

THE EDUCATIONAL PRINCIPLES
OF RICHARD MULCASTER

THE EDUCATIONAL PRINCIPLES OF RICHARD MULCASTER

By

SISTER MARY MARTINA BURKE, O.S.B.

Bachelor of Arts

Catholic College of Oklahoma

Guthrie, Oklahoma

Submitted to the Department of English
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

1940

LIBRARY
OKLAHOMA AGRICULTURAL
AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE
GUTHRIE, OKLA.

OKLAHOMA
AGRICULTURAL & MECHANICAL COLLEGE
LIBRARY
OCT 24 1940

APPROVED:

George H. White

In Charge of Thesis

M. D. Cluff

Professor of English

D. C. M. Ingham

Dean of Graduate School

129094

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to Professor George H. White for his helpful suggestions and criticisms, and to Miss Margaret Walters of the library staff for her assistance in library research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Chapter I	
Biography of Richard Mulcaster	1
Chapter II	
The Educational Principles of Mulcaster	13
Chapter III	
Mulcaster's Position in the History of Education	49

CHAPTER I

RICHARD MULCASTER

Since little is known of Richard Mulcaster (1530-1611), the subject of this paper, the following biography will enable the reader to connect him with personages and events of the time in which he lived.

He was born in the old border tower of Brackenhill Castle on the River Line, in Cumberland County, England,¹ of an ancient and honorable family which for centuries had been of importance on the Border.² According to an old pedigree drawn up in Queen Elizabeth's time and kept intact until 1867 there were two branches of the family founded by a Sir William Mulcastre in the thirteenth century. The older branch died out in the third generation but the younger branch headed by Richard, the younger son of Sir William, prospered through the centuries handing down the old ideas and ideals until the death of the last Richard Mulcaster about 1828.³

Naturally these ideas and ideals, those of the gentry, influenced the lives of the members of the Mulcaster family through the generations and especially that of their outstanding sixteenth century member, Richard Mulcaster, the educator, and often made it hard for him to adjust himself to the conditions which surrounded him especially after he

¹R. H. Quick, in app. to his ed. of Positions, by Richard Mulcaster (London, 1888), p. 299.

²"Richard Mulcaster," DNB, XXXIX, 275.

³Quick, op. cit., p. 300.

was through force of circumstances compelled to earn his livelihood as headmaster of the school established by the up and coming burgers of the Merchant Taylor's Guild.

His education made adjustment to the demands of the patrons of the guild school difficult for him, for his father, Sir Richard, had sent both his sons, Richard and James, to Eton. Eton was, at that time, conducted by the great Udall, headmaster from 1534 to 1543, whose memory is kept alive for us by Tusser in his Metrical Autobiography, in which he says of Udall:

From Pauls I went, To Eton sent,
To learn straight ways The Latin phrase
When fifty-three Stripes given to me,
At once I had,
For fault but small, Or none at all,
It came to pass That beat I was,
See, Udall, see! The mercy of thee
To me poor lad.⁴

It was here, probably, that Richard learned to be such a strict disciplinarian and also developed the love of dramatic composition.

In 1548 Richard Mulcaster was elected from Eton to King's College, Cambridge, but for an unknown reason did not take his degree from Cambridge, going instead to Oxford, where in 1555 he was elected student of Christ Church and in 1556 was "licensed to proceed in Arts," or take his Master's degree.⁵

While here he gained distinction for his knowledge of Eastern literature, especially Hebrew, which caused Hugh Broughton, "the great English Rabbi," to give him the title of "best Hebrew scholar of the age."⁶ The very fact that he was a proficient linguist may account for his emphasis on mental discipline and for the difficulties he later encountered in regard to discipline.

⁴ Ibid., p. 300. ⁵ Ibid., p. 300. ⁶ Ibid., p. 300.

Because of the activities of the "Reformers" the University lost many of its resources, and for this reason many of its students had to beg for a living. On account of those uncertain conditions Richard Mulcaster went from Christ's Church to London in 1558 to become a school-master there. Of his life for the next three years nothing is known except that he was evidently a very successful teacher because in 1561 he was chosen, at about the age of thirty-one, by the Merchant Taylor's Guild as headmaster of the school which they were establishing at St. Lawrence Pountney Hill, between "Caning," now Cannon Street, and the Thames River.⁷

It was here on September 24, 1561, three years before the birth of Shakespeare, that Mulcaster began his life's work as headmaster and began to put into practice the principles which he advocated, and which will be treated in chapters two and three of this paper.

The first headmaster of Merchant Taylors' evidently had difficulties in adjusting himself to the social demands of his new position, as it seems the members of the Company regarded him as one of their servants, and he, as an "Esquier born", thought himself a better man than they. It is certain that many of his successors, though not of as ancient or honorable lineage as he, would have grumbled at the terms imposed upon him.⁸

The instructions given him by the guild are rather interesting. He was to teach the children good literature and good manners; he was to resign his position when ordered to do so but he could not leave his position without giving a year's notice to the Governors of the Guild; he could not be absent more than twenty working days in the year. There

⁷ Ibid., p. 300. ⁸ Ibid., pp. 300-301.

were to be only two hundred and fifty boys in the school. These were to be taught by the highmaster and two or three ushers. The school work began at seven o'clock both winter and summer and lasted until eleven; then the children returned at one and remained until five. Holidays, except those allowed by religion or from patriotic motives, were not permitted; nor was play time allowed for either the teachers or the pupils, except on Tuesday afternoons or Thursday forenoons and then only when no other holiday fell within the week. The teachers were also to keep the pupils from cock-fighting, tennis playing, riding or arguing in public, all of which were considered foolish and a waste of time by the members of the guild.⁹ How like some of the patrons of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century schools and even some of today! What teacher today, or even of an earlier period, would submit to such a regime as that forced upon this philanthropic gentleman of the sixteenth century?

Mulcaster and each of the teachers were paid £ 10 for the year. Mr. Hills, the Master of the company, added £ 10 to Mulcaster's salary out of his own purse, but several years later, because of heavy expenses with one of his children, he had to discontinue the grant. This led to trouble and disagreement, for Mulcaster seemed to think the company should continue the payment of the amount because he had rendered the most excellent of services and because he had been giving an additional stipend to the senior usher out of his own salary. This request denied, Mulcaster appealed to the Guild court and the court ordered him to seek his remedy.¹⁰ He then petitioned humbly but without success; so resigned his post in 1586, either quoting or inventing the expression, "Servus fidelis perpetuus asinus."¹¹

⁹ Ibid., p. 301.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 302.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 301.

Money, however, was not the only cause of his difficulties. Other causes seem to have been his temper, his radical ideas, and especially his pedagogical theories.

About the middle of his twenty-six years of service, in fact for November 26, 1574, the following entry is found in the Minutes of the court:

Mr. Richard Moncaster convented at this Courte to be admonished of suche his contempt of the good orders made for the government of the Grammar Schole founded by the Worshipful Company in St. Lawrence Pountney's parrishe where he is now Scholemaister; And also of suche his injurious and quarrellinge Speache as he used to the Visitors to the said Schole at the last callinge thereof, refused to here his fformer doing in that behalf recyted, willinge the said Mr. Warden and assistants to procede against him angerely or otherwise as they listed so as he mighte have a copie of their decree.¹²

Mulcaster apparently decided that it was more prudent to yield to the demands of the members; at any rate, on December 14, 1574, he confessed before the court that he had spoken in anger and promised future obedience.¹³

Four years later he seems to have been in high favor with the company because at the court held on April 29, 1579, an order was passed by the company agreeing, in consideration of Mulcaster's "painful services for near twenty years," to provide for his wife if she survived him.¹⁴ This was all the recognition his services ever received and he left the service of the Guild in 1586 still at variance with the members. They placed a counter claim against him for £ 50, then offered to waive the claim if they received a receipt in full from Mulcaster. The quarrel was never made up and when in 1608, after he had left St. Paul's, he applied to the Guild for a gratuity it was refused.¹⁵

¹²Ibid., p. 301. ¹³Ibid., p. 301. ¹⁴Ibid., p. 302.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 302.

In 1586, the year in which he left Merchant Taylors' school, he became Sur-Master of St. Paul's, which position he held for several years; was Vicar of Cranbrook, in Kent, in 1590; was made Prebendary of Sarum April 29, 1594; and became Upper Master of St. Paul's in 1596 as successor of Richard Smith, who was pensioned off because of poor eyesight and general impotency. Mulcaster then retired, about 1608, to Stanford Rivers in Essex, of which he had been made Rector by Queen Elizabeth in 1598, but as he was High Master of St. Paul's for twelve years, from 1596 to 1608, he probably was non-resident at his living until 1608. That he took up his abode at Stanford Rivers at this time is proved by the fact that his wife, Katherine, to whom, according to the epitaph he composed, he had been married for fifty years, died there August 6, 1609.¹⁶

Mulcaster himself died at Stanford Rivers on April 15, 1611, five years before Shakespeare, who was more than thirty years younger than he.

Mulcaster, though an Eton boy and a student of Christ Church as has been shown above, spent his life as a master of the two great day schools of London, in which position he was naturally concerned with the education of the burgher class, though he himself was of the gentry. This was in direct contrast to his great contemporary, Ascham, who was interested in the youth who were destined to become landowners, courtiers and diplomatists.¹⁷

Though until just recently Mulcaster has been almost entirely forgotten, yet he lived on friendly terms with some of the great of his age. Among these are Queen Elizabeth, Sir Philip Sidney, and Edmund Spenser.¹⁸

¹⁶ Rev. James Hugh Rose, "Mulcaster", in A New General Biographical Dictionary, X, p. 255.

¹⁷ "Richard Mulcaster," Camb. Hist. of Eng. Lit., X, p. 494.

¹⁸ Quick, op. cit., p. 303.

Elizabeth, as we have seen, granted him a living near the end of her reign and a few years before his death, but he evidently had been long in her favor as his dedication of his Positions to her is that of an old acquaintance who is sure of a friendly reception, rather than that of a stranger.¹⁹

He was a correspondent of Sir Philip Sidney and wrote to him in Latin, although writing in Latin was altogether against Mulcaster's principles as he was an advocate of the use of English by all the people. His best chance of being remembered is the fact that he protested vigorously against the use of Latin and advised his learned countrymen to use the vernacular in their writings. He endeavoured to purify English both written and spoken.²⁰

It was perhaps the Master's purism and strong advocacy of the mother tongue which influenced the greatest of his pupils, Edmund Spenser, to write imperishable verse in English.²¹

There are many proofs that Spenser was a Merchant Taylors' boy, among which is the fact that at the head of Merchant Taylors' list of selected boys who were to receive two yards of cloth at the funeral of Robert Nowell, a generous London citizen who died in 1586, is the name of Edmund Spenser.²²

Also Spenser in the December eclogue of his Shepherde's Kalendar makes Colin say:

And for I was in thilke some looser yeares
Some dele ybent to song and musicks mirth,
A good old shepherde, Wrenock was his name,
Made me by arte more cunning in the same.²³

¹⁹Ibid., p. 303. ²⁰Ibid., p. 305. ²¹Ibid., p. 305. ²²Ibid., 305.

²³Edmund Spenser, The Complete Works of, ed. by R. Morris. (London, 1929), p. 484.

It has been surmised that "Wrenock" stands for some master at Merchant Taylors' School when Spenser was a boy there. One would naturally expect the reference to be to Mulcaster, the famous Head Master, but it is difficult to twist "Wrenock" out of Mulcaster unless it is spelled as Mowncaster which gives us the anagram "Mast. Wrenoc." That the name was sometimes spelled in this manner is proved by the Queen's book of household expenses for March 18, 1573-4, where he is written as "Mr. Richard Mowncaster."²⁴

That Mulcaster's name was spelled in various ways is proved by the records of Merchant Taylors' School, where on November 26, 1574, his name appears as "Mr. Richard Moncaster" and on December 15 of the same year as "Mr. Richard Muncaster." Beaumont and Fletcher in The Knight of the Burning Pestle have the following: "Were you none of Master Moncaster's scholars?"²⁵ This confusion of spelling was common to the Elizabethan age, not in proper names alone but in nearly all words.²⁶

Since Spenser was a pupil of Mulcaster the problem of literary diction and some part at least of its solution was probably brought to his notice early in life by his schoolmaster, whose alert mind, original methods, and literary interests must have left their impression on his active mind. It is only natural to suppose that Mulcaster was actually using the methods and principles which he advocated in his Elementarie long before Spenser left the Merchant Taylors' School in 1569.²⁷

The problem of orthography weighed heavily on Mulcaster, Spenser, and many other poets and purists, both French and English. For these

²⁴G. C. Moore Smith, "Spenser and Mulcaster," MLR, VIII (1913), 368.

²⁵Act II, Scene i, l. 25. ²⁶Smith, op. cit., p. 368.

²⁷Ibid., p. 368.

artists in sound the relation of eye and ear was more pertinent to literature than it might seem to us today.²⁸

Spenser received his education from a master who held views on the nature of the language, on the necessity of labour, freedom of use and boldness in the improvement of the mother tongue which were in sharp conflict with those of the most famous English educators of the period, but which were identical with those of the Pleiade, and especially with the Deffence et Illustration of Du Bellay. It was under this influence that Spenser translated the "Songe du Vision" from Du Bellay's Antiquities de Rome published in Von der Woodt's "Theatre."²⁹

One of the great personages of the period with whom Mulcaster was probably not very friendly was Shakespeare. This is suggested by the fact that Shakespeare probably had Mulcaster in mind when he created Holofernes, the schoolmaster of Love's Labour's Lost.³⁰ Also, when Armando says, "I protest the schoolmaster is exceeding fantastical; too vain, too too vain,"³¹ he is using an expression similar in the repetition of the adverb to many phrases in the Positions and the Elementarie. Such repetition seems to have been a tag of Mulcaster's style.

Shakespeare evidently had a contempt for the schoolmasters or "pedants" of his time. He must surely have known Mulcaster and have seen in him a typical schoolmaster and, since Mulcaster wrote and produced plays in his schools, Shakespeare must also have seen in him a strong rival in the production of Court entertainments. In Hamlet there is a dialogue between Hamlet and Rosencrantz which shows the

²⁸ W. L. Renwick, "Mulcaster and Du Bellay," MLR, XVII (1918), p. 282.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 287. ³⁰ Quick, op. cit., p. 304.

³¹ Act V, Scene ii, l. 530.

rivalry that existed about 1603 between the tragedians of the city and "the boys."³² Holofernes is both a "pedant" and a court entertainer, but in other ways he does not answer to Mulcaster, for he is a parish schoolmaster and therefore teaches both boys and girls. Since Mulcaster was a favorite at Court, Shakespeare would hardly dare do more than give a suggestion of a resemblance.

Field, the successor of Burbage in Elizabethan tragedy, had been educated by Mulcaster at the Merchant Taylors' School, but was "taken" by N. Giles as one of the Company of the Children of the Revels and later joined Shakespeare's company.³³

That Mulcaster's pupils frequently performed masques, interludes and the like before Elizabeth and the Court is shown from the records of the "Accounts of the Revels at Court" where the titles of the plays given by the Children's Companies, namely the Choir Boys of St. Paul's, Children of the Chapel Royal, the Schoolboys of Westminster or those of Merchant Taylor's are listed.³⁴ The titles of many of the plays acted by the children's companies are very similar to those of Lyly.

On Shrove Tuesday of 1573, the Merchant Taylors' boys, under Richard Mulcaster, made their first appearance at Court; in 1574 they acted Timoclia at the sege of Thebes by Alexander. On Candlemas Day and on Shrove Tuesday of the same year they enacted Percius and Anthominis, probably known later as Persus and Andromeda. On Shrove Tuesday of 1583 they performed Ariodanti and Genevora based on an episode in Orlando Furioso.³⁵

³² Act II, Scene ii, ll. 353-385.

³³ "Richard Mulcaster", Camb. Hist. of Eng. Lit., VI, p. 248.

³⁴ Ibid., V, p. 138. ³⁵ Ibid., p. 115.

Accounts are given in the Chronicle History of the London Stage of Court performances, from which it appears that nearly as many performances were given by the boys' companies as by the men.³⁶

The plays acted by St. Paul's Choir boys include the subjects of Iphigenia, Alcmaeon, Scipio Africanus, and Pompey. It is also claimed that Richard Mulcaster composed several, probably six, Latin plays for St. Paul's boys, which have been lost. Often plays were acted to the towns of the provinces, as there are in several places, especially Southampton, records of payments made by the town authorities to the master of the school for a tragedy.³⁷

Mulcaster seems to have taken part in preparing the pageant given at Kenilworth, in honor of Queen Elizabeth, in 1575, as there are preserved some Latin verses which were prepared for the occasion and which Gascoigne claims were written by Master R. Mowncaster.³⁸

Thus we see that Shakespeare and his contemporaries had every reason to dislike and lampoon, if possible, the leading schoolmaster of the day, who was so far in advance of his times as to be the advocate of ideas which are today, four hundred years later, considered very modern.

The most noted of Mulcaster's writings are: Positions, wherein those primitive circumstances be examined, which are necessarie for the Training up of Children, either for Skill in their Book or Health in their Bodie and The First Part of the Elementarie, which entreateth chefelie of the right Writing of our English tung. The second part of the Elementarie never appeared so far as is known. His minor works are

³⁶ F. Watson, English Grammar Schools to 1660: Their Curriculum and Practice, Cambridge, 1908, p. 324.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 324. ³⁸ "Richard Mulcaster," DNB, XXXIX, p. 276.

Latin Verses which were prefixed to Bonet's Albearie; Ocland's Angelorum Praelia and Eirenarchia and many others, also Catechismus Paulinus, in usum Scholae Paulinae Conscriptus, ad formam parvui illius Angelici Catechismi qui pueris in Communi precum Angelicorum libro ediscendus proponitur and his last work of importance, a poem on the death of Queen Elizabeth entitled, In Mortem Serenissimae Reginae Elizabethae Naenia Consolans which was later followed by an English version. Of these works only the Positions, published in 1581, and the Elementarie in 1582, have been re-edited and used to advantage.³⁹

Though he was once a celebrated man, and the master of the great English poet Edmund Spenser, Mulcaster has long been forgotten; but when the history of education in England comes to be written, as it gradually will be, the historian will find that few schoolmasters in the 1500's or since were so enlightened as the first Head Master of Merchant Taylors'.⁴⁰

³⁹"Richard Mulcaster," DNB, XXXIX, p. 276.

⁴⁰R. H. Quick, Essays on Educational Reformers (New York, 1892), p. 101.

CHAPTER II

THE EDUCATIONAL PRINCIPLES ADVANCED BY MULCASTER

The formal educational system of the ancients was slowly developed through the centuries on the principles of paganism, with no idea of an existence after death or future reward or punishment. Thus we find the schools of Pagan Greece and Rome becoming so immoral as to be condemned by their own great philosophers. Then came the period of barbarian invasions when the peoples of Europe were so busy making history that education and literature were considered to be of use only to the priests who were to be responsible for the liturgy and the records of both Church and state. With the expansion of the purpose and power of the Church, both religious and secular knowledge became increasingly accessible not to a chosen group of philosophers but to all mankind.¹

To Christ's followers of the centuries preceding the Renaissance this world was not a lasting home but merely a temporary dwelling place in which the soul was prepared for the future life and man learned to seek the things that were above. This brought about the elevation of woman over her estate in pagan civilization. She was no longer a mere chattel or slave of man, which had been her status in the pagan civilization of Greece and Rome, but his companion who shared his dignity before the Creator.² Marriage became a holy union, a sacrament, and

¹Patrick J. McCormick, History of Education, (Washington, 1915), p. 65.

²Ibid., pp. 65-66.

motherhood was blessed; children were held to be the gifts of God. Thus children were considered to be objects of Christ's especial dilection, and were held up by Him as the embodiments of that innocence and purity He desired to see in His followers. Parents were directly responsible for their training in the knowledge and fear of the Lord.³

Since Christ, the Perfect Teacher, could not remain on earth to teach mankind, He delegated the great office of teaching to those trained for that purpose. At first this instruction was simply of a moral and religious nature, but in consequence of the pagan environment it was not long before the Church began to provide for matter that was not purely religious. The Church's activity embraced the home as well as the Church and it was not until the discipline of the home became lax and the domestic circle became incapable of giving the moral training necessary for the young, that the Church undertook to provide for the whole elementary training of the young.⁴

Out of this movement grew the great Church and monastic schools which were the guardians of the world's knowledge during the Middle Ages, and which produced some of the greatest scholars of all time.

Between the sixth and sixteenth centuries a great movement called "Scholasticism" was on foot in the schools and among the Schoolmen. This movement included the whole educational theory produced in this wide range of time, all institutions of learning, some of which have never been surpassed, the influence of which is still felt today. It produced an army of educators who were united by a common name and profession; its representatives were practical teachers and administrators of educational institutions, writers on educational theory and practice and

³Ibid., p. 66. ⁴Ibid., p. 69.

possessors of a well-defined system of schools.⁵ The height of the period was reached between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries.

Scholasticism, like all great movements, had its period of decline and decay, brought about by the application of an elaborate system of reasoning to unworthy questions. It had served its purpose and gave way to a new movement, the Renaissance, which came into existence rather suddenly, but not as an unrelated movement. The Renaissance found the educational world ready, a university system well established, centers of learned men and societies, and an academic world prepared for the revival of a glorious past. The educational aspect of the Renaissance shows effectively how much it owed to scholasticism for its impetus and how much intellectual inheritance it enjoyed, especially from the universities, which were the chief institutions of scholasticism.⁶

Though the modern educational system is greatly indebted to the Renaissance, yet the Renaissance owes much to scholasticism because the Renaissance retained from scholasticism the substantial and fundamental subjects, that is: philosophy, theology, the exact sciences, and letters, for all of which scholasticism stood. These subjects were divided into three groups: the trivium, in which were studied the elementary subjects--grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics; the second group or quadrivium corresponded to the curriculum of Mulcaster's "Grammar" school and included arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music; the third division was called science proper and dealt with philosophy, theology, and the other exact or pure sciences.⁷ Had not the university, the great institution of scholasticism, made its distinctive disciplinary contribution, subse-

⁵ Ibid., pp. 116-117. ⁶ Ibid., p. 129.

⁷ Otto William, "Seven Liberal Arts," in Catholic Encyclopedia, I, p. 760.

quent educational developments would have been greatly retarded, if not impossible.⁸

As we know, the Renaissance, within which occurred the great educational movement of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, began in Italy and slowly moved across the continent to England, where its influence was introduced first by Chaucer, who visited Italy three times and may have been familiar with the writings of Petrarch and Boccaccio.

Humanism was a movement which aimed to base every branch of learning on the literature and culture of classical antiquity. Humanists believed that classical training alone could form a perfect man, and thus the term came to mean "study of the ancients". In this movement the unworldly came into conflict with the worldly, and these new worldly ideas found their prototypes in the ancients who extolled the pleasures of this life, the claims of individuality, literary art and fame, and the beauty of nature. Thus it broke away from theology and the Church to some extent, and the principle of free, scientific inquiry gained ground. The value of the ideal was greatly exaggerated by the Scholastics, while the medieval culture was as greatly undervalued by the humanists.⁹

With the fall of Constantinople Greek scholars were forced into western Europe and thus opened to European humanists the real sources of ancient culture which had before been used only in fragments. This caused classical elegance to come into the Latin then in use. The fact that Latin and Greek are inflected languages caused stress to be

⁸McCormick, op. cit., pp. 129-130.

⁹Klemens Löffler, "Humanism" in Catholic Encyclopedia, VII, p. 538.

placed on their study as a means of mental discipline as well as for their classical beauty.

Some great humanists of the English Renaissance were: the Benedictine William Selling and his companion, William Hadley; Thomas Linacre, a pupil of Selling; John Colet, Dean of St. Paul's; William Lyly; Sir Thomas More; Sir Thomas Elyot; Roger Ascham; and the realistic humanist, Richard Mulcaster.

When Henry VIII separated England from the Catholic Church, he brought about another educational revolution in England. One of his first acts of reform was the suppression of the smaller monasteries, in 1536, when 376 houses were closed and their property confiscated. In a few years the larger monasteries and convents were suppressed and within a period of ten years he had suppressed 600 monasteries, 90 colleges, 2300 free chapels, and 100 hospitals, thereby diverting to the government £ 150,000 which had formerly been used for education and charity.¹⁰

Very little of the money and property confiscated from the monasteries, churches and private estates by Henry VIII, his son Edward VI, and Elizabeth, was used for educational purposes. Many of the colleges, which had been established during the Renaissance, were closed because the monastic endowments by which they were supported were confiscated, and as a result, the number of students declined. Of the three hundred Halls and schools which had been built in and about Oxford, all except eight had been dissolved and their revenues appropriated to the Crown under Henry.¹¹ The inevitable result was that education ceased to be administered exclusively by the Church and that secular institutions, such as the state and guilds, began to establish schools.

¹⁰McCormick, op. cit., p. 225. ¹¹Ibid., pp. 226-227.

Educational facilities for women, which had been so abundant, now disappeared entirely and remained extinct for a long period. Both boys and girls had been educated by the nuns before the Reformation, and many a distinguished churchman owed his early education to the nuns.¹²

Thus we see that the immediate effects of the Reformation were disastrous to education and that the deterioration was felt in all grades from the University downward.

Bishop Latimer bewailed the fact that the rise in rents made it impossible for the yeoman to send his son to school and that most of the schools were closed with no provision made for a substitute. What had been taken from the abbeys, colleges and chantries had been bestowed upon unworthy causes, that is, wasted in riotous living and given as personal gifts to favorites and courtesans, rather than used for the scholars to whom it rightfully belonged.¹³

Catholics were compelled to go to the continent for their education and the three English colleges, located at Douai, Rome and Valladolid, had for their object the training of the clergy. Not until St. Omer was founded near Calais, France, in 1592, by Father Robert Parsons, S.J., was there an English college for the laity.¹⁴

Realism, a reaction from Humanism, was the movement which tended to counteract the ultra-literary aspect of the humanistic system. The devotion to literature as the basis of education caused the work of the schools to become as formal and unreal as they had ever been in the older periods. This was especially true as regards the education of the man of affairs. The first phase of Realism checked this extreme movement by recalling the real purposes of the study of the classics,

¹² Ibid., p. 220.

¹³ Ibid., pp. 228-229.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 229.

by keeping in view the practical ends of training, and by substituting the study of ideas, training in judgment and power for literary or philological skill. The realists who retained the humanities as the content of instruction are known as Humanistic Realists.¹⁵ These were the Frenchmen, Francois Rabelais (1483-1553) and Michel Eyquem, Seigneur de Montaigne (1533-1592), and Richard Mulcaster, the great English humanist of the period.¹⁶

As has been stated before, Mulcaster wrote two books in which he advanced the theories of humanism, which were prevalent among the educators of France and were being introduced into England. Like all humanists he aimed to base the education of children on the literature and culture of the ancients but not to the exclusion of the native ability of the child. He considered that education was not so much for the rich as for the clever.¹⁷

The questions which were propounded by the educators of the period were: first, should all children be sent to school without restriction of number; and second, how should this restriction be brought about if found necessary?¹⁸

Mulcaster very clearly answered these questions by comparing the country to a natural body. He pointed out that if there is a deformity or defect in the natural body, it is an eye-sore, and that an illiterate citizenry has the same effect on the body politic, and will in the end destroy the state. He also says that too many learned would be a burden to the state, while too few would be equally dangerous. Minds which are

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 251. ¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 251-260.

¹⁷ R. H. Quick, Essays on Educational Reformers, New York, 1890, p. 93.

¹⁸ Richard Mulcaster, Positions, London, 1886, ed. by R. H. Quick, p. 134.

fitted for learning should be trained without any special regard for their social position.¹⁹

The argument advanced for the restriction of the learned was really very sensible. He claimed that there was a limited number of positions to be filled and that if the number of applicants became too great, it would be a double burden for the state because they would be roaming about without any means of livelihood. This would breed evils to the community and the state because they would be at enmity with good order either through desire or need. If the ill comes through the public negligence, then the public must correct it by not permitting too many to be educated so that they become disdainful of labor, remain idle, and full of conceit because of their knowledge. If because of the desire of the wealthy to educate their young there are too many educated, then they deserve correction and punishment, and this must be done by the state for its own protection.²⁰

Another argument against letting all learn was that before the change of religion, the Church provided positions for nearly all. The new religion had not so many offices and preferments. It was to no purpose to allege that when people saw that there were not enough preferments for all the number of learners would decrease. As long as there was hope of preferment, there would be those who would wish to be educated and thus the number of students would increase instead of diminish.

Because necessary offices must be filled by those best fitted to fill them, not enough educated persons would have a bad effect on the state and the general purpose of the state would be destroyed. An in-

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 134-135.

²⁰Ibid., pp. 136-137.

sufficient number to care for the needs of the state would result in discontent and probable destruction of the state.²¹

Though Mulcaster would allow reading and writing to all yet he would restrict higher education to those who were by nature fitted for it. His first method of restriction was a natural method, the result of unavoidable circumstances. Not all were financially able to take advantage of higher education. Some parents could not make a living without the help of their children, and therefore, though they desired to educate them, it was impossible for them to do so. Thus the parents must needs be patient and think of some other way in which they could help their children. Others had no school near them and, even though there had been a school, were unable to pay the stipend, so had to teach the children their own trade. Some children were either physically or mentally weak or defective and for this reason could not attend school.²²

If for any of the above reasons a child failed to learn to read and write, his failure to do so was considered by Mulcaster to be lamentable. Reading and writing were thought necessary to the child in later life in order that he might learn his religion and intelligently follow any trade in which he engaged.²³

The child deprived by any of the above circumstances of higher education should be directed to vocational training. The vocation of the child, whether boy or girl, should be chosen according to natural fitness and liking. If the child is placed in a position for which he is unfit, the result will be contrariness, disagreement with companions

²¹Ibid., p. 137. ²²Ibid., pp. 143-144. ²³Ibid., p. 139.

and sometimes disease of both body and mind. Therefore parents and teachers should study the qualifications, likes and dislikes, and the inclinations of the child before deciding what he should be trained to do.²⁴

The second method proposed by Mulcaster to restrict the number who sought higher education was by law. According to the law proposed, children of socially inferior parents would be denied the privilege of education. This discrimination, however, was not without some humane reason. For if a person knew that he was prevented by law from seeking higher education, he would be contented and would not think himself wronged, whereas, if he had once started on the road to higher education and then was stopped by social limitations, he would feel the restraint and become rebellious.²⁵

Though Mulcaster favored restriction of those who were to be more highly educated, yet he proposed that some provision be made for the exceptionally talented ones, whether rich or poor, either by private or public patronage, since they were evidently intended by God to be servants of the state and Church for the welfare of both.²⁶ In answer to those who might object to restriction by law, Mulcaster replied that God always had and always would provide enough educated persons to care for the Church and state.²⁷

Those who were capable of receiving higher education were to be chosen not because of their social position, their wealth, or their own or their parents' wishes, but for their ability, which was usually shown at the beginning or sometime during the elementary school period.

²⁴Ibid., pp. 137-138. ²⁵Ibid., p. 145. ²⁶Ibid., p. 145.

²⁷Ibid., pp. 145-146.

Mulcaster describes the type of mind the child who lives in a monarchy should possess if he is to be selected for higher education: at a young age he must be obedient to school orders and if he breaks them, must take his punishment without anger or ill will. He must be gentle, and courteous towards his companions, must not wrangle, quarrel or complain, but must help all and use persuasion on his companions rather than disturb the master or have his companions punished. Because of this good conduct he receives courtesy from his school fellows or else punishes by challenge and combat those who show him discourtesy.²⁸

If he has any special talent, he will be modest, orderly, and humble about it and not be ambitious or seek comparisons.²⁹

At home he will be obedient to his parents, courteous to servants, and so dutiful that all will strive to see who can praise him most when he is absent, cherish him most when he is present, and pray that he may advance rapidly and not die young. These qualities do not always show until the child has finished the elementary and is ready for the grammar school.³⁰

The choice of those who are to have higher education should be left to the schoolmaster as he is the better judge of their ability. He should not be too hasty in his judgment, however, because sometimes children fail to learn through negligence rather than because they are dull. When the master has determined the quality of the child's mind, which he can easily do, then he may make his choice, but always with due consideration of the pupil and his parents. If the parents of the child who finds it hard to learn are wealthy and want to keep the child in school, then the master should have patience even though he knows that

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 150-151.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 151.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 151.

the child will make little progress; but if the parents are poor, then it is the master's duty to direct the child to some trade which will be his portion in life. The bright child of poor parents is to be punished if he fail through negligence, because intelligence is a gift of God and should be appreciated and made use of, especially by the poor.³¹

Since the master cannot be absolute in determining the disposal of the children to be educated, he must be the counselor of the parents, who should after due deliberation, follow his advice if possible because both have the welfare of the child at heart.³²

The relationship of the master as judge of the child's ability to learn and of the parents as followers of his advice should continue as long as the child is under mastership in school or tutorship in college. During this time many can be very well placed, the trades supplied, and those sent on to higher education who are most capable of advanced study.³³

The best fitted for grammar school education are those of the middle class. They are neither so poor as to be always striving for a livelihood and ready to sacrifice everything for money, nor so wealthy as to make them waste time and money in too fast living while they pretend to strive after education. This, of course, applies only to those of the middle class who have sufficient intelligence to make use of the educational opportunities offered them.³⁴

Mulcaster distinguishes primary and secondary groups among those who are to enjoy higher education. Since the prince or ruler heads the nation, he must be educated for his position and his education becomes

³¹ Ibid., pp. 154-155.

³² Ibid., p. 155.

³³ Ibid., p. 140.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 140.

of primary concern. Even though he is a prince, he is like other children, having sometimes a strong intellect and body, sometimes a poor intellect and a weak body. Sometimes he is handsome and sometimes ugly. In regard to the time of beginning his education, what he is to learn, etc., he is as much a subject as are his own subjects. If his body is weak, it may be strengthened by the proper exercise in the same manner as the body of the poorest of his subjects.³⁵

If the prince has a poor mind, good elementary training will enable him, with good advisors, to govern well. Then when he is ready for the grammar school, his reading should be such as will make him humble, able to deal with those about him in a diplomatic manner, courteous to all, and religious. Military training is necessary for him, but he should not be war-like because if he is, he will bring grief to his country. He should be an example for his people and not a hindrance either to their spiritual or material prosperity.³⁶

The sons of nobles are to be educated in such a manner as will enable them to be of assistance to the prince in governing the country. They must have not only the elementary education, but that of the grammar school and the academy as well. They must be trained in politics, diplomacy, manners, and religion.³⁷

The clergy and divines are members of the secondary group or professions. They are the worthiest of this group since they have charge of souls, which are the principle part of man. They must be trained as ministers of God to advance virtue, suppress vice, denounce death, and pronounce life; they must be humble, virtuous, and loyal both to Church and state. This training can be received by them only in the academy

³⁵ Ibid., pp. 220-221.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 221.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 196.

or university which is organized for that purpose.³⁸

The lawyer is the second and the physician is the third member of the secondary group. Because of their positions, that of the lawyer to keep the peace of civil society, to make up quarrels, and direct justice; that of the physician to heal the body and sometimes the mind, their training should be such as to cause the people to remember and requite their honorable labor honorably employed. This training is also to be found only in the university. Thus, the three members of the professions must have an academic education whether they come from the poor, middle, or noble class.³⁹

But since the nobility could not provide from their own numbers sufficient reinforcements for the learned professions, it became necessary to extend professional training to the most intelligent members of the lower classes.

✓ A third principle of Mulcaster's was that education should be extended to girls as well as to boys on the elementary level. He heartily approved of the education of women and held Queen Elizabeth up to the women of his time as an example of what education could do for women. The education of men, according to Mulcaster, was potentially unlimited, but that of women should be limited by the position they were destined to hold. If they were to be married, then they must be trained to obedience and all the qualities of a good wife and mother; if they were to make a living, then they must learn a trade; if they were to be an ornament to their position and to society, then they must be so educated. Some few are destined by God to control the government and must be educated to do so, since the position calls for great gifts and abilities.⁴⁰ Thus we

³⁸ Ibid., pp. 202-204.

³⁹ Ibid., pp. 204-205, 219.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 174.

see that the education of a woman depended upon her position and ability.

Though some men might want to deny women the right to education, Mulcaster defends their right by saying that men not only misuse the advantages provided for their own education, but abuse the education when they receive it by not making the proper use of it. For this reason then, he says, no man should object to the education of women, though women may sometimes abuse their educational privileges.⁴¹

The four reasons advanced by Mulcaster for the education of girls are these: first, it is the custom of the country to permit girls to be educated; second, it is a duty owed to them by their elders; third, their own ability, given them by God, entitles them to an education; and fourth, an educated woman has good effects on those around her.⁴²

He then proceeds to expand these four points in order.

In regard to custom he has this to say, that though it was the custom of the nation to educate women yet it has fallen into disuse to a certain extent. He would not permit them to attend the grammar school or the university, but they should be allowed education according to their ability and position. The girls of his land should be as well educated as those of a similar station on the continent.⁴³

Upon both parents and teachers devolves the duty to educate girls, for through girls, grown to womanhood, is the English race propagated. Hence it is for the benefit of the nation that the future mothers should be trained in all that is necessary and refined.⁴⁴

Women have a natural ability to learn. This is the third reason for educating them. It would be extremely unnatural to refuse development of

⁴¹Ibid., p. 174. ⁴²Ibid., p. 167. ⁴³Ibid., pp. 167-168.

⁴⁴Ibid., pp. 168-169.

this latent ability. The development of woman's ability to learn may also be considered as a commandment of God since He will demand an account of the talent given both sexes.⁴⁵

The excellent results obtained in educating women justifies it. If it had not been recommended by the ancients the results of education as exemplified by Queen Elizabeth and her court ladies would be reason enough to prove that all women should be educated as much as their circumstances allowed.⁴⁶

Therefore, according to Mulcaster, the same principles in regard to the education of boys applies to girls in that it depends on the desire of the parents, their means, and the ability of the girls to learn. Their mental and physical strength or weakness should be taken into consideration, in the same manner as that of the boys, by those by whom they are to be educated.⁴⁷

Girls may attend either the public school in the elementary grades or be taught privately in the home by a teacher of either sex. Mulcaster does not commit himself on the question of sending girls to the public schools but leaves it to the discretion of their parents. He also claims that women are better teachers in some respects, but that men are better for certain subjects.⁴⁸

According to Mulcaster, girls should attend school, whether public or private, until they are about thirteen or fourteen years of age, but may be sent longer by the parents if they are able and want to send them.⁴⁹

⁴⁵ Ibid., pp. 161-171. ⁴⁶ Ibid., pp. 171-174. ⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 175.

⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 181-182. ⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 181.

Girls were to be taught reading, writing, and singing. They were to learn to play on a musical instrument and receive physical training. They were not to be taught geometry, and the other sciences or mathematics, physics, or divinity, because they lacked not only the mental ability to learn these subjects, but the stability to use them after they had learned them.⁵⁰ Besides, to what practical use could they put knowledge of this kind?

Mulcaster who so thoroughly disapproved of travel in foreign countries for men, with the exception of merchants and soldiers, could hardly be expected to approve of it for women, even though it was for the alleged purpose of completing their education. Since girls attended school until they were thirteen or fourteen years of age, they would hardly acquire enough education to justify sending them abroad.⁵¹

In line with these principles, Mulcaster proved his originality also in his ideas of the content of education. He differed with the advocates of the trivium and the quadrivium in several points. First, he did not believe in the division of liberal and illiberal arts; second, he believed in the development of the body, which was ignored by the medieval school. He also advocated the study of subjects which would appeal to the senses, and insisted that education be according to nature, that is, that it should secure the expression of the child's ideas and not try to repress them. He followed the ideas of the medieval school by dividing his ideal school into three divisions, the elementary, the grammar school, and the college or university. The subjects taught in his school were the same as those taught in the medieval schools with the exception that the instruction be in English instead of Latin, the

⁵⁰Ibid., pp. 180-181. ⁵¹Ibid., p. 212.

language of the medieval school. Latin and Greek would have been taught in the grammar school but not before. Hebrew should be taught in the college.

Educators made the restriction that the languages should not be taught for fear that having the benefit of education, the child would become discontented with his condition and demand positions that were above him. Some of the slightly learned failed to consider that education would help them in their trades, but seemed to aspire to a higher condition and thus caused trouble in the state.⁵²

In regard to the teaching of English in the schools, Mulcaster advocated that the child be taught the mother tongue first as it was the language in which he would conduct most of the affairs of life; therefore, in his early years he should learn to read, write and speak it correctly before he studied Latin. This made the study of English extend from the sixth to the twelfth years, after which Latin might be introduced if the teacher thought advisable. More latin would thus be learned between the ages of twelve and sixteen than between seven and seventeen in the ordinary way. There would be the added advantage that the child would not be tired and disgusted with learning.⁵³ Mulcaster concedes that English spelling and grammar are more difficult than the Latin, but he prefers English because of this difficulty, which will make the child more self-reliant and studious.⁵⁴

The subjects to be taught in the elementary school, as planned by Mulcaster, were reading, writing, drawing, music, and physical training.

⁵²Ibid., pp. 144-145.

⁵³R. H. Quick, Essays on Educational Reformers, p. 97.

⁵⁴Mulcaster, op. cit., pp. 30-31.

As writing is more difficult to learn than reading, because writing requires strength of muscles in the hand, it should be taught after the child had learned to read. This should be done, so Mulcaster thought, in spite of the fact that writing was invented before reading. The child should be taught to write plainly and rapidly. The master is not to stop teaching writing until the child can write perfectly, because writing is a great help to learning. The child who can read and write well will never have any difficulty in learning. During the time the child is learning to read and write, the master will be able to determine his capacity to learn and decide whether the child will be capable of higher education. These two subjects should be made as pleasant as possible to the learner because they are really the child's stock in trade and if he has been punished or has had unpleasant associations with either of them, he will not profit from them as he should.⁵⁵

Drawing is related to writing, according to Mulcaster, and should be taught during the same period, that is, while the muscles and bones are soft and easily formed. During this time it is possible to determine those who will be good at drawing, because those who show a freedom in handling the pen or brush will have an ability to write and draw well. The purpose of teaching drawing is to enable the child, when grown to manhood, to judge of the substance, form, and fashion of the articles which he buys of craftsmen.⁵⁶

As to the coloring or painting of the drawings or painting alone, it is not recommended by Mulcaster unless the child shows an unusual ability.⁵⁷ He neither condemns nor recommends it.

Music, as taught, is to be both vocal and instrumental. Vocal is to instrumental music as reading is to writing. Both should be begun while

⁵⁵Ibid., pp. 31-34.

⁵⁶Ibid., pp. 34-35.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 35.

the child is young so that the voice and the muscles will be easily trained. Singing is supposed to be good for the body as well as the soul since it is used as a method of exercising the vocal cords and of causing deep breathing. It affects the soul when used in Church or for devotional purposes.⁵⁸

Some are opposed to music because it is a waste of time and is irreligious and causes people to feel too much delight and pleasure. It is just as sensible to forbid the use of music because of the abuse that some make of it, as it is to forbid the use of food because some commit gluttony, according to Mulcaster.⁵⁹

The child is to remain in the elementary school until he can read so well that the length of his reading lesson will not hinder his reading; can write so well and so rapidly that he will delight in writing and not be frightened by the length of an assignment; and can both sing and play so that it will be a pleasure to himself and others. When he can do all of these perfectly, then he is ready for the grammar school, where he is to remain until he has learned perfectly all the studies offered there. Then if he desires more education and his master thinks it advisable and his parents can afford it, he may go to the university, which he may attend until he is prepared for some profession or until his parents withdraw him.⁶⁰

Mulcaster promised to outline studies for the Grammar School and the University but failed to do so.

Mulcaster and his contemporaries recognized two kinds of education: public and private. Private education was preferred for girls, but public education should be allowed them if their parents desired.⁶¹

⁵⁸ Ibid., pp. 36-38. ⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 38. ⁶⁰ Ibid., pp. 260-261.

⁶¹ Ibid., pp. 183-184.

The public school was considered the best for boys because they would always be in a crowd, have competition, and if they failed would do so before all. The boy should be permitted to associate with all kinds of children because when he grows to manhood he will have to meet all kinds of men. The public school obviously offers the best preparation for the variety of adult experience.⁶²

Common or public education under fair conditions will develop the minds of even the dullest and will show forth the best qualities of the brightest. In the common school the child finds that the manners of his companions are brought from the home into the school. He should copy those of the more refined, but often does the opposite out of perversity or through human weakness. He will also find there some very bad companions, whom he should shun; but he will find more good, whom he should copy. He will realize that in the world at large vice is punished and virtue rewarded.⁶³

Mulcaster noted that some parents objected to sending their children to the common schools on the plea that they would take contagious diseases. His answer was that dainties and over feeding by fond parents had ruined, if not killed, more children than any disease or other dangers encountered abroad.⁶⁴

He also maintained that the parents and teachers should understand each other in the matter of discipline, and to facilitate this understanding he would have the master print the rules of the school and have them posted in a conspicuous place where they may be easily seen and read. These laws were to leave as little uncertainty as possible in the minds of either the parents or scholars.⁶⁵

⁶² Ibid., p. 184.

⁶³ Ibid., pp. 184-187.

⁶⁴ Ibid., pp. 188-189.

⁶⁵ Richard Mulcaster, Elementarie, ed. by E. T. Campagnac. (London, 1925), p. 273.

To secure the best results the parents should be willing to work with the school in molding the child. To do this the parent must never side with the child against the teacher, but if he is displeased with the master he should come to him privately and discuss the affair calmly and fairly. If the child is punished for a fault in school, the same fault, if committed in the home, is to be punished in the same manner as at school thus impressing upon the child's mind the seriousness of the offence.⁶⁶

As a general principle, Mulcaster believed strongly in public education, seeing in the common experience thus provided value even for the prince.

To get the most out of common schools the parents, if able, should hire a private tutor and send him to school with the child so that the teacher of the school will give the best he is able and the private tutor will have something to strive for and imitate.⁶⁷

Mulcaster summarizes his view of public and private schools by saying that he considers the public school better because it makes possible a more open display of faults and thus a more effective correction. It tends to implant virtue and learning more genuinely than the private school.⁶⁸

Criticizing private education Mulcaster pointed out its most serious limitations. First it meant denying the child a natural childhood in company with other children. For private education meant training at home under a tutor, not, as it may mean today, education in a select group in a privately supported institution. Its second fault is that it is really not education, since it fails to teach the individual how

⁶⁶Ibid., pp. 275-276. ⁶⁷Mulcaster, Positions, pp. 190-191.

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 191.

to live with others. To Mulcaster education was decidedly a social process.

His arguments against private education, as he understood it and as it was practised, are as applicable today as in the sixteenth century. Some parents gave their children private education to keep them from mixing with the general crowd. Because of the parents' own pride of rank or purse they condemned their children to an unnatural life of solitude. When privately educated the child is either alone or with two or three members of his own family with the result that there is little if any competition, but much playfulness or infinite weariness. The master is not inspired to give his best to only two or three and therefore his teaching and discipline are lax.⁶⁹

Often the child who is tutored at home is not so well mannered or thoughtful as the child who has had the advantage of common training. If he is, it is due more often to natural goodness or experience than to training. Sometimes the child who is taught privately is bashful, and unacquainted with the practice of the simplest social customs not through ignorance of them but because of lack of opportunity to practice them.⁷⁰

According to Mulcaster's theory every teacher should be trained to give both physical and mental education to his students. The reasons for this are: the teacher is in close contact with the child in the class room and thus knows his physical condition and is therefore better able to determine the kind and amount of exercise the child is capable of taking; then too the teacher who knows how to appreciate a well trained mind in a strong body is not so likely to give an unbalanced education to his students.⁷¹

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 188.

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 187.

⁷¹Ibid., pp. 124-126, 232.

Another plan of Mulcaster's which later developed was that all who were studying one subject, such as mathematics, were to be placed in one college and if possible in one building, but it would be permissible, if necessary, to place those of the same age in one building. He claimed that this collecting of students with like interests into compact groups would facilitate teaching, do away with disciplinary problems, and make better scholars. It would also be less expensive both to the students and to the state and result in better schools.

Mulcaster would divide the teachers into three classes: these are the "Elementarie," or those who teach the first principles; the "Grammatical," or the teachers of the languages; and the "Academicall," or the readers, those who tutor the young in the universities.⁷² He does not treat of the university teacher but only of those of the Elementarie and Grammar Schools.⁷³

Since the best teachers will not teach in the elementary grades because of the low salary, poor living conditions, lack of respect, and the very hard work involved in conducting these classes, poorly prepared teachers are employed. The elementary classes are often over crowded and poorly grouped so that the inexperienced and poorly trained teacher working under these handicaps is unable to teach as he should. The natural result of these conditions is that the children go into the grammar school unprepared for the work expected of them, fail to do as much as they should, and cause trouble for their parents and teachers by their misconduct and failure, brought about by their inability to apply a poorly trained mind to difficult work.⁷⁴

⁷²Ibid., p. 233.

⁷³Ibid., p. 233.

⁷⁴Ibid., p. 234.

All of this could be avoided if, according to Mulcaster, the salary, or as he calls it "reward" was sufficient to cause those who are really efficient in school work to engage in teaching the elementary grades.⁷⁵

To get the best teachers in the lower grades the following conditions should prevail in the school system: first, the salary should be the highest to the teacher who has the lowest class because his work is the hardest; second, the least number of children should be placed in the lowest form since they are the most helpless of the school groups and are therefore more dependant on the teacher for their knowledge. As the children advance in knowledge the number in the groups would be increased and the teacher's salary decreased since the children learn more easily and the work is not so hard on the teachers. The teacher's salary should always be more than sufficient for his needs since he is rendering a very great service to the state, the community and the parents.⁷⁶

Mulcaster claims that since there are colleges for the study of philosophy, law, divinity and medicine there should also be colleges for training teachers. He recognizes the fact that there will be difficulty in convincing the public at large of the necessity for such a college.

He gives four reasons why this type of college should be established: first, the teacher is indirectly responsible for the welfare of the state since the subject makes or mars the state; second, this type of college through improving the teachers would improve the scholars and thus benefit the majority; third, it is necessary for the profession; and fourth, teaching may be favorably compared to the other professions in the need for language, for judgment, for skill in training, and for variety in professional activities.⁷⁷

⁷⁵Ibid., p. 233. ⁷⁶Ibid., p. 254. ⁷⁷Ibid., p. 249.

After the college is established it would prove a good nursery for schoolmasters and would assure those sent from it of a good position and reassure those who hire them. The result would be that if good teachers are well provided for there will be good teachers.⁷⁸

Since this college was to Mulcaster only a remote possibility, he proceeded to provide for his day by advocating the choosing of the best teachers then available and requiring them to bring testimony of their good behavior and permitting them to teach only in certain schools according to the amount of learning they possessed. The reason for this restriction in teaching was that some when licensed for general instruction overreached themselves and attempted too much, though they did well enough if restricted to certain subjects.⁷⁹

Thus we find that Mulcaster approved of teacher training schools, specialization of teachers in certain fields of instruction, and the licensing of teachers for the practice of their profession in the same manner as the other professions.

Certain teachers are better adapted to teach the lower grades than others and because of this ability should receive sufficient training in this division of school work. The master should know Latin, Greek and Hebrew though these languages are not to be required; he must be able to understand his writer and to read false prints and uncertain dictionaries. He must have a knowledge of the best grammars and be able to give notes to the older scholars, but he must not make note-taking a burden to them. He must take pains with his teaching, have constancy in face of discouragement, discretion to judge circumstances, ability to delight in his successes, however small, be able to encourage a child and to regard him

⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 255. ⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 255.

as a probable genius, or at least find something good in him, and he must be humble about his own qualifications and abilities. Very little can be done in teaching except by those who know the most and get pleasure from what they do. Mulcaster after listing all of these requirements and qualifications bewailed the fact that very few good teachers were found in the schools.⁸⁰

As the schools were then conducted, according to Mulcaster, they were simply a means which lead to the other professions; and because many learned men left the teaching field for the profession of law, divinity, or medicine, insufficient provision was made for schools and teaching was made a side line for many.⁸¹

Mulcaster gave certain rules for the teaching of practically all subjects, but he was especially definite on teaching of the English language and spelling. The reason for this is obvious. He was the outstanding advocate of the use of English in all the affairs of life by all Englishmen. Since the use of English for purposes of scholarship was purely experimental and English was being used by the common people in their daily life, it was necessary to formulate a system of spelling and organize rules of grammar. He treats of this in his Elementarie, which he planned to deal "with the right writing of our English tung." This was the most extensive and important treatise on English spelling in the sixteenth century. His great virtue is his moderation. He saw that it was impossible to make English phonetic; so he compromised between the ideal and the practical. He did not think that spelling could ever perfectly represent sound because the differences between one sound and another were often too subtle. The same letter was, and still is, used

⁸⁰ Ibid., pp. 235-236.

⁸¹ Ibid., pp. 235, 248.

to represent different sounds, a fact which, according to Mulcaster, was unavoidable.⁸² Another difficulty was that the pronunciation constantly changed. He therefore based his reform of speaking and writing upon custom and usage, not on the custom of the ignorant but on that of the more educated. Customs cannot be suddenly or entirely changed but may be modified by patient effort on the part of the educators. He did not ignore sound but insisted that not too much attention should be paid to it. He claimed that we must use common sense and not try to substitute a new system but gradually modify the old one. The educational reformer, according to Mulcaster, should look for general goodness in usage, not perfection in detail; and for ease and convenience in writing, not a set law or system which would probably be cumbersome and hard to follow.⁸³

His aims generally were to get rid of superfluous letters, but not to omit necessary letters. Consonants were ~~to be~~ doubled where they belong to separate syllables, but seldom at the end of words. He pointed out that final "e" usually indicated a preceding long vowel. He was really much more interested in consistent spelling than he was in phonetic spelling. The spelling whether adopted by an individual or by the people at large should always be consistent. Mulcaster himself followed this principle strictly in both his Positions and his Elementarie.

In the Elementarie he listed about 7000 of the commonest words and gave their recommended spelling; and though this spelling was not always adopted, yet it helped to standardize a large number of current spellings, justifying them and leading to the consistent use of them.⁸⁴

⁸²Albert C. Baugh, A History of the English Language, New York, 1935, pp. 255, 259.

⁸³Ibid., pp. 259-260. ⁸⁴Ibid., p. 261.

This general table of words was to be used for the following purposes: first, to confirm the rules of spelling laid down by Mulcaster; second, to perfect proportion of words; third, to show the borrowed words; fourth, to show the relationship between the rules and words as applied to particular words and the arranging of words in order; and fifth, to help the ignorant man who could not judge of sounds in his spelling and to aid the learned man when suddenly in need of a correct word or spelling.⁸⁵ In other words it served much the same purpose as our present day dictionaries. The child in school, in fact, everybody, was to be taught how to use this general table of words to the manifest improvement of the English language oral and written. He would have added other words but he considered that all others whether not listed or invented would conform to the rules laid down.

X For the guidance of those who would use his table he gave the following directions: The words are listed according to alphabetical order. Notes occur where considered necessary in order that the table of words and rules might agree. The accent is placed over vowels and consonants where necessary for pronunciation. Foreign derivation is indicated, as is the general custom. Foreign words are given as such, then any change in spelling or pronunciation which English custom had established is shown.⁸⁶

If words are introduced into English writing, that is, if foreign words are incorporated or translated or words are newly coined, they should be used in the proper place and manner, fitting smoothly into the sentence without betraying either their foreign origin or their newness.⁸⁷

⁸⁵ Richard Mulcaster, Elementarie, pp. 183-187. ⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 185.

⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 287.

Mulcaster gives as a reason for this that those who are learned will not be hindered in the use of a word while the ignorant would make wrong use of it. He cites his own writings as an example of correct English and as models for others to follow.

Mulcaster claims that there is no language better than the English in which to conduct arguments; and though we do use many foreign terms in argument this practice is no more prevalent in our language than in foreign languages. Thus it is all right to treat in English matters which concern England.⁸⁸

The English language has many qualities, among which are commonness for every man, beauty for the learned and bravery for the bold. It is able to assimilate borrowed words for those who desire to borrow.

In the elementary school Mulcaster distinguished five areas of instruction: physical, mental, vocational, social, and religious. He treated of the physical and mental groups more fully than of the other three.

His definition of exercise, his name for the physical area of instruction, was "a vehement, and a voluntarie stirring of ones body, which altereth the breathing, whose ende is to maintaine health, and to bring the bodie to a verie good habit."⁸⁹ It was devised for several purposes; either for games and pastime, for war and service, or for health and the lengthening of life.⁹⁰

Exercises practiced as games strained the body too much and thus weakened it before its time, while those practiced for health were not of such a nature as to give the man the endurance necessary for a soldier;

⁸⁸ Ibid., pp. 274-275. ⁸⁹ Richard Mulcaster, Positions, p. 53.

⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 51.

thus the three divisions of exercise.⁹¹

Mulcaster does not approve so much of the martial and the game type of exercise as he does of that which is engaged in for the health of the body. Even this must be taken in moderation and under proper conditions. Mulcaster divides exercises into two groups, those to be practised out of doors and those for indoors, so that the weather will not prevent the child getting the proper amount of exercise.

The exercises to be practised indoors are: loud speaking, singing, loud reading, talking, laughing, weeping, holding the breath, dancing, wrestling, fencing, and scourging the top. Some of these indoor exercises do not appeal to us as being real exercises but as outlets for aroused emotions, especially talking, laughing, weeping, and the holding of the breath. The games or exercises for outdoors are: walking, running, leaping, swimming, riding, hunting, shooting, and playing ball.⁹²

Mulcaster begins in order with the first, loud speaking, and proceeds to give very minute instructions for teaching each of the exercises. He gives the benefits which they are supposed to bestow on the body and the harm they inflict if they are engaged in too long or too strenuously.

Most of the supposed benefits of both the indoor and outdoor exercises have been found by medical authorities of today to be purely imaginary, as is true also of much of the harm which has been ascribed to them by Mulcaster and his contemporaries.

Gymnastics, as they are called today, were very highly recommended by Mulcaster. They included dancing, wrestling, fencing, etc., and every child was required to engage in some of them according to his physical condition. If his body were strong, then he should engage in the more

⁹¹Ibid., p. 52. ⁹²Ibid., p. 54.

vigorous exercises; but if his body were weak, then he should take light exercise until his body was strong enough to endure the more vigorous exercises. If the child was neither purely sick nor purely well his exercise should be pleasant and gentle such as will warm the body yet not tire it.⁹³

After treating of these matters Mulcaster proceeds to give the time and place in which the child should exercise.

He divides the time into "accidentarie," and "natural" and the natural into the general and particular. The "accidentarie" time, which is really "accidental" time, depends on the weather. The rule for exercise in accidental time is to choose fair, clear, cool weather, neither too hot nor too cold; neither too dark and cloudy, nor too hot and windy.⁹⁴

The natural time of exercise is before meals because it increases the appetite, aids digestion, and causes the body to perspire, thus throwing off bodily impurities. The child should never be permitted to exercise if he is very hungry, as this will cause him to bolt his food when he does eat and will result in indigestion and other disorders of the stomach.⁹⁵

The best hours of the day for exercise, as advised by educators were: in spring, about noon because of the mildness of the air; in summer, in the morning to avoid the excessive heat; in autumn and winter, towards night because the days are short and are usually spent otherwise, and the food will by that time be digested. Mulcaster himself favored the morning as the best time because it prepared the body for the day.⁹⁶

There are four things necessary for the place in which the exercise is to be taken: first, it should have a floor or be fixed so that the

⁹³ Ibid., pp. 110-112.

⁹⁴ Ibid., pp. 115-116.

⁹⁵ Ibid., pp. 116-117.

⁹⁶ Ibid., pp. 117-118.

person who is exercising will not be injured; second, it should if possible be free from wind or at least free from cold biting wind; third, it should be open so as to have the best and purest air; and fourth, there must be nothing evil smelling or dirty near the place.⁹⁷

Everyone should know when to stop exercising since the purpose of exercise is to build up the body. One may know when to stop by the fact that the body begins to sensibly perspire, the veins begin to swell and the breathing becomes hard. One may continue the exercise as long as the face is fresh in color and the motion quick, and no weariness is felt; but if the color fades, the body becomes weary and the motions slow down, then the exercise is doing more harm than good and should be stopped.⁹⁸ For children the exercise should be very light and not for too long a time.

The clothing to be worn while exercising should be in accordance with the exercise taken, always light and, if the weather is cold, of a warm material. After exercising the student should put on other clothing to avoid being chilled. If the child has no clothing other than that he is wearing, then the master should see that he takes such exercise as will not cause him to perspire unduly. Otherwise he will take cold when he stops exercising and begins to cool off.⁹⁹ Simple and obvious as these directions seem to us, they show that Mulcaster was far in advance of his age in realistic, common sense.

mental To the mental group of studies belong grammar, reading, spelling, and punctuation, which are to be taught to all, girls as well as boys. These have been discussed fully under the elementary curriculum so that it is only necessary to add here that they were considered indispensable

⁹⁷ Ibid., pp. 114-115.

⁹⁸ Ibid., pp. 118-119.

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 132.

for the proper mental development of the child because of their alleged difficulty and benefit.

It is better according to Mulcaster not to start the child to school too young because much may be gained in the later years which would be lost by too much forcing. Forcing often weakens both the brain and the body. If the child's body is weak and his mind strong, then he should be allowed to remain at home until his bodily strength is nearly equal to his mental ability. If a physically weak child is forced in his studies, the result is that the child sometimes dies, to the sorrow of those who forced him beyond his powers of endurance. Even though he does live, he is never deep in his knowledge but always superficial and light. He has very little pleasure in life because of his weak body. Mulcaster would, therefore, have him either start to school later or not go to school so long, but he must not be allowed to remain idle or he will become lazy or else dissolute and wanton.¹⁰⁰

A slow or dull mind in a strong body is to be lamented but a child of this type can be trained to the crafts and thus be made useful to himself and others, while a weak mind in a weak body is a burden to everyone concerned, a grief to his parents, relatives and friends and a greater burden to himself. Contrariwise, a strong mind in a strong body is a joy to all, himself, parents, relatives, and friends. If one is so fortunate as to be of this type he owes a great deal to God and mankind and should make the most of his blessings and gifts.¹⁰¹

We have seen that Mulcaster recognized the fact that the child should not be trained only physically or mentally but that both the mind and the body should be developed, that this should not be done separately

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., pp. 19-20. ¹⁰¹ Ibid., p. 20.

but at the same time and by the same teacher. Of course he stressed mental training because he was a school teacher first, and only secondarily a theorist. His ideas are quite similar to ours in regard to forcing a child in school and trying to co-ordinate mental and physical ability. We do not try to force the mentally slow child.

In regard to vocational training Mulcaster would have all taught to read, write, and draw in the common school or privately in the home as these arts were necessary to the children in gaining a livelihood. The boys of the poorer classes were either to be taught a trade by their fathers or else apprenticed to some work for which they were mentally and physically equipped.¹⁰²

As for the girls they were to be taught reading, writing, drawing, music, needle work, and housewifery. Mulcaster does not tell us where, when or by whom girls are to be taught but he implies that they should be taught by the mother or some competent woman in the home to direct and govern the house, to provide necessities, to be able to care for the ill, and to do other things required of a good housewife.¹⁰³

The social life of the child was considered in relation to his parents, teachers, and associates. In this he was to give pleasure to others without regard for his own likes, dislikes, or inconvenience. He must learn to sing and play so well that others would enjoy listening to him, and he must be taught to be obliging and play when requested. He should learn to dance gracefully, not only for the physical exercise but also for the pleasure it gives himself and others.¹⁰⁴

Religious training should begin in the home, where the parents should do nothing which they would not have their children see and imitate.

¹⁰² Ibid., p. 139.

¹⁰³ Ibid., pp. 177-178.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., pp. 74, 261.

They should instill into the young minds high ideals and a great love of virtue. This is furthered by the teacher in the school, who should give the child good principles of living, and by the minister in church, who by his sermons and instructions should give knowledge of the reward of virtue and the punishment of vice and make the child fear to do wrong and love to do right. The child should be so taught by all who have any contact with him that he will be able to discern good from bad, religious from profane, honesty from dishonesty, etc., so that he may serve God and his country and be a comfort to his friends.¹⁰⁵

Thus we see that though Mulcaster lived and taught over four hundred years ago, some of his ideas and ideals are just now coming into our educational system. Some of the older generation can remember when some things he advocated and which are now considered an integral part of the curriculum, were first being introduced into school work.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., pp. 28-29.

CHAPTER III

MULCASTER'S PLACE IN THE HISTORY OF EDUCATION

To ascertain Mulcaster's place in the educational thought of the Renaissance, one may compare him with his great French contemporary, Montaigne. Mulcaster, the active educator, and Montaigne, the theorist, had many ideas in common though they differed radically on some questions.

Montaigne, never like Mulcaster an active teacher, simply a theorist, won his position in educational history by his brilliant essays, especially those on the Education of Children and Pedantry. He is known as a realist because he looked to the practical purposes of study and endeavored to take a common sense view of life. He taught that man should live for all of life's enjoyments and should avoid trouble and sorrow.¹

He aimed to train the reason and judgment in such a way as to secure moderation of mind and the practice of virtue, and to train the body so that it would be a fit and ready instrument for the soul. In this way he hoped to produce the cultured and capable man of affairs.²

This, as has been shown in Chapter II of this paper, was the ruling principle of Mulcaster's two books the Positions and Elementarie. It is especially true of the Positions.

Unlike Mulcaster, the active educator, Montaigne would not give an education to all, not even an elementary one, but would educate only the

¹Patrick J. McCormick, History of Education, Washington, 1915, p. 257.

²Ibid., p. 257.

princes and the sons of the nobility.³ Another difference between them was that Montaigne favored individual or private instruction over the class or common school method, while Mulcaster was a strong advocate of the common or public school. Montaigne contended that the teacher of the class gave the form of knowledge without being sure that the students understood or were capable of utilizing the matter learned. The class teacher, who had too much memorizing and not enough thinking, failed to develop the child's ability to think for himself. The result was that the child took things too much on trust or the authority of the teacher.⁴ Mulcaster, while acknowledging that the common school failed in many matters, argued that they were better than private schools because they brought children of various intellects and different social standing to the same level and caused them to realize that only endeavor and personal ability counted in the affairs of life.

Another great difference was the advocacy of travel by Montaigne in common with most educators of the period. Travel, as contended by Montaigne and others, would broaden the boy's outlook on life and make him a finished gentleman. Mulcaster, the ardent nationalist, heartily disapproved of travel abroad as a means of finishing the education of the boy. He claimed that it did often "finish" young men in fact as well as theory and made them useless to the state, community, and family.

Mulcaster and Montaigne also differed on the time to begin the teaching of Latin. Montaigne, who had learned Latin before he learned French--in fact, Latin was as a mother tongue to him--would have Latin taught to the child as soon as possible after he has attained a reasonable

³ Arthur Tilley, The Literature of the French Renaissance, Cambridge, 1904, II, p. 164.

⁴ McCormick, op. cit., p. 257.

mastery of his mother tongue. He would teach the child the names of objects around him, then proceed to verbs and from thence to easy classic readers. Latin, however, was not to supersede the mother tongue. Because he had suffered so much from his inability to speak French when he entered school he said of the Latin and Greek:

"I must needs acknowledge that the Greeke and Lataine tongues are great ornaments in a gentleman, but they are purchased at over high a rate."⁵

In spite of these differences, the two men agreed on a number of fundamentals. They both advocated the use of the vernacular. Being a true Frenchman and loving his own country, Montaigne demanded that French should be studied before either Greek or Latin because of its real utility;⁶ whereas Mulcaster was as ardent for the use of English by Englishmen and said in his Elementarie:

"I honour foreign tungs but wish my own to be partaker of their honour. Knowing them, I wish my own tung to resemble their grace, I confess their furniture and wish it were ours."⁷

Both Mulcaster and Montaigne saw the relation of the body to the mind and would have the training of one coincide with that of the other. Montaigne, however, says that the man-child should be made complete; while Mulcaster would have both boys and girls made complete; that is, in France physical training would be given to the boys only, while in England both boys and girls would enjoy its benefits. During the Middle Ages stress had been placed on mental training with very little if any attention to the development of the body. This lack of attention to the physical

⁵ Michel Eyquem de Montaigne, Of the Institution and Education of Children, ed. by Chas. W. Eliot, New York, 1910, p. 67.

⁶ McCormick, op. cit., p. 258.

⁷ Richard Mulcaster, Elementarie, London, 1582, (1925 ed.) p. 209.

gradually changed during the Renaissance and more so when humanism came to the fore. It has not been stressed so much in England and was therefore a radical innovation when proposed by Mulcaster as a part of the school curriculum.

A further comparison reveals that Mulcaster considered a number of factors to which Montaigne paid little or no attention. This is largely due to the more democratic philosophy of Mulcaster. Montaigne was considering mainly the education of the nobility.

The English educator, for example, considered the value of certain practical skills. Music, art, and housewifery were practically unknown in the European common school, though some knowledge was given to students under private instruction. The introduction of these subjects into the common school was proposed by Mulcaster but did not become a part of the curriculum until several centuries later. Mulcaster himself put physical training, art, music and dramatics into the course of study of both Merchant Taylors' School and St. Paul's.

Another favorite project of Mulcaster's which failed to be appreciated in his own day and was not recognized by educators to be of any practical value was the co-operation of teachers and parents and of teachers with each other.

Both Mulcaster and Montaigne were inclined to think that parents pampered their children too much and often injured the well being of the child by interfering with his school discipline. Of this Mulcaster says:

"One displeas'd parent will do more harme upon a head, if he take a pyrrre at some toy, never conferring with any, but with his own cholere; then a thousand of the thankfullest will ever do good, though it be never so well deserved. This very point whereby parentes hurte themselves in deede, and hindere their owne, though they discourage teachers, would be looked unto by some publike ordinaunce, that both the maister might be driven to do well, if the fault rest in them; and the parentes to deale well, if the blame rest there; considering the

publike is harmed, where the private is unharmed, to ends it in meter is my president."⁸

Though he recommends gentleness in dealing with the child, he still reserves a place for the rod, always after due warning and a consultation with the parents.⁹ Montaigne always advocated severe discipline especially for the younger boys.

As an educational theorist and as a practical teacher, Mulcaster far exceeded the scope of Montaigne's thought. He made a number of original suggestions which entitle him to a high place among the world's great educators. To further education Mulcaster advised that conferences should be held by teachers among themselves to take advantage of collective experience; to help one another and bring about good to all concerned. The conference must be built upon the honest care of the public welfare without respect to private gain, without private emulation, and without disdain. All of these manifestations of selfish ambition have been enemies to conference and hindrances to good schooling, and in some cases have ruined schools not only in Mulcaster's time but even today. Conferences properly motivated are the very best way of settling all questions.

These views were so broad of conception and of such a radical nature in Mulcaster's day that they had little effect on English schools of the time but later theorists were deeply influenced by them. His most notable contributions to the theory of his time were in regard to elementary education, use of the vernacular, the preparation of teachers, and the method of teaching which should develop the natural powers of the child and cause him to develop symmetrically.

⁸ Ibid., p. 220. ⁹ Ibid., p. 276.

Mulcaster's influence on contemporary teachers was very slight because the vast majority of them were extreme humanists or classicists and like all advocates of a set principle refused to accept these new fangled ideas. This attitude was maintained by both parents and teachers.

Since the schools which survived the so-called Reformation were principally Latin schools conducted by humanists it was only natural that they should be modeled on the school of the man who was considered the greatest educator of the period, Johann Strumm. His school was the prototype of the German gymnasium and was essentially a Latin or classical school with the same avowed purpose as the schools of the Renaissance.¹⁰

Thus we see that the progress of education was retarded for several hundred years. It has been within the last hundred years that many of Mulcaster's principles have been applied by educators who never had heard of the early English advocate of liberalism and utility in education.

¹⁰ McCormick, op. cit., p. 259.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Montaigne, Michel Eyquem de, Of the Institution and Education of Children, edited by Charles W. Eliot. New York: P. F. Collier & Sons, 1910. Pp. 29-73.

_____ Of Pedantry, edited by W. Carew Hazlitt. New York: A. L. Burt, 1892. Pp. 124-138.

Mulcaster, Richard, Positions Wherein Those Primitive Circumstances be examined, which are Necessary for the training up of Children, either for skill in their booke, or health in their bodie, edited by Robert Herbert Quick. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1888.

_____ The First Part of the Elementarie which Entreateth Chiefly of the right writing of our English tung, edited by E. T. Campagnac. London: Clarendon Press, 1925.

SECONDARY SOURCES

1. Baugh, Albert C. A History of the English Language. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co. 1935. Pp. 255-261.
2. "Humanism", Catholic Encyclopedia, VII, pp. 538-542.
3. McCormick, Patrick J. S.T.L., Ph.D. History of Education. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Education Press, 1915. Pp. 66-69, 167, 204-210, 225-229, 251-263.
4. Quick, Robert Herbert, M.A. Essays on Educational Reformers. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1890. Pp. 90-102.
5. Renwick, W. L. "Mulcaster and Du Bellay," MLR, XVII (1922), pp. 282-287.
6. "Richard Mulcaster," A New General Biographical Dictionary, X, p. 255.
7. "Richard Mulcaster," DNB., XXXIX, pp. 275-276.
8. "Richard Mulcaster," Cambridge History of English Literature, III, pp. 353-354; V, 115, 138; VI, 247; VII, 276.
9. "Seven Liberal Arts," Catholic Encyclopedia, I, pp. 760-765.
10. Smith, G. C. Moore, "Spenser and Mulcaster," MLR, VIII (1915), p. 368.
11. Spenser, Edmund, The Works of Edmund Spenser. Edited by R. Morris. London: Macmillan & Co., 1929.
12. Tilley, Arthur. The Literature of the French Renaissance. Cambridge: 1904. II, pp. 136-176.
13. Watson, Foster, M.A. The English Grammar Schools to 1660: their Curriculum and Practice. Cambridge: University Press, 1908.

Typist

Celeste Anderson