of the Commission

were received with unrelenting hostility. . . . The burden of the complaint was that "the questions were too inquisitorial for any woman of spirit to answer." One lady said that, if the Law required her to answer, she did not know if she should not give up her profession. "We have always been private in our home, and desire so to remain, in spite of the march of intellect in the nineteenth century."' Occasionally the objection was more unexpected. In Yorkshire Mr. Fitch reports: 'It is not always easy to obtain even so simple a fact as the number in a school. One governess, in reply to my question, hoped that I would not think her superstitious, but she never *counted* her pupils; she had a feeling that it was unlucky to do so.'

A few schools for girls are described as very good, but on the whole the verdict is even less favourable than for boys. Below 12 years old, Mr. Fitch suggests, the girls may have the advantage. Women teachers cannot be called efficient, because they know so little, but women have certain gifts for teaching which come out with elementary subjects and young children. The girls read aloud far better than the boys; they write better composition, and occasionally even do better elementary arithmetic. But after 12 a girl is told 'that Latin is not a feminine acquirement; that arithmetic and mathematics are only fit for boys; that science is not useful to a woman; and that she must begin to devote her chief attention to "lady-like accomplishments."' . . . It is said that 'a girl must be educated for domestic life. But I cannot find that any part of the training given in ladies' schools educates them for domestic life. . . . Everywhere the fact that the pupil is to become a woman and not a man operates upon her course of study negatively, not positively.' Even her writing may have to change at the age of advancing ladyhood. 'Girls,' says Mr. Bryce, 'were often taught to write a clear round hand, like that of boys, until they

reached 12 or 13 years of age, from which time on it was thought proper to require them to imitate a saw as closely as possible.' The teachers are mostly conscientious—'I met with but one thorough-paced impostor among the private schoolmistresses, and three or four at the least among a not greater number of private schoolmasters'—but the girls' time is swallowed up in practising the piano whether or not they have talent for it, in learning dancing without having any proper outdoor exercise, in talking very bad French, in needlework, and in learning little textbooks by heart.

The textbooks, 'lamentable catechisms' and lists of detached facts, were extraordinarily bad and badly used. 'One lady in her schedule of school instruction,' reports Mr. Hammond, 'returns two students in biography, two in astronomy, and one in mythology. This merely means that the students in question are at present engaged in learning the chapters in Mangnall which refer to the specified subjects.' The method of learning history from such books, writes Mr. Bryce, is 'not more disagreeable to its unhappy victims than it is intellectually worthless. . . . They would tell you that gunpowder was first used at the battle of Cressy without knowing where Cressy was or who fought the battle, or why it was fought, or what difference the use of gunpowder has made in war.'

Memory was heavily taxed, but intellect was not. Apart from the catechisms, and allowing in the better schools for interest in reading and lectures, the investigators still hold that the education given to girls is 'easy, pleasant, superficial,' 'aimless and desultory.' It is possible that a few of the witnesses had their minds fixed more than we should now approve on the grammatical-analysis type of mental effort, and gave too little credit for other kinds of thought. Still, it is hardly to be doubted that in most schools the work was not only not wide enough but not deep enough. Ladies' schools pro-

duce, said Mr. Hammond, 'an inability on the part of unoccupied females to undergo any intellectual fatigue.' They have, said Mr. Fitch, no work which demands real concentration of attention. (Mrs. Gaskell asked this witness to consider the circumstances in which a woman had to live—if you gave a girl the habit of attending closely to one thing at a time, were you not merely preparing to make her unhappy for life?)

Lack of education in the teachers might seem almost a sufficient reason for their inability to train difficult thinking in their pupils, but Mr. Hammond sees it in a broad and solemn light. 'I have no hesitation in reporting that there are some subjects, those in fact which rest on scientific principles, which females at present cannot teach. There is a traditional flaw, the result of generations of unsound method, which penetrates their whole treatment of such subjects.' In geography, Mr. Bryce finds 'nothing to call for special remark in the manner of teaching, except as respects that exalted branch of it which . . . is entitled "The Use of the Globes." When requested to examine a class of girls in this, I found it expedient to begin by asking, "What is the equator?" Their answer to this . . . usually showed so hazy a comprehension . . . as to make it unnecessary to proceed further.' Yet apparently the flaw did not lie in women teachers alone. In Mr. Fearon's district, 'at an expensive school where a clergyman . . . was engaged to teach Latin and mathematics, I found that the first class professed the first book of Euclid.' They proved to be wholly ignorant, except that three out of the seven knew proposition 32 very fairly well. 'The pupils were not at all alarmed or flurried. They told me in the most simple manner that they always forgot a proposition directly they had said it to the teacher.'

In considering points of inefficiency in the girls' schools,

we shall fail to do justice unless we remember the charges brought by the same investigators against the contemporary schools for boys. A man teaching arithmetic in a girls' school told Mr. Fearon, 'A young lady of upwards of 20 years of age, the eldest daughter of a family that had somewhat suddenly risen to opulence, was perfectly startled when I pointed out to her that three halfpence are 1½d. . . . Another young lady of about the same age . . . later in the lesson . . . understood halves and quarters readily, but could not accustom herself to the notion of thirds.' But the criticism here must lie against the previous neglect at home, and the school is trying to improve matters. Whereas Mr. Hammond reports on some boys' private schools, which give great attention to commercial arithmetic, that the arithmetical science is often doubtful. One teacher 'informed me with all gravity that 3/4 equals ·75, as a fact not generally known.' Another 'disputed the fact that $(2/3)^3$ equals 8/27.' The same comparison must be remembered where inefficiency is complicated with social exclusiveness. One mistress, of whom Mr. Fearon inquired 'whether she ever gave any simultaneous lessons to the junior classes, said that she should not think of trying such a plan with young ladies; such ways were only suitable to the schools of the poor.' ('Simultaneous' lessons may be ambiguous in meaning, but in Mr. Fearon's use they are probably equivalent to good class teaching, as opposed to an unsystematic 'hearing' of lessons from individuals in turn.) Hundreds of boys' schools are shown to lack such teaching, but no master is found to give so ingenious an excuse. 'A select school in Norwich,' described by Mr. Hammond, 'is not only not allowed to admit a tradesman's daughter, but the day scholars are confined to the children of families residing in or visiting with the Close.' But Mr. Fitch at Easingwold in Yorkshire found a boys' endowed school 'along the middle of which was a partition,

breast high, dividing the scholars into two groups. The master's desk was fixed in an elevated position, and dominated both divisions of the school. He explained to us that the free scholars were on one side and the paying scholars on the other. . . . Unless he kept the two classes of pupils . . . habitually apart, the more respectable parents would object to pay, and perhaps remove their children altogether.' The faults may sometimes belong less to girls' education as such than to the general life of the middle classes in the middle of the nineteenth century.

Yet the general ideal for girls was more cramped than that for boys, and the mother had more power over the private school than the father over the grammar school. 'If a girl begins to get interested in the school work,' says a Lancashire schoolmistress, 'and is seen in the evening busy over her theme, her mother comes to me and says, "Now, Miss, you must not make Augusta a blue." If I report that another does not try to improve herself in arithmetic, the mother says: "Well, you know I am anxious about her music, of course; but it doesn't really matter about her arithmetic, does it? Her husband will be able to do all her accounts for her, you know."' 'Boys are educated for the world,' says Mr. Bryce, 'and girls for the drawing-room.' One might question whether the Latin in a bad grammar school was preparing boys for the world even so well as bad piano-playing was preparing their sisters for the drawing-room. But at any rate the male was more likely than the unoccupied female to be pressed by his parents to undergo some intellectual fatigue.

Many schoolmistresses were clearly able and earnest women. When the inspection had once been accepted they found it valuable and desired to profit by it; and many even welcomed the idea of using the new public examinations. (The College of Preceptors' examinations had been instituted in 1853, the

Cambridge Locals in 1858.) Some, of course, were much more doubtful about this. 'A disheartening depression might be the result of failure, and it is desirable that girls should be kept in modest retirement.' (This at a time when girl pupil teachers were being examined every year of their lives.) Mr. Hammond considers carefully statements made to him about girls being liable to 'extraordinary excitement.' 'I ought perhaps to state that in one school two girls appeared to suffer from a kind of hysterical affection, and could not help screaming when stopped from answering out of their turn. But everywhere else I found the scholars perfectly cool and collected.'

III

The reform of the Grammar Schools was made possible by the Endowed Schools Act of 1869, a direct result of the Commission's report. A special 'Endowed Schools' Commission' was established with very wide powers of approving new schemes for dealing with endowments. Where bad machinery or inertia had blocked the way, reorganization frequently led to surprisingly good results; and the general spirit of reform, with better teachers sent out by the Universities, had free play in old schools as well as new. The Bradford Grammar School, for instance, in 1868 contained fifty-eight boys who were receiving a poor classical education in an atmosphere of 'general languor and feebleness.' 'I could see among the boys no evidence of interest in their work, or of desire to do it well.' Without adding any endowment, the new scheme was a means of transforming this institution into two schools of 530 boys and 300 girls, receiving the best education of the day.[1] In the ten years previous to 1871 it sent only five boys to the Universities and gained only one scholarship. 'In the ten years previous to 1893 it sent 108 boys, took 73

[1] See Leach, *Educational Charters*, where the scheme is given.

scholarships, 44 first classes, 4 fellowships, and 10 university scholarships and prizes. And a vast proportion of these honours were taken by boys who had been in public elementary schools.' [1]

Girls as well as boys were helped by the Commissioners wherever it was possible, and their work in this direction joined the current of wide independent movements of the time. The indispensable beginning had been made with University education for women—Queen's College and Bedford College in their first tentative form were at work before 1850, and Girton College in its first home at Hitchin was opened in 1869. New girls' schools might find a new supply of head mistresses, not all University trained, but affected by an opportunity and stimulus which had not been available for a past generation. The great names of Dorothea Beale, Frances Buss, Alice Otley and others are recorded in every history of nineteenth-century education. The Girls' Public Day School Company began in 1872 its work of founding schools all over England in which instruction might be found secure from the defects of 1868. For the many girls who must still depend on the home schoolroom Charlotte Mason began in 1887 her task of improving and organizing the work of private governesses, and making the Parents' National Education Union a wide channel for good literature and good learning.

When the next Commission on Secondary Education met in the 'nineties,[2] its membership included distinguished women teachers. In schools for boys and girls alike, its Report notes remarkable progress made in the twenty-seven years. 'The classical languages are taught more effectively than ever, but less as if they were dead, and more as if they still lived. . . . A place and a function have been found for modern languages

[1] Report of Bryce Committee on Secondary Education, 1895, I, p. 140.
[2] Bryce Commission on Secondary Education, 1895.

and literatures. . . . There has been a remarkable and growing use in education of certain physical sciences, whilst technical and manual instruction has risen and assumed . . . large proportions.' The business of this Commission was to deal no longer with the curriculum but with organization and supply. In considering this, we must look back at the official arrangements for elementary as well as for secondary schools.

CHAPTER XVII

A. THE CHIEF ACTS FOR NATIONAL EDUCATION, 1870–1920

I

For the first seventy years of the nineteenth century, no schools were provided by any public authority. Private persons, or endowments, or joint-stock companies provided them, and Parliament under certain conditions gave them aid out of public money. This aid was given to elementary schools under the auspices of the Privy Council Committee created in 1839; to secondary schools (if at all) under the Science and Art Department created in 1853.

It was in the larger undertaking—elementary schooling—that it first became evident that private enterprise was not adequate to its enormous task. In the 'sixties, as we realize now and as some people realized then, 'only about half the children of the country were educated at all, most of them very indifferently. England, for all her wealth, lagged far behind Scotland and several foreign countries.'[1] The Reform Act of 1867 extended the franchise. In 1870 the nation, to 'educate its masters,' took responsibility for seeing that schools were provided for all its children.

It did not take responsibility for providing them by direct public action, except where this could not be avoided. The Government of the day preferred to continue as far as possible with the voluntary system. To remedy a deficiency of

[1] C. M. Trevelyan: *History of the Nineteenth Century in England*, pp. 352–353.

schools in any district, the religious denominations were offered building grants during a period of grace. If they failed, or if the ratepayers explicitly asked for the alternative plan, a School Board was to be elected by that district, with power to levy a rate and to build and carry on a school. In such a school, religious instruction was to be undenominational.

We conceive elementary education as being naturally both free and compulsory, but neither of these points was prescribed in 1870. School fees were abolished in 1891 in most schools, and reduced in the remainder, but their last vestige did not disappear till the Act of 1918. Compulsion came in by degrees. School Boards from the beginning might compel attendance if they wished, and might pay the fees of necessitous children. In 1873 the children of parents receiving poor relief were obliged to attend. In 1876 a motive for absence was removed by forbidding the employment of children under 10; and power of enforcing attendance in voluntary-school districts was given to School Attendance Committees if they desired it. In 1880 attendance was made universally compulsory up to 10 years old. And so on by short steps. Universal full-time attendance up to 14 was not reached until the 1918 Act.

II

The Act of 1870 succeeded by degrees in placing a school ('voluntary' or 'Board') within the reach of every child. The disadvantages of the system adopted appeared as years went on. In the first place, as the standard of education gradually rose and the cost rose also, it became less and less possible to keep the voluntary schools up to the level of the rest. In 1870 the average cost of school maintenance was 25*s.* 5*d.* yearly for each child. No one at that time expected it to rise beyond 30*s.* But in 1897 the average Board School

was spending a little over 50*s.*, and the average voluntary school, in spite of special help from the Treasury, was 11*s.* 3*d.* short of this. Ten shillings of the difference went in better teaching—one school would have well-qualified teachers where the other had not. The rest might be a difference, small to the outsider but very real in school, in the quantity and quality of books, paper, maps, pens; in the comfort of the furniture for children's legs and backs; in the cleaning, lighting, warming, and ventilation of the rooms. Children paid a good deal for religious differences.

Other disadvantages becoming clear as all education advanced, were the isolation of elementary education from the rest, and its lying in the hands of a separate body for each small district. Where the district was very small or very rural, the schools lagged behind. Where it was comparatively large and progressive, the School Boards were found inevitably to be trying to provide for something more than elementary instruction. The point was all the more puzzling since 'elementary education' has never to this day been defined. But the auditors of public accounts began to rule that, definition or no definition, a School Board which provided the teaching of French and which sent up classes for Science and Art examinations was doing something illegal.

Meanwhile a different arrangement began to seem possible after our modern system of local government, with its City Councils and County Councils elected for general purposes, had been created in 1888. In the following year these bodies, not the School Boards, were empowered to provide for technical and manual instruction. The fact was significant.

Meanwhile also the problem of the secondary schools had been forced before the public mind. The Schools Inquiry Commission in 1868 had recommended public responsibility and control for these, but Parliament was not ready for such a view, and good schools as well as bad were opposed to it

(perhaps with justification when they looked at the contemporary way of controlling the elementary schools). The Commission on Secondary Education in 1895 repeated the recommendation with more chance of effect. In spite of the great improvements since their predecessors' inquiry, private endeavour had still failed to produce an adequate supply of secondary schools. It was time, they said, for the State to act; and to act by other means than the present rather distorting device of paying grants for instruction in Science and Art.

III

Out of these conditions came the great Act of 1902. An Act of 1899 prepared the way by unifying the central control. For the Privy Council Committee, and the Science and Art Department, and the Charity Commissioners who had inherited the Endowed Schools Commissioners' duties of supervising endowment schemes, this Act substituted a single Board of Education. Then in 1902 the School Boards were abolished, and the local authority in charge of general administrative work was made also the local authority for education. In the large towns the City Council, in the villages the County Council, became responsible for elementary schools and empowered to provide higher schools. Small towns were made responsible for their own elementary education, but the higher education was put in the hands of the County. The voluntary schools were boldly put 'on the rates' like the others. They retained denominational instruction, and certain privileges of management, but the managers' responsibility was now reduced to the mere provision of the buildings.[1]

[1] A Board School, since the disappearance of the School Board, has been known as a 'provided' school, on the ground that the building is provided by the public authority. The former voluntary school is called non-provided,—an awkward pair of terms.

This levelling up of the elementary schools (though an old building may often be a terrible handicap), and the great (though still inadequate) provision of secondary schools, and the systematic supply of free places and scholarships by which selected children may pass along the road which is still too narrow—all these were made possible by the Act of 1902, and even within their present limits they have gone far to transform the education of England.

Incidentally, they are gradually (very gradually) transforming the staffing of the elementary schools. The pupil-teacher's apprenticeship has been shortened, and postponed by one step after another, to leave room for education before teaching begins, until now it is common for the future teacher to spend the years from 11 or 12 to 17 at a secondary school, and then to go on to a Training College or University with or without the insertion of one year of teaching practice between school and college.

IV

The third very important Act, that of 1918, has still to come to full fruition. It completes the abolition of fees in State-aided elementary schools, and completes the compulsion of attendance up to 14. It requires for the first time (as distinct from merely permitting) that local authorities shall concern themselves with higher education as well as with elementary, and asks them to submit schemes for the progressive development and comprehensive organization of education in their area. It has a number of provisions for administrative convenience, and for liberalizing the functions on which money may be spent—permitting camps and playing fields and baths, social and physical training, and nursery schools for babies, and requiring practical instruction suited to the ages of the children. Finally, it introduces a large and very interesting requirement—compulsory part-

time education up to 18 (320 hours a year) for all who have not had the equivalent of a secondary education up to 16. At present this part of the Act is suspended, and it is impossible to say what will ultimately be done.

V

It may be worth while to give a few figures to conclude this chapter, though exact figures go rapidly out of date. (i) The public elementary schools in England and Wales contain about 6,000,000 children, many times more than all the other schools put together. (ii) Of these 6,000,000, about one child in ten afterwards enters a secondary school. (iii) In the year 1920–21, of the total number of fifteen-year-old boys and girls (taking rich and poor together) about six in every seven had already left school.

B. THE GROWTH OF ADULT EDUCATION

I

Side by side with the increasing extent of schooling for children during the last two hundred years, we see the increase, very slow at first, of opportunities for those whose school-days were over or had never been. The S.P.C.K. minute-book in 1700 makes note, as the reader will remember, of adult persons who received free instruction in Reading and Serious Principles from John Reynolds and John Pierson, and the eighteenth century makes a good beginning with the religious movement represented by the Adult Schools. This is one line of growth. Another came with the Industrial Revolution, when the engineers and mechanics (to whom

the changing times had brought, as compared with their fellow-workers, less loss and more gain) desired to know more of the principles of their work, and of the world in general. Thus Mechanics' Institutes, self-governing and self-supporting, began with the nineteenth century and flourished during its first forty years.[1] A third step was taken when working-class desires and the interest of educated friends united to produce the first working-men's Colleges, notably that in London opened in 1854 by Frederick Maurice, with the help of John Ruskin on the staff.

II

Meanwhile in the 'forties and 'fifties as the day schools for children multiplied, so under the same influences did the night schools for those who (by courtesy at any rate) were no longer children. The Newcastle Report in 1861 (pp. 41–42) quotes some of the accounts of its investigators. 'I saw a little fellow 12 years of age,' says Mr. Fraser, 'who worked twelve hours a day at a coach-maker's, who shortened his dinner hour by half an hour to get his work forward, and be able to leave the shop at half-past seven in time for his evening school.' At Lyme Regis 'among those who were there that night were two lads of 18 or 19, who were going to Exeter gaol the next day, having been committed by the magistrates for some 5th of November freak with squibs or tar-barrels. The prospect did not prevent their coming to school till the last moment.'

At Wells, reports Mr. Cumin, 'I found the Bishop himself teaching a class of navvies to read and cypher. I witnessed with admiration these brawny men come into the room with clean smock frocks and newly washed hands and faces, having walked a distance of more than two miles to pursue their

[1] One such institution is now the Birkbeck College, the centre for evening students in the London University.

studies. Every one had his reason for coming, and one of the most intelligent had the ambition of rising to be an engine driver. The fact is, as the superintendent of locomotives at Bristol said, these men know that some of the richest contractors have risen from being mere navvies, but that such a position is impossible to reach without a knowledge of reading, writing, and arithmetic, but especially the last, in order that they may be able to measure work.'

'On one occasion,' says Mr. Winder, 'I was examining a class of young men at Rochdale, when the hour for breaking up arrived. I was about to stop, when one of the scholars appealed to me, "Go thou on; we want as much as we can get for our money." In another school at Bradford I found a class most industriously learning reading and arithmetic at once. Each scholar had by his side a Bible and a slate. When his turn came, he read his verse, laid down the book the instant he had finished, and then went on with the sum till the circuit was again complete.'

We can see, however, that this zeal must mark a transitional state. When ten years later the supply and the standard of day-school instruction began rapidly to improve, lads of such intelligence and such ambition would no longer be left in great numbers to gather mere reading and arithmetic at night. The Cross Commission in the 'eighties found evening school attendance at a low ebb. They had the insight to set the schools on a new upward path by turning them into true continuation schools, no longer occupied with merely elementary subjects; and were thus the founders of the flourishing Evening Institutes of London and other great towns to-day.

These institutions, and the surviving Mechanics' Institutes, and the Polytechnics provided by philanthropists from 1880 onwards, all benefited alike by the growing interest in science and the movement for technical education. State and charit-

able funds were now available in greater measure than before, and it has sometimes been no more than the accident of the greater or smaller wealth of local benefactors that has decided whether or not the local centre of adult education should swell into a University College, and finally into a new University.

III

One other movement has still to be added—the last and perhaps the greatest in its effect. The last fifty years—the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the first quarter of the twentieth—have seen an extraordinary deepening and extension of public interest in social and economic science and history. In this atmosphere, shared by University men and working-men alike, there came to birth the most characteristic of our recent institutions. The first residential college for working people, Ruskin College at Oxford, was founded in 1899. The Workers' Educational Association began its remarkable work in 1903, and has carried it on in close connexion with the Universities, endeavouring to bring liberal education in any subject to all such as desire it. In economic subjects, this work is flanked by the definitely denominational movements represented by the Plebs League and Central Labour College on the one hand, and the newly-opened Philip Stott College on the other.

IV

Meanwhile we shall do well to remember certain obstacles which still impede the studies of the greater part of the nation.

'My hours of work during the past ten years,' states a goods checker in the service of a railway company, 'during which time I have been a student of non-vocational subjects, have been between sixty and seventy a week.' A North Staffordshire colliery surface labourer referring to the position

of surface workers says: 'They check on at 6 o'clock a.m. and leave at 5 o'clock p.m. You generally find the collieries are outside the towns and are miles away from social activity. This means to the workers that they have to rise at 3 o'clock and they arrive home between 6 and 7 o'clock at night.' . . . A Newcastle-on-Tyne witness says: 'The effect of the shift system will be shown by an example—that of a teemer in a coal dock. For some years past his studies have been carried on as follows: During the day-shift week he is able to work in the evenings. On the night-shift week the labour is so exhausting that he generally finds it impossible to do any study at all; he simply works and sleeps.' . . .

A class secretary, speaking on his many years' experience in a large industrial town, says: 'Unemployment, when all the future is uncertain, is even more distressing and demoralizing. The writer has seen keen, able students suddenly unemployed through no fault of their own, steadily deteriorate with the long anxiety and the daily fruitless search for work until they are no longer able to continue, or to take pleasure in their studies; and it has been distressing to see such students who formerly were moved by the strongest educational desire, fall to pieces as it were, and eventually lose touch with the movement.'

'The evidence of a Leeds Tutorial Class student, a woollen-fettler, is: 'Housing conditions are against the worker being able to do justice to any subject that he would like to study. Even now, after the family has gone to bed, I am writing these few remarks. Ours, like many thousand more in Leeds, is one of the back-to-back houses: one living-room and that is all. It is my study, and the dining-room, kitchen and all combined; and I am writing now after working fourteen hours without a stop.'

'It is often overlooked that the housewife engaged in domestic duties is in some ways one of the worst sufferers

from long hours of work, and is consequently largely debarred from participation in educating and social amenities. . . . Her difficulties are aggravated by the present cramped, ill-arranged houses. . . . An adequate scheme of housing reform is of vital importance to women, and upon it will depend in no small measure the extent to which they will be able . . . to develop intellectual interests.'

From such passages of a Report issued in 1918 [1] we may turn to a historian in 1851 : [2]

'The unexampled efforts now making in every part of the kingdom for the intellectual and physical improvement of the lower classes of the community, distinguish the present, as the age of philanthropy and good will to all men. . . . The beloved Sovereign of these realms lends her fair and royal name in behalf of Bazaars, to increase the stores of Institution Libraries. The lawned Divine, and the ermined Duke feel a pleasure in presiding over the festivals of the artizan and the day labourer.' 'The middle classes vie with the rich in promoting the great and good work of education. The brightest minds in literature and science direct their talents to its development; preparing the ignorant by addresses, by lectures, and by their writings, to receive and understand the great and interesting truths which the Creator unfolds before them.'

We realize perhaps better than our great-grandfathers the magnitude and the indirectness of some of the preparation that is needed.

[1] Interim Report of the Committee on Adult Education (Industrial and Social Conditions in Relation to Adult Education). Cd. 9107.

[2] J. W. Hudson, Ph.D. : *The History of Adult Education*, 1851.

PART III

CHAPTER XVIII

REFLECTIONS AFTER SURVEYING EDUCATION

I

'In nothing,' writes Mr. Leach, 'not even in religion, has the innate conservatism of the human race been more marked than in education. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the subjects and methods of education remained the same from the days of Quintilian to the days of Arnold, from the first century to the mid-nineteenth century of the Christian era.' [1]

It is relevant to remember that civilization itself, viewed in the large, showed hardly more change until near the end of this time. Much the same life, of the small farm and the small-scale industry and the small market town, of travel on foot or with horses or sailing-ships, unites the neolithic age with the later eighteenth century. When towards the end of that century the great changes began, a change in education followed, about half a century behind, and moving slowly at first and unevenly always, as the wider changes had moved and are moving.

The gap is only to be expected, whether we consider the great movement or the little ripples. When the thought of an age moves, its leaders have other things to think about

[1] A. F. Leach: *Educational Charters and Documents*, p. ix.

than the course of education. Educational consequences must usually be worked out by disciples, and the disciples are likely to be chiefly the younger men, whose chance to apply their ideas on a large scale may not come for a good many years. Even then there will be no wide effect until a generation later, when they have sent out pupils to become mature teachers in their turn. Moreover, the thought of an age does not move in one piece. Those whom we select as the characteristic thinkers of their generation are usually the pioneers with whom their generation as a whole does not yet agree. At every moment, in the different groups and strata of society, the thoughts of a dozen centuries exist side by side. We may say that Darwin was a characteristic figure of the nineteenth century, but in the twentieth century protests are made in England and America against the acquaintance of youth with the doctrine of evolution.[1]

The growth of knowledge by itself is clearly not enough to change the substance of the school curriculum. A subject may be making great progress in the world of scholars, yet be far from the point at which its content can be expressed so simply and reasonably as to make it suitable for the minds of children. Comenius wrote good textbooks in Latin and very bad ones in Physics. Arithmetic long made progress outside the schools; but which of us would have undertaken in the sixteenth century to teach the 'first four rules' for the benefit of the 7-year-old? Those interested may

[1] A writer in 1839 condemns Greek logic exactly as it was condemned in the early Church. 'It must be remembered that Aristotle's is a heathen system; and it may well be looked upon with wonder and suspicion, that a heathen philosopher should so long have given laws . . . to Christians. Aristotle's system of reasoning is not consistent with Holy Scripture; and he has himself used it to disprove some of the fundamental truths of revelation. The sacred authors adopt a style of reasoning which is wholly opposite to it in character; and it is impossible but that the habit of mind acquired by the study of the Organon, must greatly unfit the proficient for the examination of Scriptural truth.' (S. R. Bosanquet: *A New System of Logic.*)

look up Miss Cunnington's delightful *Story of Arithmetic* to see how it was done by cyphering masters for the benefit of clerks and business men.

If it is proposed to teach to older students a subject newly opened out where new ground is being broken, the objection may usually be justly brought that the knowledge is still unorganized, scrappy, and superficial. It is difficult to break new ground except by beginning with the surface; whether the subject be the re-discovered Greek of the fifteenth century or the economics and craft-work of the twentieth. If the subject is of living interest, its content may be either 'controversial' or 'popular,' and both are terms of reproach, rightly or wrongly, in most actual discussions. Anyhow the new subject, in the fifteenth century, or the twentieth, is likely to involve the appointment of new teachers. And the same obstacle of finance obstructs the way of students contemplating a subject which is not yet established; where the circuit of study-leading-to-earning is not yet complete.

But we must admit finally that in our trade as in every other an immense weight of our hard-worked human nature leans to conservatism. When the inexperienced teacher or parent is confronted with the problem of a child to be educated, he brings to it not the hypothetical fresh and empty mind, but a mind with a history, a mind filled and formed by his own bringing-up and by tradition and memories and hearsay. He clings to remembered scraps as to supporting planks in the ocean—a statement which may be tested by anyone who attacks a new unstudied practical task. At first the need of keeping things going somehow may be too confusing and overwhelming to allow of new thought. Afterwards his leisure for thought comes only when he is tired, or when he is preoccupied with the pressing matters of each day, and he defers to another time, or refers to other people, the question of what education in general should be. He has enough

to do in doing justice in the established ways to the children already in his charge. Finally he reaches the assurance of the elderly man, that what he has always known must be the best.

In trades where machines work upon lifeless material, the harm of too great a sameness may be no more than that possible improvements are missed. But in a work knit together by human relationships the effects are worse, for upon lack of growth follow staleness and conventionalization. Aristophanes tried to make Greek education stand still in the shape which he had known in his own boyhood, but its life was too strong. We look back and see its growing days in a golden glory; and it was fortunate perhaps in the moment of its death, or rather in the moment at which historians cease to call it Greek. With Quintilian, we find the study of oratory already stereotyped; ready to dry up further during the few centuries before darkness covered it—darkness in which new arts were beginning to grow. Vittorino and his fellows took Quintilian's teaching into a new world and made it new for the time; but three centuries later much of classical education was a mere shell, waiting for the coming of a new spirit which partly used it and partly broke it to pieces. Mathematics came into the schools by slow degrees as something adventurous and fresh, but as the nineteenth century waned an adventurous mind found their treatment 'narrow, stylistic, unambitious, hedged in by the artificialities which so rapidly grow round a self-centred subject.' [1] This reformer turned to applied science as his centre; it was complex, he said, 'and apparently difficult, yet it had romance and mystery which appealed to youth. Moreover, it was in direct contact with the ordinary life, the home life of the day. It was always progressing; there was less inducement to become conventional and stagnant and to fall a prey to

[1] *Life of Sanderson of Oundle*, p. 77.

stereotyped methods than there was in the study of general principles only.' [1] Yet a hundred manufactories and technical schools could surely bear witness that not even this subject can automatically keep itself alive.

There is no automatic safeguard. No subject and no curriculum can dispense with the teacher's periodic effort of heart and mind, or with his sensitiveness to growing possibilities and changing needs. The central problem of organization is to safeguard and promote such high diligence and such awareness, and to help them to their full effect.

II

'Clearly, he said, whether in actual battle or on a march, it will make all the difference whether a general is or is not a geometrician.'

'Yes, I said, but for that purpose a very little of either geometry or calculation will be enough. The question relates rather to the greater and more advanced part of geometry—whether that tends in any degree to make more easy the vision of the idea of good.'

(Plato: *Republic*, Bk. 7. 526 D.)

For many reasons besides those already given, the question of the essentials of education is raised by the intelligent outsider more often than by the man who is immersed in the work; and the outsider tends to go straight to what he feels to be a clear point. A Greek soldier and country gentleman in the fourth century B.C., describing a Utopia which he named Persia, said that 'the boys attending the public schools pass their time there in learning justice; and say that they go there for this purpose, as those with us say who go to learn to read.' [2] A French lawyer and country gentleman in the sixteenth century A.D. set forth the same idea:

'Our child has no time to lose: he cannot give more than fifteen or sixteen years of his life to schooling. . . . Let us use this brief space for essential teaching. We are wasteful: I know the

[1] *Op cit.*, p. 64.
[2] Xenophon; *Cyropædia.*

thorny subtleties of Logic, which can in nowise avail our lives: take philosophy's simple teachings . . . a child, leaving his nurse, can understand them better than he can learn to read or write. . . . I agree with Plutarch that Aristotle did not waste his great pupil's time [1] on the trick of making syllogisms . . . but rather taught him the rules of valour, prowess, magnanimity, and temperance, and that confidence which knows no fear: and, thus armed, he despatched him—a child still in years—to conquer the whole world. . . .' [2]

Let us assume for a moment (leaving it for argument later) that Montaigne and Xenophon are suggesting a reasonable purpose for education; and let us ask how far our schooling is fulfilling that purpose, or making progress in fulfilling it. The influence of schooling on the growing child will depend partly on the teacher's character and personality, partly on the organization of study and of the whole school life, and partly on what is learnt. Let us take each factor in turn.

As to the character of the teacher, this is a matter in which improvement of the average level should be expected, rather than improvement of the best. The world has never lacked a succession of wise and kindly men who have cared for the helplessness of youth, though there have never been enough of them. Quintilian, Vittorino, John Brinsley, Lewis Paton, stand in a true line; and the saints of all generations partake of an eternal life which does not change its nature with the progress of time. So far educational history, like religious, is not a journey but a continual reinspiration.

But the detailed ideas and customs of the saint may vary immensely in value in different generations, and here we may have true landmarks on a road. Some mark the growth of better customs or ideals, some are the fruitful inventions which help to make that growth possible. The invention of writing; the invention of printing; the multiplication of

[1] I.e. Alexander's.
[2] Michel de Montaigne: *On the Upbringing of Children.*

good books in the widest sense of the phrase; all these surely we note upon the journey. In our last hundred years, the marks are crowded—from Arnold's Rugby and Thring's Uppingham to the Perse School and the Little Commonwealth; from the school laboratory to the school camp; the steady growth of classroom humanity and civilization, and the fitful growth in beauty; the boys' workshop, and the apparatus for the individual work of young children. May we not hold that the small child in a good infants' school, learning to tackle his own reading-sheet and to help his weaker neighbour and to take his turn in the school work and play, is learning 'the rules of valour, prowess, magnanimity, and temperance' as truly as the young Alexander? We prepare the way for justice in the world of men by exercising it in the world of childhood.

Thirdly, what of the content of school studies and their effect upon the national life?

'There can be no better illustration,' writes Dr. Rashdall, 'of the nonsense commonly talked about the moralizing and elevating effects—I will not say of education—but of mere instruction than the annals of the mediæval Schools. The average mediæval scholar was much better instructed, much more cultivated (in so far as purely intellectual training communicates culture) than the mass of the working class can ever be on leaving school. Yet his habits, his manners and moral tone generally were in many ways no better than those of the roughest and most uncivilized classes of modern society. From an evening tour through some of the worst dens and alleys of Seven Dials and Ratcliffe Highway, before the institution of the Metropolitan Police, there might have been gathered some faint conception of what life in a mediæval University town must have been like at the end of the thirteenth century.' [1]

[1] Rashdall: *Universities of Europe*, Vol. III, p. 687.

This is not a criticism of secularized education. The mediæval scholar's upbringing was under the control of Churchmen from the beginning to the end, and every science was a handmaid to Theology. Education of any kind is clearly not enough by itself to produce an immediately orderly general life. Of its immediate effects, we can only say that an educated person is enabled to share the ethos of the educated persons of his age; that the way for justice has some obstacles removed from it. It has the kind of obstacle removed, for instance, which Mr. Baring indicates in his description of a Russian scene—people watching the casting of a great bell: The three policemen 'were trying with all their might to keep back the crowd, so that when the metal was released a disaster should not happen; but their efforts were in vain, because the crowd was large, and when they pressed back a small portion of it they made a dent in it which caused the remaining part of it to bulge out; and it was the kind of crowd—so intensely typical of Russia—on which no words, whether of command, entreaty, or threat, made the smallest impression.' [1]

A more educated nation can understand words, and share a common life more widely. But each member, for the time, is likely to reproduce the defects of the common life and opinion.

'In a letter (September, 1880) to the Mayor of Manchester, Sir William Harcourt pointed out that in a single year 6,000 children between the ages of 12 and 16, and 720 under the age of 12, were sent to prison. In a long letter to the Queen, who had not approved of some remissions of sentences, he said: "Many of these cases were for trifling offences, as, for instance, a boy of 9 years old for throwing stones, several boys of 11 and 12 years for damaging grass by running about in the fields . . . several boys of 12 and 13 for bathing in a canal . . . a boy of nine for stealing scent . . . a boy of 10 for

[1] Maurice Baring: *The Puppet Show of Memory*, p. 383.

wilfully damaging timber. This morning a case is reported of a boy of 10 years old sentenced to fourteen days' hard labour or a fine of £1 15*s.* 3*d.* for "unlawfully throwing down a boarded fence," and the Governor of Prisons reports this child as a small delicate boy who can neither read nor write.' [1]

In spite of the last note, the magistrates of 1880 probably saw in these cases the failure of education to cure juvenile delinquency; whilst we see in them, forty years later, the failure of education to moralize magistrates. The Howard Association and the Penal Reform League have had to supplement the schools; but at any rate the schools have enabled these associations to exist, and have enabled their hearers to understand.

In 1888, again, the History of the S.P.C.K. records that Major Elliot, chief magistrate at Umtata, wrote to the Society: 'I estimate that not less than 500 persons are annually smelt out and put to death (frequently by the most appalling tortures, far too terrible to describe) in Pondoland, upon charges of witchcraft. The acceptance of Christianity would certainly abolish this terrible crime.' No doubt that is true, if acceptance of Christianity implies accepting the guidance of modern Christian missionaries. But in Christian Europe between 1500 and 1700 not less than three-quarters of a million persons (an average of ten a day) were arrested for witchcraft, horribly tortured, and finally burnt alive.[2] What shall we say here? That education was powerless against this blackness, seeing that many of these Christian judges were highly educated men? or that a more widely spread education, and a different education, finally abolished it in Europe? A commentator in an interesting article [3] suggests

[1] A. G. Gardiner: *Life of Sir William Harcourt*, Vol. I, pp. 394–395.

[2] See E. T. Withington, 'Dr. John Weyer and the Witch Mania,' in Dr. Singer's *Studies in the History and Method of Science*, Vol. I.

[3] 'Witches and Evidence,' by S., in *The Nation and Athenæum*, March 3, 1923.

that the advance of science has done much to foster 'a certain vague but widely diffused estimate of probabilities, a sense of rationality,' which, if it has not disproved witchcraft, at any rate has raised the standard of evidence that investigators require. 'At Lindheim, a woman confessed, under torture, that she had dug up and carried off the body of an infant. She named four other women as her accomplices. But it happened that the grave was opened and the body of the infant found uninjured. Such evidence was held to be irrelevant in face of the confessions, and all five women were burned.' 'Since science has done a great deal to bring about this increase in rationality, and since, as long as science is respected, those old manias cannot flourish, we must preserve an underlying respect for the scientific mind. For, seeing how horrible the alternatives may be, we must hold fast to this rigorous standard of truthfulness, this cautious scepticism, this unexcited sanity, as one of the chief and most indispensable elements in our present-day standing as human beings.'

It is a most difficult question. Perhaps for this particular change the most important condition was the advance in humane law which brought the use of torture to an end. But the general spread of knowledge which a general education makes possible (still abstracting from the 'character' side of schooling) must at any rate prepare a state of things in which advances can happen. Man's power of assessing evidence, and his standard of humanity in law, both depend very largely on his framework of general ideas; on the world of thought which he shares with his fellows in a smaller or in a larger circle. As more of a nation comes to share a common world and to use a larger common framework, at first they may merely multiply the minds in which the defects of those ideas can live. Yet they yield more room for the ideas to modify one another, and for good thought to prove its worth. More minds become able to criticize on this point

or on that, to construct here or there; and the suggestion can travel more easily.

One of the most important effects of the spread of knowledge is a negative and destructive effect. An ignorant community does not feel itself to be standing in a vast unknown world; it knows much more about it than the more instructed know. The Hindu peasant knows that disease comes, if not because his neighbour has bewitched him, then because Englishmen have poisoned the wells; or because the gods are angry, and he usually knows why they are angry. The Mendip miner knew why Miss More wished to bring his children into the schools: it was because, if they were under her instruction for seven years, she would then have legal power over them and could sell them into slavery.[1] Absence of knowledge does not leave a blank; it leaves tangled cobweb masses which multiply themselves.

We need not seek examples of this only in the illiterate part of a nation. For each of us, a chief work of study is to push back the walls of our world and to show us how much of it is hidden in twilight. When in some department of our life we cease to study, that department stays, or becomes, small and set and clear. By middle age most of the universe is far too clear to most of us.

III

Perhaps, then, we are paving the way for the advance of justice, even though the boys say only that they go to school to learn to read. Yet the complaint of Montaigne and Xenophon never quite dies down. Much of our instruction always seems to some onlooker to be irrelevant to the greatest and most necessary affairs; just as to eager or troubled reformers the doings of politicians seem so often to be nothing but a game.

Part of the honest answer of educators must be that, in

[1] Adamson: *Short History*, p. 234.

education as in politics, and as in everything that is part of human life, irrelevance always does exist. We have continually to be trying to purge it away and to put the more relevant in its place; but this is not a simple or an easy task. Superficial thinkers ask with indignation of their companions, 'Why can't you say what you mean?' 'Why don't you keep to the point?'; as if these were easy achievements. Superficial writers bring against whole professions or nations or classes an accusation of 'persistently shutting their eyes to reality'; as if we needed to shut our eyes. Reality and relevance, whether in philosophy, in law-making, in religion, or in the teaching of the elementary school, are hardly won; and are kept only by continual effort and self-criticism and new life.

Part of the answer, again, will be that successful teaching leads not only to knowledge but to interest and love, that much (though not all) of injustice and suffering comes from the lack of better things to think about and better things to do; indeed that some of the worst injustice of our human world not merely comes from this but consists in this.

And thus perhaps we are led to the rest of the answer we would give when we try to conceive the essential purpose of a world-education. We shall take our phrases from Plato and Aristotle rather than from Xenophon. Justice, said the first, consists in every man doing his own work; in a world so guided by wisdom and permeated with sympathy that the work of each forwards the work of all. Happiness, said the second, is an activity of the soul in the direction of excellence in an unhampered life. The work must be an element in something worth doing; worthy to be the foundation of the Thesis in our first chapter. Truth must be loved and sought, beauty must be loved and made, fellow-creatures must be loved and served; and we must seek to set the child and the man free, each for that co-operative part in the world's work which he was born to do; the work which

includes play and the life which includes dying. Thus we shall have the first chapter's Antithesis achieved—the soul of each fulfilling itself in its own fitting activity in the direction of excellence.

IV

Let the whole period of life on the earth (we said in the first chapter) be represented by fifty years. The life of human and sub-human races is contained on this scale in the last month of those fifty years; the institutions of civilization are contained in the last eight hours. Quintilian wrote less than two hours ago: Arnold worked in the last ten minutes. 'While believing in Moral Progress as a fact,' says a modern writer,[1] 'I also believe that we are much nearer to the beginnings of it than the end.' We may do well to accustom ourselves to the same thought on educational progress.

As for thesis and antithesis, objective and subjective, intension and extension, neither can ever be dropped, but each age and group must lay its special stress on one or the other, and we need not be ashamed if the teacher's work of distribution even more than the scholar's and artist's and poet's work of creation characterizes our own lifetime. 'A superficial, popularizing, vulgarizing age,' say some critics, and we must not shut our ears to any true criticism; but we must never give up the difference, for the Eternal Ideas, between withering and seeding. Thesis and antithesis go side by side in the same progress; if they fail, it is together. Man, generation by generation, looks on his children in the little space between darkness and darkness, lit by such form of Deity as he is able to perceive; and one voice in his heart says: 'Here, Lord, is still a seed to serve,' whilst the other says, 'The God of our fathers bless the lads.'

[1] Principal Jacks.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READING

THE outstanding English account of the general history of education since the fall of the Roman Empire is now J. W. Adamson's *Short History of Education* (1922). The reader should also consult Professor Adamson's little *Guide to the History of Education* (S.P.C.K., 1920); and the bibliographies given in his chapters on the subject contributed to the Cambridge History of English Literature, Vols. 9 and 14 (periods 1660–1750 and 1750–1902 respectively).

A general sketch, slight but suggestive, is given by Kenneth Richmond, *The Permanent Values in Education*, 1917. Mention should also be made of *The Children of England*, by J. J. Findlay, 1923.

The leading investigator of the history of English Schools has been A. F. Leach. Consult first his *Schools of Mediæval England* (1915, with bibliography); and *Educational Charters and Documents*, 598 to 1909. Professor Foster Watson has also done much similar work; e.g. his *English Grammar Schools to* 1660 (1908).

For special sections of the history the following works will be found useful. Adamson's *Guide* gives many more, including French and German books. English writers only are referred to here.

GREECE.

Kenneth J. Freeman: *Schools of Hellas.* 1907.
J. Drever: *Greek Education.* 1912.
For the general background, consult:
A. E. Zimmern: *The Greek Commonwealth.* 3rd Ed., 1922.
Gilbert Murray: *The Rise of the Greek Epic.* 2nd Ed., 1911.
„ „ *Ancient Greek Literature.* 1897.

ROME.

A. S. Wilkins, *Roman Education.* 1905.

A.D. 1–1000.

Geraldine Hodgson: *Primitive Christian Education.* 1906.
F. H. Swift: *Education in Ancient Israel, to* 70 A.D. 1919.
H. O. Taylor: *The Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages.*
Charles Bigg: *The Church's Task under the Roman Empire.* 1905.
P. R. Cole: *Later Roman Education.* New York, 1909 (Columbia University contributions to education. No 27).
E. Brehaut: *An Encyclopædist of the Dark Ages* (Columbia College studies in History. Vol. 48), No. 1. 1912.
J. B. Mullinger: *The Schools of Charles the Great.* 1877.

LATER MEDIÆVAL.

Hastings Rashdall: *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages.* 1895.

R. S. Rait: *Life in the Mediæval University.* 1912.

F. Warre Cornish: *Chivalry.* 1901.

The rhymed treatises quoted in Ch. 5 of the present book are reprinted in *The Babees' Book,* Early English Text Society, 1868 (edited by F. J. Furnivall).

RENAISSANCE.

W. H. Woodward: *Vittorino da Feltre and other Humanist Educators.* 1897.

„ *Studies in Education during the Age of the Renaissance.* 1906.

J. A. Symonds: *The Revival of Learning.* 1877.

P. S. Allen: *The Age of Erasmus.* 1914.

17TH AND 18TH CENTURIES.

J. W. Adamson: *Pioneers of Modern Education,* 1600–1700.

M. W. Keatinge: *Introduction to Translation of Comenius' 'Great Didactic.'* 1905.

J. Morley: *Life of Rousseau,* 1896.

EXPANSION OF EDUCATION SINCE 1760.

Two Hundred Years: The Story of the S.P.C.K.

A. Gregory: *Robert Raikes: A History of the Origin of Sunday Schools.* 1880.

R. and C. C. Southey: *Life of Dr. Bell* (3 vols.). 1844.

David Salmon: *Joseph Lancaster.* 1904.

F. Smith: *Life of James Kay-Shuttleworth.*

A. Dobbs: *Education and Social Movements,* 1700–1850. (1919.)

Thomas Guthrie: *Seed-Time and Harvest of Ragged Schools.* 1860.

Matthew Arnold's Reports.

Sir Graham Balfour: *The Educational Systems of Great Britain and Ireland.* 2nd Ed. 1903.

A. W. Newton: *The English Elementary School.* 1919.

Edmund Holmes: *What Is and What Might Be.* 1911.

„ „ *In Quest of an Ideal.* An Autobiography. 1920.

C. Birchenough: *History of Elementary Education in England and Wales from* 1800. (1914.)

R. L. Archer: *Secondary Education in the Nineteenth Century.* 1921.

INDEX