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The "Revival of Learning" had a definite effect upon the educational trends of the sixteenth century, particularly upon the English educational system. Because of the diverse ideas that pervade the century, writers found it necessary either to join a school of thought or to launch out on their own ideas and concepts. Hence, the purpose of this study is to examine pre-selected works in the light of the ideas or attitudes toward education as expressed by their authors, giving special attention to their similarities and dissimilarities.

While attention will be given to the precursors in sixteenth-century educational theory, I have chosen the following works which are, in my opinion, most indicative of changing sixteenth-century thought: Sir Thomas Elyot's *The Boke Named the Gouernour*, Roger Ascham's *The Scholemaster*, and Richard Mulcaster's *The Elementarie*. Selection of these works is based on a reading knowledge of these works and on the knowledge that these men wrote during different periods of the century, thus enabling us to note the changing attitudes. Realizing the wealth of information to be found in these works, I shall try to select the most prevalent ideas inherent in the work of each author, referring when possible to other works by these men. Treated ideally, these works would present enough ideas to fill several volumes; consequently, some ideas will be treated in detail, whereas others less important will be summarized.

During the course of this study, an attempt will be made to point out, compare, and contrast the trends of thought, with attention being placed on the influence that others have had upon their attitudes.
Finally, an attempt will be made to evaluate what has been read both according to comprehension and interpretation and according to information received through conferences, interviews, and library resources. The main idea is to note the changing attitudes—whether they are still conservative or liberal—and the possible causes of these changes. To this end, the cited works have been chosen as representative of different periods of the century.

Research prior to the compilation of this material revealed that little work has been done in this area relative to a definite treatment of the changing attitudes. This is not to say that no study of the attitudes has been made; but those studies that have been conducted are, for the most part, examinations of the period as a whole, including consideration of numerous men of the sixteenth century. As a result, only limited attention can be given to each individual, whereas this study will give a broader view of these attitudes relative to the men that have been chosen.

There is little reference to serve as a canon for measuring the type of study which is here to be conducted; consequently, this work may be viewed as a kind of ground-breaking or pioneering effort.
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CHAPTER I

THE FORMULATION OF SIXTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLISH EDUCATIONAL THOUGHT

England owes much to the spirit of the Italian Renaissance. The vigorous renewed interest in classical literature had its inception in the Italian universities; and Manuel Chrysoloras, as early as 1397, taught Greek at the University of Florence.\footnote{James Walton, "Education," Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th ed., VIII, 952.} The stages of the movement cannot be adequately traced; however, it is safe to say that the spirit manifested itself especially in an enthusiastic search for manuscripts, followed by their multiplication and wider distribution. \footnote{Ibid.} There existed two basic trends of thought, one scholastic and one humanistic, both of which flourished in Italy during the closing decades of the thirteenth century.\footnote{Paul O. Kristeller, Renaissance Thought (New York, 1961), p. 113.} Contrary to what is sometimes believed, humanism did not represent the sum total of learning in the Italian Renaissance; for jurisprudence, medicine, theology, mathematics, and natural philosophy represent an apparent continuation of medieval learning which may very well be labelled scholasticism.\footnote{Ibid., p. 111.} Kristeller views scholasticism not as something derogatory; rather, he regards it as a "specific method, that is, the type of logical argument represented by the form of the Questio."\footnote{Ibid., pp. 111-12.}
Scholastic philosophy, which had its inception in France during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, was largely based on the writings of Aristotle, with the major emphasis being placed on logic and natural philosophy. The teaching of logic and natural philosophy was an important part of the university curriculum, even spreading to some of the secondary schools. And an increasing number of references to the works of Aristotle reflected this teaching tradition, a tradition that lasted, though brokenly, far into the seventeenth century.

Though Kristeller believes that the scholastic philosophy proved to be an important aspect of the Italian Renaissance, he expresses his convictions about the importance of humanism:

The most characteristic and most pervasive aspect of the Italian Renaissance in the field of learning is the humanistic movement. I need hardly say that the term 'humanism,' when applied to the Italian Renaissance, does not imply all the vague and confused notions that are now commonly associated with it. Only a few traces of these may be found in the Renaissance. By humanism we mean merely the general tendency of the age to attach the greatest importance to classical studies, and to consider classical antiquity as the common standard and model by which to guide all cultural activities. The humanistic movement is commonly associated with the name of Petrarch.

Petrarch, considered along with Boccaccio as a precursor in the Renaissance spirit, is renowned for his poetry that was filled with the new classical spirit, his discovery of two previously unknown orations of Cicero, and his construction of the first modern map of Italy. Boccaccio is noted for his book of tales filled with the modern spirit. He was the first western scholar to read Homer in the original, and he prepared the first

1Dr. Helen Coulborn, Conference and thesis consultation, June 28, 1962.

2Kristeller, op. cit.

3Ibid., p. 95.
dictionaries of classical geography and mythology.¹

Though Kristeller gives us a workable and concise definition of humanism, the thoughts of Taylor broaden the definition to include several ideas important to the understanding of the far-reaching aspects of humanism.

Humanism in a literary sense is usually thought of as referring to humane studies, the litterae humaniores. Their academic field has always been the literature and plastic arts of Greece and Rome. The conception seems just, as far as it reaches. For, in the main, the thought, the literature and the plastic arts of Greece and Rome are the record and expression of man living on earth, and all things are conceived, reflected on, and felt in their relationships to humanity.²

The reference to man living on earth is significant, for the humanistic system of thought concerns itself with what man can do in this world. This is not to say, however, that man had forgotten the "other world"; but this does mean that life after death is not the main concern of the humanists and that moral philosophy is emphasized more than natural philosophy. Man's relationship to man was a basic concept in classical literature.

The revival of classical antiquity served as a foundation on which later English educationalists based their views. The languages of the Greeks and Romans were especially influential; for as Lewis points out, classical Latin and Greek were the staples of English education, with

¹W. B. Otis and M. H. Needleman, An Outline-History of English Literature, 4th ed., I (New York, 1952), 111. For further discussion, see work in following footnote.

emphasis placed on a conversational as well as a reading knowledge.\textsuperscript{1}

While humanism was in conflict with scholasticism, "both traditions developed side by side throughout the Renaissance and even thereafter."\textsuperscript{2} Basically humanism inculcated into its tradition the fields of grammar, rhetoric, poetry, and moral philosophy; scholasticism, in the fields of logic and natural philosophy.\textsuperscript{3}

Indeed, the humanists and scholastics were at war, but the war was not one of ideas—-it "was, on the humanists' side, a war against ideas."\textsuperscript{4} The conflict was so intense that when humanists gained authoritative positions in the universities, they burned scholastic works. In the process, many good works were destroyed; consequently, humanism created a new learning by creating a new ignorance.\textsuperscript{5} What Lewis means here is that by emphasizing a type of learning (classical) that was unfamiliar to most of the individuals of their age, the humanists were intellectuals in their fields of endeavor. On the other hand, those who were intellectuals according to scholastic standards appeared, for the most part, uninformed if they were unable to expound the doctrines of the humanists.

We can logically conclude at least three things relative to humanism and scholasticism: (1) Both flourished in Italy about the same time although scholasticism had its inception in France, particularly at the University of Paris; (2) both fought for a tradition

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1}C. S. Lewis, \textit{English Literature in the Sixteenth Century} (Oxford, 1954), p. 60.
\item \textsuperscript{2}Kristeller, op. cit., p. 113.
\item \textsuperscript{3}Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{4}Lewis, op. cit., p. 30f.
\item \textsuperscript{5}Ibid.
\end{itemize}
based on its own teaching; and (3) both occupied an important place in
the educational process of the Renaissance.\(^1\)

It would appear to me, then, that the state of humanism and scholasticism during the Renaissance is analogous to a debate\(^2\) not unlike those of painter and sculptor, Douglas and Lincoln, Huxley and Gladstone, or the classicists and the Romanticists. It is a battle based on a way of life or thought, a battle not necessarily of survival, but of expression.

This is the spirit that found its way into sixteenth-century England, and these are a few of the men who expressed the spirit and who greatly influenced English thought: Vittorino da Feltre, Juan Luis Vives, Erasmus, Sir Thomas More, William Grocyn, Thomas Linacre, John Colet, and William Lyly. The most influential men in this group are foreigners, a fact that lends credence to the assertion that English humanism was a matter of thought and training more than of spontaneous emotion, of borrowing from foreign countries more than of native impulse.\(^3\)

One of the most influential was da Feltre, who was a schoolmaster at Mantua during much of the fifteenth century. He was one of the first to apply pagan literature to Christian ideals, for he felt that emulation of the virtuous practices of the pagan heroes would aid Christians in developing better and more virtuous living conditions. He was definite in his views and saw classical literature as a means of implanting ideas,

\(^1\)Kristeller, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 117.

\(^2\)I owe Kristeller the idea of the debate.

of developing tastes, and of acquiring knowledge, all of which help to ornament a Christian life.1

There is much to be said about da Feltre, but Bush adequately and succinctly sums up his life, spirit, and teachings in one long paragraph. Because it is my feeling that the passage resists any attempt to express it any more vividly, it is here quoted in its entirety.

I should like to mention one example, an admittedly special example, of the realization in actual life of classical-Christian ideals. Perhaps the greatest Italian teacher of the earlier 15th century was Vittorino da Feltre. He labored with such zeal, piety, and gaiety in his all-embracing role as teacher of Latin and Greek, spiritual guide, athletic director, and nurse, that he was not, as we grimly say, a productive scholar; his life was given to his pupils. But one of those pupils happened to be Federigo who became ruler of the little principality of Urbino. Under Federigo and his son Urbino was renowned, even in Renaissance Italy, as a center of the finest culture, and it remains famous because it was mirrored in the finest of all courtesy books, The Courtier of Castiglione. Castiglione, a minor diplomat, was himself an ideal gentleman, versed in literature and painting, a poet and a friend of artists and writers, and no one could set forth with fuller authority the attributes of the ideal gentleman and amateur who, in addition to public service, makes life itself an art. Thus in a book partly based on Cicero's De Oratore—one of the half-dozen ancient treatises that created the formative ideals of Renaissance education—we have pictured an aristocratic group whose way of life was the flower of humanistic teaching. If the word 'aristocratic' offends some ears, it may be said that Vittorino, who had been poor himself, took in as pupils poor boys who could not pay fees, that this kind of aristocratic education was being given to all and sundry in the thousands of European grammar schools (such as that in Stratford on Avon), and that education was conceived of in terms of the highest, not the lowest common denominator.2

Vives, a Spaniard, probably had a more direct influence upon English thought; for he spent several years in the court of King Henry VIII, where

1Walton, op. cit., p. 957.

2Douglas Bush, Classical Influences in Renaissance Literature, XII of Martin Classical Lectures (Massachusetts, 1952), 20-21.
he advised Queen Catherine and taught Princess Mary.

In general, Vives' aim is the attainment of both the heavenly and the earthly ideal. ... /and/ the central doctrine of his pedagogical theory is based upon virtue and upon practical excellence gained by Christian education and by logical development. Whatever does not serve this end is worthless; nothing should be striven for except the paths of wisdom. Harmonious upbuilding of soul and body, in theory and in practice, in developing the mentality and in imparting material knowledge, is the way by which this is attained. He therefore substitutes for the scholastic deductive method practically an inductive method, in which both teacher and pupil work together ... .

The reference to a "Christian education" is significant to the understanding of the humanistic spirit, for the classics were written before the advent of Christianity. Consequently, for the ancients to have referred to the doctrine of Christianity constitutes an impossibility. What they did do was to advocate a way of life that was exemplary of virtue and "right living." The key phrase, as related to a form of religion, was "service to the gods." The major difference is a change from a polytheistic to a monotheistic theory of a deity; but the emphasis on virtuous living and service to God still remained, though slightly tailored along the lines of Christian living. Hence, the possibility of gaining a Christian education based on following the classics became a reality. Contrary to what was popularly believed, interest in classical literature did not express antagonism toward Christian practices, though some early humanists thought so.2

Vives is also renowned for his work titled Instructions of a Christian Woman, which began the decisive movement for the education of women.3 Under the patronage of Queen Catherine, he began the effort with

---

2 Walton, op. cit., p. 957.
tutoring Princess Mary.\textsuperscript{1} He spent many hours at the home of Sir Thomas More, where he met, and doubtlessly influenced, such notables as Sir Thomas Elyot, John Heywood, and Lord Mountjoy. The congenial and informal atmosphere of the Mores' home proved quite conducive for the study and discussion of ideas relative to the Renaissance spirit.\textsuperscript{2} To assume that Vives discussed with More and his friends his own ideas and attitudes towards education does not appear to be treading on unsafe grounds. Both Berdan and Watson feel that he made significant contributions to the trend of English educational thought; and I feel that he must have discussed his ideas in the presence of More, Heywood, Mountjoy, and Elyot.

For example, his assertions include: adapting teaching to the needs of the child, advocating that only the capable be permitted to proceed to higher education, preferring slow wits to quick wits, teaching in the vernacular, and teaching languages by the direct method.\textsuperscript{3} These ideas can be found in his de Disciplinis. He believed also that knowledge should be turned to usefulness and emphasized for the common good\textsuperscript{4} and that teacher and student must work together.\textsuperscript{5}

Summing up Vives' importance, Watson says,

No Spaniard up to his date (perhaps, indeed, not at any time in the past) had ever come into such friendly relations with the English leaders of learning and culture on their own soil. It may be said that at least he ranks as high, educationally, as Erasmus. Probably as a pioneering performer he should be placed higher.\textsuperscript{6}

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., p. 66. \hfil \textsuperscript{2}Ibid., p. 100.  
\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., p. 100. \hfil \textsuperscript{4}Ibid., p. 60.  
\textsuperscript{5}Berdan, op. cit., p. 303. \hfil \textsuperscript{6}Watson, op. cit., p. v.
Despite Watson's avid praise for Vives, Erasmus is held to be one of the greatest, if not the greatest, influence upon sixteenth-century English thought. He was closely connected with many of the early English humanists which included Thomas More and John Colet. He made current the classic spirit; humanism ceased to be the exclusive privilege of the few. He is generally credited with introducing the true classic spirit, that is, he did not parade his knowledge of fields with which others had little acquaintance. Instead, he was interested in providing avenues of expression open to the multitude, though his writing in Latin limited his direct influence to the educated classes which were mostly members of the upper classes.\(^1\) He wrote widely and competently on various subjects, and

The wealth of subject-matter was found with no one in greater abundance than with Erasmus. What knowledge of life, what ethics, all supported by the indisputable authority of the Ancients, all expressed in that fine, airy form for which he was admired. And such knowledge of antiquities in addition to all this! Illimitable was the craving for and illimitable the power to absorb what is extraordinary in real life. This was one of the principal characteristics of the spirit of the Renaissance.\(^2\)

One example of his indomitable spirit may be evidenced in his fervor to master the Greek tongue; for while he possessed almost infallible command of Latin, he felt the need for learning the Greek tongue, an endeavor which probably owed itself to his desire to read the Holy Scriptures in original Greek.\(^3\) Having finally mastered the language, he proceeded immediately to try to convince his colleagues that they,

---


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 41.

\(^3\)Ibid., pp. 48-49.
too, should have a good knowledge of that wonderful language.\(^1\)

He also recognized the dual nature of the Renaissance; he saw it "as a struggle between old and new, which, to him, meant evil and good. In the advocates of tradition he saw only obscurantism, conservatism, and ignorant opposition to bonae literae, that is, the good cause for which he and his partisans battled."\(^2\) Although he should not be stigmatized for his failure to recognize the good in medieval studies, Erasmus loses something in his unwavering adherence to the classics. It is indeed unfortunate that he failed to recognize the lessons to be found in scholastic philosophy; yet, even modern-day scholars are sometimes divided as to the relative importance of scholasticism. Some see it as having been a threat to liberal education; others see it as having been a complement of liberal education. Still, his ideas are sound; for as Huizinga points out:

In this line of confidence in what is natural and desire \(\text{sic}\) of the simple and reasonable, Erasmus' educational and social ideas lie. Here he is far ahead of his times. It would be an attractive undertaking to discuss Erasmus' educational ideals more fully. They foreshadow exactly those of the eighteenth century \(\text{as well as those of the sixteenth century}\). The child should learn in playing, by means of things that are agreeable to its mind, from pictures. Its faults should be gently corrected. The flogging and abusive schoolmaster is Erasmus' abomination; the office itself is holy and venerable to him. Education should begin from the moment of birth. Probably Erasmus attached too much value to classicism, \(\text{but}\) what gentleness and clear good sense shines from all Erasmus says about instruction and education!\(^3\)

Berdan thinks that the effect of Erasmus on his generation is due to content, not form.\(^4\) He sees him as being best known for his scholarly

\(^{1}\text{Ibid.}\) \(^{2}\text{Ibid., p. 103.}\) \(^{3}\text{Ibid., p. 107.}\) \(^{4}\text{Berdan, op. cit., p. 283.}\)
work and emphasis on moral philosophy\(^1\) and as being the "chief figure of English humanism"\(^2\) and the "mouth-piece of humanism."\(^3\)

If Erasmus was the mouthpiece of humanism, Sir Thomas More was certainly the living example of humanism. More, Erasmus' close friend, wrote both in Latin and the vernacular; but he made no attempt to enrich the English language,\(^4\) an assertion that is only an echo of an earlier statement by Berdan: "As a writer of English, More may be ignored; it is only as a humanist that he is a world-figure."\(^5\) In his *Utopia*, a work written in Latin, he pictures a commonwealth state that exists for the benefit of the individuals,\(^6\) a point of view with which Elyot vehemently disagreed. *Utopia* is also an illustration of More's propensity for the study of classical literature, as some of its ideas are derived from Plato's *Republic*, notably the idea of the commonwealth.

Though there is a great deal of modernity in *Utopia*, More's humanism was of a kind that concerned itself with the expansion of man's possibilities in this world rather than with the study of the past and of the world to come.\(^7\) His basic attitudes towards education are probably most apparent in his own way of life. For example, he read all of the chief classical authors, including Plato, Lucian, Horace, Seneca, and Terence;\(^8\) and he devoted much of his leisure time to the

\(^{1}\)Ibid., pp. 283-85.  \(^{2}\)Ibid., p. 278.

\(^{3}\)Ibid., p. 294.


\(^{5}\)Berdan, *op. cit.*, p. 269.  \(^{6}\)Ibid., p. 270.


education of his household. Referring to the atmosphere of the Mores' household, Erasmus says,

Plato's academy was revived; only whereas in the academy the discussion turned upon geometry and the power of number, the house of Chelsea is a veritable school of the Christian religion. In it is none, man or woman, but readeth or studieth the liberal arts. Yet it is their chief care of piety. There is never seen idle. The head of the house governs it, not by lofty carriage and frequent rebukes, but by gentleness and amiable manners. Every member is busy in his place, performing his duty with alacrity, nor is sober mirth wanting. Several conclusions can be inferred from the foregoing statements. First, it is apparent that More was interested in the litterae humaniores and in virtue exemplified in Christian living. Second, he was interested in the education of both sexes. And third, he approved of gentleness and love as allurements to learning. Though he does not positively declare his convictions, his patriarchal family group is proof enough of his attitudes towards education.

Noted along with More in connection with English humanism are Grocyn, Linacre, Colet, and Lyly. They are generally referred to as the "Oxford Humanists" for they played significant roles in the development of the humanistic spirit in England. Grocyn, who left no memorable work, studied diligently in the classics and patronized the erudite Erasmus; his contributions were primarily those of inspiration rather than of productivity. Linacre's interest lay in the study of medicine, particularly the medical treatises of Galen. He was also a student of linguistics and, for the benefit of Princess Mary, published a monograph

---

1 Ibid., p. 887.

2 Erasmus, quoted in ibid. (Source of original not given.)
on Latin grammar, making use of the vernacular. These two men are generally credited with introducing the new learning into Oxford; and they are primarily remembered for this feat and their scholarship, not for any published works.

Colet and Lyly voraciously studied the classics at Oxford and spent considerable time in other countries, seeking further exposure to the classics. Colet is probably best known for his founding of St. Paul's School, which produced the brilliant classicist, John Milton. Lyly became the first headmaster of the school; and he, Colet, and Erasmus collaborated on the organization of the school's constitution and also on a Latin grammar textbook for the pupils, a work which proved to be the most influential of the English textbooks. The work is referred to under three names: "Lyly's Grammar," "Paul's Accidence," and the "Eton Grammar."  

Even though Grocyn, Linacre, Colet, and Lyly left no pure literature, they produced the matrix in which it was molded. And though we must respect their contributions, we must be aware that

Humanism was never the revelation to England that it had been to Italy where for a century it arrested the promise of its original genius. In England, where humanism was imported, the normal centers of attraction were confined to the courts and two universities. Much of its original force was gone before it crossed the channel, and it had already become the shadow of a shadow.

---

1Baugh, et al., op. cit., p. 327.
2Ottis and Needleman, op. cit., p. 112.
3Ibid., pp. 327-28.
5Lewis Einstein, Tudor Ideals (New York, 1921), p. 316.
A few churchmen took interest in the new learning, but English scholarship remained "stunted." And the writing of Greek and Latin became an opportunity to display academic ingenuity and classical revelation. 

Coupled with this humanistic spirit were shifts in attitudes and the eventual formulation of the Copernican theory of revolution, which threatened to disrupt man's view of himself and the universe. Gone were the old feudalistic system and printing by hand, paving the way for English nationalism. Explorers made earth-shattering discoveries that widened geographical boundaries and made men think on a wider scale. Hence, the sixteenth century was an age of transition.

However, the transition from one theory of the universe to another theory that lessened the importance of man was not so easily effected. The opposing theories of the universe as held by Ptolemy and Copernicus created little disturbance. The former held that "the earth was a flat plain covered by a series of transparent globes between which the planets move with the 'music of the spheres'." In such a scheme, man is of great importance; for everything revolved around man and earth, which acted as the center of the universe. However, Copernicus upset this theory with the contention that man is only an atom in the scheme of things, only a part of a greater whole. Man was no longer the center of the universe and had moved to a less commanding position, only

---

1 Ibid., p. 317.  
2 Ibid., p. 318.  
3 Ibid., p. 321.  
4 Ibid., p. 2.  
5 Ibid., p. 23.  
6 Ibid., p. 24.
another entity revolving around a new center. The Church and various scholars reacted violently to this theory, resulting in the burning of Copernicus' works.¹ Though his theory was not immediately accepted, he had started a trend of thought not to be easily dismissed.²

Sixteenth-century educational thought is not an ordinary progression of ideas and attitudes. Rather, it is the result of trial-and-error, hit-or-miss practices that were retained if they were favorable and discarded if they were unfavorable. The conflict between scholasticism and humanism, the ideas of such men as da Feltre, Vives, and Erasmus from other countries and of More and the Oxford Humanists in England are all essential links in the chain of English educational theories and ideas to follow. Further, the importance of the break-up of the feudal system, the invention of the printing press, the advent of the Copernican theory, and the extension of geographical boundaries cannot be minimized.

The stage is indeed set for a new act in the development of English thought and attitudes, particularly those related to the development of English education. Sir Thomas Elyot, Roger Ascham, and Richard Mulcaster were only a few of those who took advantage of the rich selection of ideas and materials open to them; but they are quite representative of the development of definite ideas toward English education, as will be indicated in the following chapters.

¹Ibid.
²According to Lewis, op. cit., p. 2., the Copernican theory was not seriously considered until the work of Kepler and Galileo verified it years later.
CHAPTER II

PURPOSE OF EDUCATION AND CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION OF THE SCHOLAR AND THE SCHOOLMASTER

The purpose of education during the period immediately preceding the sixteenth century was almost always connected with the welfare of the upper classes. Before the advent of the Tudors, scholars were usually individuals other than the princes and noblemen; and their duties consisted of performing any task that required literary skill. Many of the Latin letters supposedly written by the monarchs were in actuality written by these scholars, whereas the monarchs only signed their names to the finished product. The education of the upper classes was basically chivalric in nature, that is, much more emphasis was placed upon the development of social graces, particularly those graces connected with the court and courtier.

The ideals of chivalry prescribed a long and careful preparation for the degree of knighthood which was quite unlike the preparation of the scholar, because it was directed to capacity of a different kind. It sought to educate a man of action, the ruler, soldier, courtier, not the thinker, or fluent speaker of clerkly ecclesiastic. The schools offered but a limited exercise ground for capacity of this sort, and a different kind of instruction was necessary.

"The day was over for a prince to be unlettered as Henry VI whose stupidity passed for holiness."

The program of education was shifting towards the training of individuals who would bear authority in the realm.

---

3 Ibid.
And Henry VIII, who was noted for his intelligence, his proficiency in languages, and his general all-round ability, established a new image of the English ruler.

Because of this lack of a clear-cut idea of the purpose of education in English schools, various writers sought to point out what they considered to be the purpose of education. It is noteworthy that many of the writers on education coupled the purpose of education with the welfare of the state. From time to time, the idea of the purpose of education was re-interpreted and expanded to fit the particular age in which the work was written. There was an obvious shift from an attitude favoring the dashing, but unlettered prince to one favoring a strong, versatile, and intelligent prince epitomized in the person of Henry VIII. One of the most emphatic in his stand favoring the latter is Sir Thomas Elyot, who expresses his views in The Boke Named the Gouernour. And

Inasmuch as the most important business of the State, in Elyot's estimation, as in that of Plato and Solomon, is the training of its rulers, he devoted the work almost entirely to that subject.¹

This attitude is partially based on Patrizi's De Regno et Regis Institutione,² but the scope of Elyot's work is greater and pertains to both princes and noblemen who would bear authority in the realm.³ Despite this apparent borrowing of ideas, The Gouernour "may be accepted as the first full exposition of the humanistic point of view, not only in English

but also in England.\textsuperscript{1} And despite the apparent shift from the chivalric attitude, the two purposes cannot be dissociated; for the ruler must possess the attributes of both the courtier and the intellect.\textsuperscript{2} Elyot is aware of the need for this "composite" man, and as Adamson points out:

The Boke Named the Governour (1531), by Sir Thomas Elyot, is the first English contribution to the discussion of the education best fitted 'a gentleman which is to have authority in the public weal.' Elyot is at one with Castiglione in asserting the power of a humanist discipline for this purpose. The instruction in physical and military exercises and in social accomplishments prescribed by both writers is the same.\textsuperscript{3}

It is also

... a treatise on moral philosophy, intended to direct the education of those destined to fill high positions, and to inculcate those moral principles which alone could fit them for the performance of their duties.\textsuperscript{4}

Elyot is a firm believer in the idea that not everybody was capable of ruling; therefore, power should be vested in the hands of those most capable of governing, notably princes and magistrates. These individuals should have the ability to reign wisely and competently over the subjects in a "communaltie"\textsuperscript{5} and, therefore, should be grounded in the knowledge suitable to ruling wisely and carrying out the duties pertaining to their offices. Hence, it is the purpose of education to equip them with the

\textsuperscript{1}S. S. Laurie, Studies in the History of Educational Opinion from the Renaissance (Cambridge, 1905), p. 38.

\textsuperscript{2}Morehouse College, Interview with Dr. Richard Barksdale, June 27, 1962.

\textsuperscript{3}Adamson, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 173.


qualities necessary for a good leader.\textsuperscript{1}

There may be some question in the modern-day reader's mind as to the justification of Elyot's limiting the purpose of education to the furtherance of the ruling class; however, as Foster points out, the political writer on education, who looks at his problem from a large national point of view, almost inevitably will throw his work into the form of the political ideals which underlie his thoughts. Thus the 'form' may be monarchical, oligarchical, aristocratic, or democratic. A writer to-day, dealing with national education, thinks of the education of the great mass of people, for political power has passed into the hands of the people at large. The responsibility of the exercise of intelligence, and hence of systematic preparation by education, is absolutely urgent wherever the political power is concentrated. It is therefore as necessary, politically to-day, to take steps to have an educated democracy, as in the Tudor time it was necessary to have an educated monarch.\textsuperscript{2}

Here is a strong defense of Elyot's belief that the purpose of education, in his time, was to equip the monarch for his responsibilities to his realm. His attitude towards this purpose is indeed a reflection of the man himself, for Elyot . . . was courtly and aristocratic in the extreme; he opposed communism; he defended 'degrees' in government and the monarchical form of government; he believed in due submission of the common people. . . .\textsuperscript{3}

If we subscribe to these contentions, we can readily see why Elyot writes as he does; for he is a firm believer in order; therefore, he wants an educated monarch so that the order could be maintained. This is something that God ordained; and he feels it has duty to adhere to the laws of God, laws based on gradation in the universe.\textsuperscript{4} Here he makes use of the Chain of Being concept, which holds basically that everything in the

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., pp. 4-18.

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., p. xvii.

\textsuperscript{3}Elyot, op. cit., p. xviii.

\textsuperscript{4}Ibid., pp. 7-15.
universe is relegated to a position ordained by God.

Roger Ascham’s ideas of the purpose of education are much the same as Elyot’s, but he is probably more explicit than Elyot in the presentation of these ideas. He gives us an indication of his attitude in the very sub-title of his The Scholemaster, in which he says, in essence, that the purpose of his treatise on education is connected with the plain and perfect way of teaching children to understand, write, and speak the Latin tongue and with the bringing up of youth in gentlemen’s and noblemen’s houses.\(^1\) Also inherent in his ideas concerning the purpose of education is the bringing up of gentlemen’s and noblemen’s sons to a virtuous life and enabling them to be of service to God and their country.\(^2\) He also believes that education should enable a scholar to observe truth in religion, honesty in living, and right order in learning,\(^3\) which are to be attained through literature and the criticism of life which is embodied in the literature.\(^4\)

Ascham gives us another indication of his attitude when he contrasts learning and experience:

Learning therefore, ye wise fathers, and good bringing up, and not blinde & dangerous experience, is the next and readiest waie, that must leede your children first, to wisdom, and than to worthiness, if euer ye purpose they shall come there.\(^5\)

---


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 179.

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 215.

\(^4\)Laurie, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

He, like Elyot, expresses the courtier-prince attitude; for "... he considers education as embracing not merely school learning, but all culture of mind and body..."¹

Little difference exists between the ideas expounded by Elyot and Ascham. As it can be observed, both assume that the nobility and aristocracy have certain rights and privileges, as well as certain duties. Consequently, they equally assume that these potential rulers, with all their rights and powers, are sworn to protect their countrymen—noblemen and commoners alike. With this idea in mind, Elyot makes the following comment:

... For as moche as the saide persones, excelling in knowledge whereby other be governed, be ministers for the only profite and commoditie of them whiche have not equall understanding: where they whiche do exercise artificiall science and corporall labour, do nat trauaiyle for theyr superiours onely, but also for theyr owne necessitie. So the husbande man fedethe hym selfe and the clothe maker: the clothe maker apparyleth hym selfe and the husbande: they both socour other artificers: other artificers them: they and other artificers them that be gouernours. But they that be gouernours (as I before sayde) nothinge do acquire by the sayde influence of knowledge for theyr owne necessitie, but do impoye all the powers of theyr wites, and theyr diligence, to the only preseruation of other theyr inferiours, ...²

Here Elyot recognizes the necessity of a division of labor within a state and reasons it out on the basis of the Chain of Being.

Ascham's warning to the members of the court reflects the Chain of Being concept, as well as his belief that the noblemen are ordained rulers.

Take hede therfore, ye great ones in ye Court, yea though ye be ye greatest of all, take hede, what ye do, take hede how ye liues. For as you great ones vse to do, so all meane men louse to do. You be in deed, makers or marrers, of all mens maners within the Realme.

¹Garnett and Gosse, op. cit., p. 332.
²Elyot, op. cit., pp. 5-6.
For though God hath placed yow, to be cheife in making lawes, to beare greatest authoritie, to commaund all others: yet God doth order, that all your lawes, all your authoritie, all your commandementes, do not halfe so much with meane men, as doth your example and maner of liuinge. And for example even in the greatest matter, if yow your selues do serve God gladlie and orderlie for conscience sake, not coldlie, and somtyme for maner sake, you carie all the Courte with yow, and the whole Realme beside, earnestlie and orderlie to do the same. . . .

He not only recognizes the importance of the ruling class as leaders of the state but also as establishers of good examples for other members of the realm to follow.

Mulcaster, who succeeds Elyot and Ascham as the supporter of changing educational practices, deals with the purpose of education much in the same manner as his predecessors. The major difference is that he expands his ideas to include the sons of merchants and others of similar status. The effect of the progression of time upon the changing attitudes is evidenced in this expansion, for power is moving outwards to include those other than the nobility. Although he is also concerned with the ruling body, Mulcaster has different ideas about who make up the ruling body, as evidenced in his consideration of the rise in power by the merchants.

It is his belief that each person is best fitted to perform certain functions and that each person must be prepared to execute adequately and proficiently that function. Therefore, those that are to rule must have the benefit of an education that will sufficiently equip them for this task; consequently, education should be directed to this end: preparation

---

1 Ascham, op. cit., p. 220.
2 Ainsworth, op. cit., p. 37.
3 Infra, p. 11.
of individuals for service to God and their country.\(^1\) He concludes that the end of education is "to help natur unto hir perfection, when all hir abilities be perfited in their habit, whereunto right Elements be right great helps."\(^2\)

Indications of who should be chosen for education have been given in the discussion of the purpose of education; but there are certain qualifications that a scholar must have, regardless of his social status. Here are found more differences in the ideas and attitudes of the three champions of education.

Previously scholars had been chosen with an eye towards service in the court, and were not usually taken from the ruling classes. Their duties were connected with such things as writing letters for the monarch. Those who wanted a practical education studied at the Inns of Court. In fact, they executed almost all transactions that required literary skill or legal knowledge.\(^3\) Now the attitudes were shifting towards the education of those who were to bear authority in the realm,\(^4\) and the educationalists naturally thought in terms of the desired qualifications of the potential rulers.

Elyot is, without a doubt, a supporter of the education of the ruling class. He points out repeatedly that princes and noblemen are more fit to be educated because of their high and responsible positions. The crux of


\(^2\) Ibid., p. 31.

\(^3\) Dr. Helen Coulborn, Thesis consultation, June 30, 1962.

his thesis is the idea that the princes and noblemen are ordained by God to rule the other members of society. He contends that each man should be suited to his own station, namely a husbandman to growing food, the clothesmaker to making clothes, and logically, the rulers to ruling the people, thereby necessitating the acquisition of knowledge suitable to their own station.⁴ Therefore, the scholar should be chosen according to the duties he has to perform in the society. Since princes and noblemen are the rightful rulers and since the purpose of education is to equip them for ruling, they are the ones to benefit from education. As Mary Lascelles points out, "Elyot's Governour . . . is a plan for the upbringing of gentlemen's sons who will bear authority in the realm. . . ."² Elyot supports this contention when he says:

> For as moche as all noble authors do conclude, and also commune experience proueth, that where the governours of realmes and cities be founden adourned with vertues, and do employ thyr study and mynde to the publicke weale, as well as to the augmentation therof as to the establyslynge and long continuance of the same: there a publike weale must nedes be both honorable and welthy. To the extent that I wyll declare howe such personages may be prepared. . . .

He chooses his scholars from the nobility and justifies his choice with the aid of the Chain of Being concept. Just as fire, the highest of elements, is placed in a superior position because of its superior merits, the future rulers and noblemen, as the highest in society, should "be set in a more highe place than the residue [lower classes] where they . . .

---

¹ Elyot, op. cit., pp. 4-6.


³ Elyot, op. cit., p. 18.
must also be maintained according to their merits.¹ He metaphorically illustrates his method of choosing a scholar.

... I will use the policie of a wyse and counynyge gardener: who purposyng to haue in his gardeyne a fyne and preciouse herbe, that shulde be to hym and all other repairyng thereto, excellently comodiouse or pleasant, he will first serche through-out his gardeyne where he can find the most melowe and fertile erth: and therin will be put the sede of the herbe to grow and be norisshed: and in most diligent wise attendeth; no weede be suffred to growe or aproche nyghe unto it: and to the entent it may thrive the faster, as soon as the fourme of an herbe ones appereth, he will set a vessell of water by hit, in such wyse that it may continually distille on the rote swete droppes; and as it spryngeth in stalke, under sette it with some thynge that it breake nat, and alway kepe it cleane from weedes.²

He goes on to say that this is the method by which he would choose and educate those who are sons of the ruling class and who are to bear autho-rity in the realm.

He also thinks that training in virtue should begin with consulting the natural disposition of the pupil.³ And here is one of the earliest refer-ences to a system of selection based on psychological principles.

Ascham justifies his choice of princes and noblemen as scholars on the basis of degree, which is also one of the aspects of the Chain of Being concept. He believes that it is through the grace and power of God that the nobility should rule; therefore, persons of noble rank are more suited to learning. For just as a ship needs a good, strong, learned captain, a country needs a good, strong, learned ruling body.⁴ With the use of another image, he emphasizes the importance of choosing the right kind of

¹Ibid., p. 5.
²Ibid.
³Leslie Warren, "Patrizi's De Regno et Regis Institutione and the Plan of Elyot's The Boke Named the Gournour," JEGP, XLIX, 75-74.
⁴Ascham, op. cit., pp. 205-207.
scholar. He says that a scholar should be chosen as one would choose an apple, the best scholar being one who is comparable to a green apple rather than a ripe one; for a green apple grows to ripeness, whereas a ripe apple rots more quickly. Therefore, if a young scholar be kept and tended like a green apple, he will grow into ripeness, thus becoming a "fruit" ripened by knowledge.¹

He also discusses the quick wits (those quick to learn) and the hard wits (those slow to learn) and concludes that the hard wits are preferable to quick wits because quick wits are

... verie light of conditions: and thereby, very readie of disposition, to be carried ouer quicklie by any light cumpanie, to any riot and wnrthiftness when they be yonge: and therefore seldom, either honest of life, or riche in living. .. ,²

whereas the hard wits are

... hard to receive, but sure to keep: painefull without werinesse, hedefull without wauring, constant without newfangledness; bearing heauie things, though not lightlie, yet willinglie: entering hard things, though not easeli, yet depelie, and so cum to that perliteness of learning in the end, that quike wits, segme in hope, but not in deede, or else verie seldom, euere attain to.³

Describing his ideal pupil, he lists the following attributes: (1) a wit applicable by readiness of will to learning; (2) a good memory; (3) a love of learning; (4) a desire to work; (5) a willingness to learn from others; (6) a propensity to ask questions; and (7) a love of praise for doing well.⁴ Basing his assertions on the recommendations of Socrates in Plato, he expands the seven points to include traits relative to each point.⁵ First, along with a willingness to learn, the scholar must have

¹Ibid., p. 192 ²Ibid., p. 189 ³Ibid., p. 191. ⁴Ibid., pp. 191-97. ⁵Ibid.
good qualities of mind and body. He must not stammer, his voice must be strong, masculine and audible, and his appearance must be comely. He laments the practice of sending deformed children to school as those most in need of an education. Second, a good memory is distinguished by three properties: quick in receiving, sure in keeping, and ready in delivering. Our modern day psychologists would probably label these correspondingly as the ability to be receptive, retentive, and productive (based on recall). Third, a love of learning must be coupled with will and memory, for learning would then be facilitated.

Fourth, the scholar must be willing to apply himself; he must be willing to work hard. Fifth, he must be prepared to work with others and to accept their ideas, provided that the ideas are valid and reliable. And if he must work with others, he must discuss with others, which entails point six: a propensity to ask questions. In keeping with the ideals that this trait embodies, the scholar must not be ashamed to learn from the meanest or afraid to go to the greatest until he is perfectly taught and satisfied with the answers. Seven, he must have a mind wholly bent to win praise for doing well.

Mulcaster differs from his predecessors; for

... unlike Elyot and Ascham, he is less concerned with the sons of 'magistrates' and landed gentry than with the sons of merchants and common citizens. Thus, though he does not share the aristocratic presuppositions of earlier humanists, he finds a compensation in democratizing (some would say vulgarizing) the tradition of Tudor education. ...

This is not to be interpreted as being a recommendation for the opening of educational opportunities to all persons within a state; for the

---

... State or Society, as he conceives it, is made up of parts, as a machine of a living body is made up of parts, and each part must fulfil its proper function in its proper place, a function and a place of dignity and of usefulness in service to the whole. But not more than a certain number of parts are needed. A coach would run ill on five wheels, and a centipede would be hampered in its movement an hundred and first leg. Now according to Mulcaster the State at any time needs only so many learned persons --more of them would be too many.¹

Here again is the Chain of Being concept as it is evidenced in the attitudes of Mulcaster.

He believes that the first thing to consider is whether or not the scholar will utilize his knowledge for the benefit of the public. The scholar whose learning will be beneficial to the public is to be preferred to those whose learning fit them for living privately to themselves.² With this idea in mind, he discusses the potential leaders of the realm and divides them into "principal and subaltern magistrates."³ The principal magistrates are those leaders "which ar not subject to account of their government by anie common order, tho in conscience and religion both towards God and men theie be euerie one subject...."⁴ The subaltern magistrates are those "ruling other yet ar subject to other, as in a Monarchie all the mean and inferiour magistrates...."⁵

According to this evidence, it appears that Mulcaster thinks that a scholar should be chosen according to his natural ability to learn, provided that he has a propensity to be of service to God and his country. Consequently, his ideal pupil must be strong of body and mind, quick of wit, and must have a facility for retaining what he has learned. Added to this

¹Mulcaster, op. cit., p. xv.
²Ibid., p. 13.
⁴Ibid.
⁵Ibid.
must be a desire to ask questions, to emulate good examples, and to seek praise.¹

Though the writers agree that a scholar should be chosen according to his service to God and his country, they differ in other matters—at least, Mulcaster differs from the other two. First, he does not think in terms of the aristocracy; for he considers other social classes such as the merchants. The progression of government out of the hands of a smaller group into the hands of a larger group is indicated in this attitude of Mulcaster's. Second, he does not support the idea that the nobility are ordained rulers. Third, he disagrees with Ascham as to what wits should be chosen. Whereas Ascham works on the thesis of "hard to get, hard to lose," Mulcaster thinks that a scholar should be chosen according to his natural ability to learn and according to his quick and ready wit.² Ascham himself is not consistent in his attitude towards quick and hard wits; for he favors the hard wit in one instance and later lists "quick in receiving" as a property of a good memory, good memory itself being one of the qualities of an ideal scholar.³ Despite his inconsistency, Ascham's preference for hard wits reflects the probable influence of Vives.

Each writer recognizes the importance of a good teacher, but each is not as equally as profound in presenting his ideas upon the subject. However, the awareness is still there. It seems that the schoolmaster had been previously accepted on the basis of his title. For the most part, his ability was little questioned; for the parents were more interested in getting their children out of their way. A later discussion of Elyot will

¹Ibid., pp. 12-17.
²Supra, p. 23.
bring out this point. Perhaps here more than anywhere else the influence of Vives is clearly seen, particularly in the works of Elyot and Ascham. His recommendations include consideration of a schoolmaster who teaches through love, who appeals to the student as the embodiment of the classical ideal, and who sets a good example for the student to emulate.¹

Elyot approaches this subject with a great deal of modernity, for his arguments are valid even to this day. He argues that the schoolmaster should be motivated just as the student must be motivated, and he recognizes the fact that salary plays a large role in the motivation. He points out that the salary for schoolmasters is too low; therefore, the schoolmasters are not as dedicated to their work as they should be. The parents are partially to blame, for

... nobles and gentlemen, who wolde haue their sonnes by excellent learning come unto honour, for sparynge of coste or for lack of diligent serche for a good schole maister wilfully distroy their children, causinge them to be taught lerninge, whiche wolde require sixe or seuen yeres to be forgotten; by whiche time time more parte of the age is spente, wheri~ is the chiefe sharpnesse of witte called in latine acumen. ... ²

Whereas he recognizes the part that salary has to play relative to the earnestness with which a schoolmaster applies himself, Elyot still believes that a teacher's main interest should like in cultivating the minds and bodies of the young. Consequently, the desirable teacher is learned and dedicated, regardless of the money that he receives.³ On the other hand, he attacks the parents who, because of their miserly inclinations, subject their children to being "trained" by incompetent schoolmasters.

He is more profound than his successors; and, as a result of his positive

¹Berdan, op. cit., p. 328.
²Elyot, op. cit., p. 71.
³Ibid., pp. 69-71.
thinking, he concludes that the best schoolmaster is

... a maister ... excellently lerned both in greke and
latine ... , of sobre and vertuous disposition, specially
chast of living and of moche affabilitie and patience:
leste by any unclesane example the tender mynde of the child
may be infected, harde afterwandes to be recovered. For the
natures of children be nat so moche or soone adusenced by
things well done or spoken, as they be hindred and corrupted
by that whiche in actis or wordes is wantonly expressed. Al-
so by a cruel and irous maister the wittes of children be
dulled; and that thinge for the whiche children be often tymes
beaten is to them sooner after fastidious; wherof we nede no
better autor for wittnes than daily experience.¹

He goes on to cite scholars who had profited from having studied under
"sobre and virtuous maisters." The best examples he concludes, as he
calls upon history to corroborate his contention, are Alexander the
Great, who studied under Aristotle, and Traiane, who studied under Plutarch.²
He sets these men up as models to be emulated and warns the schoolmasters
that their own way of life is reflected in the lives of their students.

Ascham is not as profound as Elyot, but he is a little more definite
than Mulcaster. He advocates plainly and emphatically the selection of a
gentle schoolmaster who would encourage the student to ask questions; con-
sequently, understanding and communication between teacher and student can
be reached. The idea of advocating gentleness in a schoolmaster is a carry-
over from Elyot, who was probably influenced by Vives during the many gath-
erings at the home of Sir Thomas More. Though he realizes that whippings
may get results, Ascham believes that more results could be obtained by a
more gentle method.³ Because his discussion touches more on the subject of
of method, it is here only treated generally, whereas a fuller treatment
will be given under the discussion of method.

¹Ibid., pp. 32-33. ²Ibid., pp. 33-34.
³Ascham, op. cit., p. 184.
However, it can be said that his love of a gentle teacher is significant; for this attitude contributed greatly to his composing this work. The composition of the work stemmed from a conversation begun in the home of Sir William Cecil. Discussing the report that some Eton students had run away for fear of beating, the company aligned themselves into two groups, one supporting the floggers and the other opposing them. Ascham, who was of the latter group, began, upon the suggestion of Sir Richard Sackville, to write a treatise upon methodology in teaching, giving special consideration to gentleness in teaching. The result was *The Scholemaster*.

And the rest is English literary history.

Mulcaster makes no pointed recommendation of a desirable schoolmaster, but he does speak largely in terms of what he would do. However, by this repeated reference to himself and his methods, he indicates the type of teacher with whom he would be satisfied. Apparently he approves of a stern but not too harsh master, for he says that he will do nothing to confuse or to discourage the student in the learning process.

The earlier ideas of Elyot are more profound—and more advanced—than his successors, for he treats the attitude of the schoolmaster as a possible problem hindering the execution of teaching duties. And he recommends the employment of teachers who are morally upstanding, for a corrupt teacher breeds corrupt students. One has only to look to our present age to observe the validity of his statement. His ideas are more advanced not because the other two do not express similar ideas but because his

---

treatise was written at least thirty-seven years before Ascham's and fifty-one years before Mulcaster's, and yet their views are basically the same.

The most apparent shift in attitudes can be seen in the ideas concerning the purpose of education. By Elyot's time, education was more directly connected with the ruling classes, having shifted from the preparation of scholars to aid the rulers to the education of the rulers themselves. Gone was the tendency to educate the leaders only in social graces; instead, the trend shifted towards educating the whole man—the soldier, the courtier, the thinker, and the scholar. Henry VIII provided this new image of the English ruler.

We have also seen how closely connected were the purpose of education and the criteria for the selection of a scholar. Both attitudes are basically ruler oriented; however, the three writers differ slightly. Whereas all are concerned with the ruling class, they differ in their ideas of who comprise this class. Elyot is the champion of princes and the noblemen a step below the princes; Ascham considers the princes as well as a large group of noblemen; the Mulcaster considers the princes, noblemen and merchants.

Inherent in these attitudes is the expansion of authority to include a great number of individuals. By Mulcaster's time, the merchants had been included in this expansion; but the expansion did not yet include the consideration of society-at-large.

The attitudes towards the selection of a schoolmaster are closely connected with the selection of the scholar and indicate the probable influence of Vives and Erasmus, especially the advocacy of gentle teachers. Elyot goes as far as to consider the possibility that salary plays a
part in the selection of a good, dedicated schoolmaster. However, little can be inferred from Mulcaster's generalities.

In my opinion, these men are pre-psychologists; for they recognize the importance of inspiring the students by setting good examples and by drawing them to learning with the aid of pleasant allurements. However, a further development of this statement would entail a discussion of method, which is reserved for a later section.

As a result of this discussion, several ideas can be pointed out. First, the attitudes towards the purpose of education shifted towards preparing men to bear authority in the realm, necessitating the initiation of a program of study designed for the ruling class. Second, this purpose included both chivalric and scholarly preparation. Third, the scholar was chosen according to his function in the realm. Fourth, the attitudes were expanding to include a greater number of people, though the lower classes had not been truly considered. Fifth, more attention was paid to the selection of qualified schoolmasters. Indeed, education during the Tudor period proved to be a serious and an important endeavor.
CHAPTER III

ORDER OF LEARNING

In the discussion of the order of learning, I have taken certain liberties in the organization of the material and have arbitrarily discussed it under three headings: (1) language, which deals specifically with the status of the English language; (2) exercise; and (3) curriculum and method. The attitudes towards the study of painting, carving, and music will be treated in the discussion of curriculum and method rather than in the discussion of exercise, which is basically concerned with the treatment of sports. Technically, English may not be considered a part of the order of learning; for the first two writers give it little consideration. But the communicative aspect of the student-teacher relationship dictated a choice of language common to both. For this purpose, such men as Vives advocated the use of the vernacular; therefore, English students would have to utilize the English vernacular. Although language and exercise could be treated within the discussion of curriculum and method, it is my conviction that a clearer, more orderly treatment can be effected by dividing the discussion into the three categories listed.

Language

Latin had long been preeminent in English educated circles, with the current interest in Greek gaining momentum, whereas English as a vehicle of teaching and expressing lofty ideas was almost ignored. However, with the advent of the Tudors and widespread national self-consciousness, the concern for the shaky state of the English language made itself felt. As
a result, there arose a certain nervousness as to the capacity of English
to express lofty ideas. This nervousness arose not only from the human-
istic exaltation of Latin, but perhaps even more from ignorance of linguis-
tic history. The fifteenth century had at least established the language
of London as the English literary norm. But the impact of humanism and the
revival of the classics set Latin and Greek up as "kingpins" of the lan-
guages. Ascham makes a notable statement when he says that Italian, Span-
ish, French, and even Latin are inferior to Greek, which is the best of all
languages; however, Latin is a worthy substitute for Greek.

It is also noteworthy that in this particular quotation, Ascham fails
to mention English even as an inferior language. English was a tongue that
many found convenient in reaching people uneducated in the humanist tradi-
tion; it was not held in high esteem, or perhaps not even in moderate esteem,
by the learned men of the day. Nevertheless, English national self-conscious-
ness soon led to the support of English and the subsequent attempt to enrich
the vernacular by borrowing words from other languages such as Latin and
French and by forcing the words into English usage. All movements usu-
ally have supporters and dissenters, and the move to enrich the English lan-
guage proved to be no different.

Two of the most representative of the dissenters were probably Sir
John Cheke and Thomas Wilson. Writing to Thomas Hoty, Cheke says:

1 Barksdale, op. cit. 2 Ascham, op. cit., p. 213.
3 Otto Jespersen, Growth and Structure of the English Language
   (New York, 1923), pp. 115-16.
4 J. L. Moore, Tudor-Stuart Views on the Growth Status and Destiny
   of the English Language (Halle A. S., 1910), p. 6.
I am of this opinion that our tongue should be written clean and pure, vnmixt and vnmanegled with borrowinge of other tungen, wherein if we take not heed bi tyme, ever borrowing and neuer payeng, she shall be fain to keep her house as bankrupt. For then doth our tongue naturallie and praisablie vnter her meaning, when she bouroweth no couterfeith of other tungen to attire her self withall. . . .

He goes on to say that if Englishmen find it necessary to borrow from other languages, the words should be so discreetly included that they would be hardly noticeable.

Wilson writes:

"Among all other lessons this should first be learned, yt we never affect any straunge ynkhorne terms, but so speake as is commonly receuied: neither sekyng to be ouer fine, nor liuing ouer carelessse, vsyng our speache as most men do, & ordyring our wittes as fewest have doen. . . . He that cometh lately out of France, wil talke Fræche English, & neuer blushe at the matter. . . ."

Even the translators of the Bible, Tyndale and Coverdale, helped to enrich the English language by borrowing words from other languages,\(^2\) thus relegating themselves to the ranks of the supporters of the movement to enrich the English language. Trading with other countries also contributed to the enrichment of English, for the traders became familiar with and used terms that foreigners used.\(^4\)

Elyot and Aschem may be classed with the supporters of the move to enrich the vernacular, and Mulcaster may be classed with the dissenters. However, a later discussion of these men will include their attitudes towards this movement.

---

\(^1\)Letter from Sir John Cheke to Thomas Hobie, July 16, 1557. Quoted in ibid., p. 94.

\(^2\)Thomas Wilson, Arte of Rhetorike, quoted in Moore, op. cit., pp. 91-93.


Regardless of the views held, the fact still remained: English was definitely in need of some enrichment; and

... the idea of changing one's native language by classical grafts or other literary manipulation, though it was unchecked by any accurate or extensive linguistic science, gradually gave way before the facts of literary experience.¹

English was still the language of the largest part of the population, that part innocent of literary inclinations. Latin was the language primarily employed for written communication and speech in the upper classes, whereas English still remained the vehicle of spoken communication for the lower classes.² And there was still the need for communication between teacher and student; consequently, the mother tongue proved most practical.³

Finally, as Baldwin points out:

Prose, of course, lingered behind verse. Chaucer's prose rendering of Boethius, in sharpest contrast to his verse, had been groping. Malory's prose was sufficient for narrative, though not for philosophical discussion. Prose control in both narrative and discussion seems assured first in Sir Thomas More; but as late as John Lyly the progress of prose was still uncertain. The brief vogue of 'Euphuism' shows an attempt to 'enrich' the vernacular by Latin sentence figures.⁴

Elyot and Ascham defended English, not because they particularly relished the idea of writing in the English tongue, but because they could reach more people. Elyot was the first true supporter of the use of English as a literary vehicle; for as Watson points out in his introduction to Elyot's

---


³Vives had advocated the vernacular as a means of student-teacher communication. See Chapter I. See also Berdan, op. cit., p. 330.

English Works,

It is a distinctive feature of Elyot to have been the first to bring the Renascence spirit to the application of the English language, not of course to the spontaneous utterances with regard to the outlook on our life as a whole, the impressing of romance on the common life—such as is the poet's domain—that cannot in the long run be disjoined from the mother-tongue. Homer wrote in Greek, Virgil in Latin, Dante in Italian, and Chaucer in English—in each case because that language was the mother-tongue. Elyot was not a great writer... He simply found that English could be used for learned purposes, for explaining difficult questions, for the uses of logic, rhetoric, and oratory on abstruse matters. In other words, instead of dealing with the philosophical and literary aspects of education, ethics, and jurisprudence in Latin, he found that English would do, not merely as a makeshift, but as an adequate, effective, and telling alternative. He discovered—it may be regarded as a great or small discovery, but it is his—that philosophy can speak in English as well as in Latin.¹

And in his desire to enrich the tongue, Elyot very freely borrowed expressions from other tongues and forced them into his works. A random selection of these words reveals such terms as adminoculation ² (prop, support), esbatements ³ (amusement), illeccebrous ⁴ (alluring, attractive), and many others. ⁵ He also translated Isocrates into English in an effort to gain the quality of speech found in the Greek tongue.⁶

He was not alone in his efforts, for Ascham soon followed his example. Ascham, who believed with Aristotle that simplicity is often the best method by which to drive home a point, had been tutored by the knowledgeable Sir John Cheke, whose ideas undoubtedly had a great influence on him and whose concern for the English language manifested itself in his teachings. Despite his belief that the English tongue was weak, Ascham believed in it

and sought to make use of the idiom because it was the surest way to en-
noble it. He sheds further light on his thought when he says:

And because I write English, and to Englishmen, I will plain-
lie declare in English both, what thies words of Plato meane, and
how aptlie they be linked, and how orderlie they follow one
another.1

This quotation refers to his explaining the qualities that a scholar should
have.

He makes a similar statement in Toxophilus.

And although he have vvritten this boke either in latin sic
or Greke (vvhich thing I vvould be verie glad yet to do, if I might
surelie knowv your Graces pleasure there in) had bene more easier
sic & fit for mi trade in study, yet neuerthelesse, I supposinge
it no point of honestie, that mi commodite should stop & hinder ani
parte either of the pleasure or profite of manie, haue vvritten this.
Enlishe matter in the Enlishe tongue, for Enlishe men ... for
manie to folovv. ... .2

He is clearly apologetic for his use of the English language, and he
clearly states that Latin and Greek are much better suited for literary
expression. But he is so interested in the welfare of the whole realm that
he is willing to sacrifice the use of a more fluent style for the sake of
communication. Berdan sums up this attitude in the following manner:

The motive here for writing in English is frankly unselfish, and the
author claims the merit of sacrifice. This differs in toto from the
Lydgation apology, the lament for 'lack of cunning' implies that such
cunning is possible. He did not write English, as did Skelton be-
cause he enjoys it, nor as does More, because he is driven to it.
Nor does he choose English, as Bembo does Italian, because he thinks
it the proper medium for artistic expression. On the contrary he
feels that what he has to impart is so necessary to the well-being
of his readers, that even to his own disadvantage he is willing to
stoop to conquer.3

1Ascham, op. cit., p. 194.

2Ibid., p. xi.

3Berdan, op. cit., p. 332.
He is also disturbed by the use of indenture English and inkhorn terms.\(^1\)

Mulcaster is the most outspoken of the three; in fact, his work is geared to the "right writing" of the English tongue. He argues vehemently that the English language is as good as any other tongue and bases his arguments on four points: the antiquity of the English tongue, the wit of the English people, their learning, and their experience. He begins:

As for the antiquitie of our speche, whether it be measured by the ancient Almane, whence it cummeth originallie, or even but by the latest terms which it boroweth daeliae from forentungs, either of pure necessitie in new matters, or of mere brazerie, to garnish it self withall, it cannot be young. Onelesse the Latin and Greke be young, whose words we enfranchise to our own use, tho not allwaie immediatlie from them selves, but mostwhat thorough the Italian, French and Spanish: Onelesse other tungs, which be neither Greke nor Latin, nor anie of the forenamed, from whom we haue somewhat, as theie haue from ours, will for companie sake be content to be young, that ours maie not be old. But I am well assured, that euerie one of these will strie for antiquitie, and rather grant it to vs, then forgo it themselves. So that if the verie newest words, which we use do fawor of great antiquitie and the ground of our specke be most ancient, it must nedes then follow, that our hole tung was weined long ago, as haung all her tethe.\(^2\)

He goes on to say that the English, through their great wit, have earned their place in history, that they have shown through their great knowledge and ability their capabilities of handling themselves admirably. And through their relationships and their trading with other countries, they have gained inestimable experience.\(^3\) He is also concerned with the spelling of the English language and recognizes the difficulty of forcing

\(^1\)Ascham, op. cit., p. 260. "Indenture English" was the term applied to the style of Hall's Chronicles. "Inkhorn terms" was the name given to extremely long and technical vocabulary words. See Wilson's Art of Rhetoric.

\(^2\)Mulcaster, op. cit., p. 89.

\(^3\)Ibid., pp. 69-92.
the spelling into a phonetic pattern.\textsuperscript{1} For example, he says, "There is no such assurance in sound for the establishing of a right, as you do conceive, neither such necessitie in letters, to be constant in one use, as you seek to enforce."\textsuperscript{2} Further along, he summarizes his argument.

\begin{quote}
\ldots First the sound alone did rule the pen, bycause the letters were first deuised, onelie to resemble, and expresse the sound by their aspectable figur. But verie manie inconueniences did follow while that sound alone did command the pen, bycause of the difference in the instruments of our voice, wherewith we sound: bycause of the finenesse or grossenesse of the ear, wherewith we receive sounds: bycause of the judgiment or ignorance in the partie, which is to pronounce, of the right or wrong expressing of the sound. For the avoiding whereof, the peple, which found inconueniences, and the causes why, to be in the imperfection of their gide, while sound alone was the leader in writing, ioyned reason and custom in commissi\-on with sound: Reason to obserue where the sternesse of sound were to be followed, and where to be qualified, bycause letters resemble the ioynts in sound, but ar not the same with the things resembled; Custom to confirm that by experience in the pen, which reason doth obserue, and note in the sound.\textsuperscript{3}
\end{quote}

He recognizes the part that speaking, as well as hearing, has to play in noting the sound of a word. It is possible that persons coming from different localities pronounce words with different accents; therefore, it would be too difficult to reduce their speech to a consistent sound. Furthermore, a sound may appear to be differently accented to different auditors. Consequently, he recommends the observance of sound, custom, and reason as a guide to spelling correctly.

Referring to the status of the English language, he asserts:

\begin{quote}
\ldots this period in our time, semeth to be the perfittest period in our English tung, & that our custom hath alredie beaten out his own
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{2} Mulcaster, op. cit., p. 101. In some instances, Mulcaster's spelling is regularized in an effort to facilitate reading.

\textsuperscript{3} Ibid., p. 115.
rules redie for the method, & frame of Art . . . & there is no such infirmitie in our writing, as is pretended, but that our custom is grown fit to receive this artificial frame, and that by this method, which I have laid down, without any foreign help, and with those rules only, which are, and may be gathered out of our own ordinarie writing.¹

We can easily infer from those few words that Mulcaster did not approve of the move to enrich the language by "grafting." He did, however, realize that foreign words were being incorporated into the English language; and he devotes a discussion—enfranchisement—to handling these words. This discussion will be considered under curriculum and method, for it is a part of Mulcaster's methodology.

From all evidence, the expression of these writers' attitudes towards the English language is clearly more intense with the passing years. Elyot satisfies himself with the inclusion of foreign words in his English compositions; Ascham apologetically refers to writing in the English language because he writes to Englishmen; and Mulcaster dedicates his whole work to the glorification of his mother tongue.

Walton admirably sums up the final outcome of the move to utilize English for educational and literary purposes.

So long as Latin remained the language of learning, and new fields of knowledge were not appropriated, the schools remained in harmony with the culture of their time, though, as Mulcaster (1530-1611) pointed out, Latin was not of value to the majority of boys. For them he urged an elementary education in the vernacular; but . . . his advice was not followed.²

Exercise

The idea of including exercise in the educational process was not new. Da Feltre, the noted Italian schoolmaster, had provided his students with

¹Ibid., p. 85.
²Walton, op. cit., p. 958.
exercises to relieve the monotony of heavy and diligent study. To this end, he encouraged his students to participate in different forms of athletic endeavor and served as their athletic director.\(^1\) The inclusion of exercise in the educational process is also an apparent carry-over from the education of the courtier, who was expected to be skilled in such things as archery, use of the battle axe, wrestling, and other endeavors that required physical dexterity. In fact, Castiglione's *The Courtier* is based on the achievements of Federigo, who was a student of da Feltre and who exemplified the qualities that da Feltre had striven to instill in his students. Again we see in the combining of the chivalric ideals and training for authority the composite nature of Tudor education.

Elyot's attitudes towards exercise are also probably influenced by Vives,\(^2\) with whom he had undoubtedly conversed during those gatherings at the Mores' household. He considers at some length several different types of sports.

Elyot in *The Gouernour* recommends games and sports, especially wrestling (an English sport). For other sports he cites classical parallels running from Epanimodas and Achilles, swimming found useful by Horatius and Caesar, hunting practised by the Young Cyrus...\(^3\)

He feels that exercise is a necessity and supports his belief with the following assertion:

> All thoughse I haue hitherto ahuancunci the commendation of lern-ynge, specially in gentil men, yet it is to be considered that continuall studie without some maner of exercise, shortly exhausteth the spirites vitall, and hyndereth naturall decoction and digestion, wherby mannes body is the soner corrupted and brought in to diuers sickenessis, and finallye the life is therby made shorter: where

---

\(^1\) See Chapter I. Aristotle also advocated the development of the whole man. Coulborn, *op. cit.*, July 14, 1962.


\(^3\) Hardin Craig, *The Enchanted Glass* (New York, 1936), p. 89.
contrayrewise by exercise, whiche is a vehement motion (as Galene prince of phisitions defineth) the helthe of man is persevered, and his strength increased: for as moche the members by meuyng and mutuall touching, do waxe more harde, and naturall heate in all the body is therby augmented. . . .

The child should not refrain from engaging in some exercise, particularly from thirteen years upwards; for exercise has the following benefits: aids digestion, augments the strength and muscle tone of the body, helps one to be agile and nimble, and helps to improve speed. Consequently, he will only

. . . speake of those exercises, apt to the furniture of a gentilmannes personage, adapting his body to hardnesse, strength, and agilitie, and to helpe the with hym selfe in perile, which may happen in warres or other necessitie.

With this idea in mind, he recommends wrestling, an English sport, as the exercise with which the student should begin. He believes that both wrestlers should be nearly equal in strength so as not to give one the advantage of superior strength. Recognizing the possibility of sustaining injuries, he recommends wrestling on some soft material which would break falls and reduce the possibility of bruises. Additionally, the ability to wrestle may be of aid if the student should later find himself weaponless during a battle.

Running, both a good exercise and a laudable solace, should be concomitantly considered along with wrestling, engaging in the former in the evening after having engaged in the latter during the morning. Running can also be helpful in a battle. Referring to the utilization of running,

---

1 Elyot, op. cit., p. 72.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid., p. 73.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid., p. 74.
he says, "And also that in the chase, rennyng and leaping, he mought either ouertake his enemye, or beying pursued, if extreme nede required, escape him..."

Citing authority, as he frequently does, he singles out Achilles and Alexander as examples of men who profited from the ability to run.

Swimming, aside from offering the benefits previously cited, may also be handy in war. Appealing again to authority, he cites the stories of Oratius and Julius Caesar as cases in which the ability to swim saved a city.

Next, he considers hunting, which

... may be called a necessary solace and pastyme, for therin is the very imitation of batayle, for nat onely it dothe shewe the courage and strength as well of the horse as of him that rydeth, trauersyng over mountayne and valeys, encountringe and overthrowynge great and mighty beestes, but also it increseth in them both agilitie and quicknesse, also sleight and policiestoynde such passages and straytes, where they may preuent or intrappe their enemies..." Elyot recommends hawking, but he thinks that it should be done in moderation. His treatment indicates a lack of sincere interest in hawking as a sport.

His discussion of dancing is significant in that the general opinion of dancing was that it was objectionable and licentious. There have been references, though the source defies recall, to Henry VIII's distaste for dancing. However, Elyot adopts a particularly favorable attitude towards

1 Ibid.  
2 Ibid.  
3 Ibid., pp. 75-76.  
4 Ibid., p. 81.  
5 Ibid., pp. 83-84.  
6 These references came to mind during the organization of this discussion, and a subsequent search failed to uncover the source.
dancing and discusses the objections to dancing, concluding that idolatrous, wanton, and lewd dancing is justifiably condemned. He follows with a long, verbose discussion of the history of dancing, starting with the pagan gods with whom dancing supposedly began. He asserts that dancing was once a form of communication between men and women.\(^1\) He concludes that dancing is desirable because it utilizes the qualities of men and women.\(^2\) Finally, dancing may be an introduction to prudence, the first moral virtue.\(^3\) This attitude towards dancing does not, however, reflect the influence of Vives, who disliked dancing.\(^4\)

Of all the other exercises, he feels that none can compare with "shooting in the longe bow."\(^5\) Drawing the long bow strengthens the body. Tennis is good for young men, but it is more "violent," for each man must play according to the tactics of his opponent. If his opponent should play vigorously, he must play just as vigorously, even though he may want to play more slowly.\(^6\) "Classhe" employs too little strength, "bouling" often employs too much, and football is too violent.\(^7\) Returning to a discussion of archery, he hails it as a native sport and points out that other nations are aware of the prowess of the English with the long bow. He expresses a negative attitude towards hand guns and crossbows and laments the de-emphasis of shooting with the long bow.\(^8\)

Berdan feels that "Elyot argues in favor of good health /a\ed by

\(^{1}\) Elyot, op. cit., pp. 87-94.

\(^{2}\) Ibid., p. 95.

\(^{3}\) Ibid.

\(^{4}\) Berdan, op. cit., p. 315.

\(^{5}\) Elyot, op. cit., p. 112.

\(^{6}\) Ibid.

\(^{7}\) Ibid., p. 113.

\(^{8}\) Ibid., p. 114.
exercise for its own sake, and Ascham for sport for sport's sake.\textsuperscript{1} It should not be difficult to understand that a "man of Ascham's antique habit of thought was not likely to omit the Greek gymnastic out of his consideration."\textsuperscript{2}

Before he gives any consideration to the gymnastics proper, Ascham says, "I am sorie with all my harte, that they \textsuperscript{3} be giuen no more to riding, than they be: For, of all outward qualities, to ride faire, is most cumelie for him selfe, most necessarie for his country ... ."\textsuperscript{3} After discussing some of his methodology for the teaching of Latin, he states:

And, I do not meene, by all this my taulke, that yong Gentleman, should alwaies be poring on a booke, and by vsing good studies, shold lease honest pleasure, and haunt no good pastime, I meene nothing lesse: For it is well knowne, that I both like and loue, and haue alwaies, and do yet still vse, all exercises and pastimes, that be fitte for my nature and habilitie. And beside naturall disposition, in judgement also, I was neuer, either Stoick in doctrine, or Anabaptist in Religion, to mislike a merie, pleasant, and plaifull nature, if no putrage be committed, against lawe, mesure, and good order.\textsuperscript{4}

He goes on to defend his belief that "cumlie" exercises should be joined with learning and cites Pallas, the goddess of wisdom and war, and Apollo, the god of shooting, who were also the patrons of learning to the youth of Athens. The ancient Greeks saw the importance of choosing patrons of learning who were both athletic and learned, for they represented the combination of exercise and study.\textsuperscript{5} He reaches the following conclusion:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1}Berden, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 314.
\item \textsuperscript{2}Laurie, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 81.
\item \textsuperscript{3}Ascham, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 199.
\item \textsuperscript{4}Ibid., p. 216.
\item \textsuperscript{5}Ibid.
\end{itemize}
Therefore, to ride cumlie: to run faire at the tilte or ring: to plaie at all weapones: to shote faire in bow, or surellie in gon: to vaut lustely: to runne: to leape: to wrestle: to swimme: To daunce cumlie: to sing, and playe of instruments cummyngly: to Hawke: to hunte: to playe at tennes, & all pastimes generally, which by joyned with labor, vsed in open place, and on the day light, containing either some fitte exercise for warre, or some pleasant pastime for peace, be not onelie cumlie and decent, but also verie necessarie, for a Courtlie Gentleman to vs.

He promises an elucidation of these ideas in a proposed book titled The Cockpitte, which he did not live to write.

The discussion of Ascham's attitudes towards exercise cannot be properly concluded without mention of his work titled Toxophilus, in which he sets forth his ideas on the state of shooting with the long bow. Toxophilus is a lengthy discourse on archery, as well as on other diverse subjects; therefore, only one or two pertinent ideas are here quoted.

For example, he asserts: "... I promise you shoting by my judgement, is ye most honest pastime of all. ..." Later he says:

Wherfore, shoting is fitte for great mens [sic] children, both bycause it strengneth the body with holysome labour, and pleaseth the mynde with honest pastime and also encourageth all other youth ernestlye to folowe the same. And these reasons (as I suppose) stirred vp both great men to bring vp their chyldren in shotinge, and noble commune wealtheis so straytelye to commaunde shotinge. Therfore seinge Princes moued by honest occasions, hath in al commune wealtheis vsed shotynge, I suppose there is none other degree of men, neither lowe nor hye, learned nor leude, yonge nor oulde. ...

Lewis does an admirable job of summarizing the ideas found in Toxophilus. Although he summarizes all of the main ideas, only the section dealing with archery is here quoted.

His Toxophilus (1545) is one of the most genial and

---

1Ibid., p. 217.  
2Ibid.  
3Ibid., p. 4.  
4Ibid., p. 10.
winning books that had yet appeared in English. The modern reader who feels the subject of archery to be a little remote has only to realize that it was to Ascham what cricket has been to many of his successors and all will be well. The tone is unmistakable. Archery is England's safety and glory (for it is a vile French lie that the Scotch shoot better than we); these new fangled guns are unreliable and at the mercy of the weather; nothing keeps a man so fit as shooting at the butts; archery gets boys out into the open air, and away from those nasty cards. Archery, that is, with your true English long-bow. Cross-bows are a poor affair. you find no mention of them 'in any good Author'. Shooting is far better sport than bowls or music. . . .

Mulcaster, speaking of apparel, diet, and exercise, says:

... Of the which thre I recommend two, their apparell, and their diet, to the parents care, as most proper to their charge, bycause theie concern home most: the third, which is exercise, I handle there at full, both bycause it is a seuerall branch from the mater of learning, and therefor requireth a seuerall treatise.

Although he does not name the type of exercise with which the student should be familiar, he does recommend the joining of exercise and learning. He feels that the growing body needs exercise to retain its strength and agility and that exercise aids bodily functions. He concludes that all

... qualities therfor whether belonging to the bodie, bycause their executio, is by it, or partaining to the minde, bycause their feat is in it, must nedes confess themselves to be auanced by this Elementarie, as in dade theye were nothing, if it were not. Take exercise awaie, what then is the bodie, but an unweildie lump?

Each of these writers indicates a favorable attitude towards exercise as an important part of the child's education. In Elyot and Ascham, we see some nationalistic tendencies in the form of praise for such English sports as archery and wrestling. Wrestling, should be understood, is not of English origin but of Grecian or Roman origin, as almost any reputable

1Lewis, op. cit., p. 280. 2Mulcaster, op. cit., p. 4.

3Ibid., pp. 28-29. 4Ibid.
physical education handbook will point out. Its popularity as a sport well liked by Englishmen possibly accounts for this nationalistic attitude towards it, as well as for Craig's labelling it an English sport.\(^1\) Elyot and Ascham are so similar in their attitudes that it would not be too adventurous to assume that Ascham was probably influenced by Elyot. Both are especially fond of archery and point out its position as a native sport; both deprecate crossbows and hand guns. This is not to say that Mulcaster did not have similar attitudes. His failure to enumerate his preferences puts us at a loss as to his specific attitudes towards exercise.

It cannot be said with absolute assurance that one writer emphasizes exercise more than another, for the differences in time must be taken into consideration. For example, Elyot is not far removed from the period during which a prince or nobleman was judged on the basis of his skill in riding, shooting, handling the battle axe, and performing other feats of athletic prowess. Emphasis had just started shifting towards a combination of the qualities of both the courtier and the scholar. By Ascham's time, the educational program was even more integrated; and by Mulcaster's time, emphasis had probably shifted more towards the intellectual side of the educational process. But if we judge by the amount of treatment that each writer gives to the consideration of exercise, the order of emphasis, from the greatest to the least, would be Elyot, Ascham, and Mulcaster.

If there is any noticeable shift in their attitudes, it is in the amount of treatment given to a consideration of exercise. They are also

\(^1\) During the Middle Ages, wrestling was most popular with the lower classes. Coulborn, op. cit., July 14, 1962.
concerned with the wearing apparel of the student; for by wearing commendable clothes, he sets examples to be followed, the setting of examples being inherent in a leader's education. Certain apparel was also conducive to performing different exercises, the best being that which permits free movement.¹

Curriculum and Method

As it has been pointed out in the discussion of the general background of sixteenth-century educational opinion, both the scholastic and humanistic disciplines were taught in the universities. The scholastic curriculum, which dominated the medieval curriculum, neglected the study of the classics of Greek and Roman antiquity. And since

... logic was the one approved method of scholarship, learning was of necessity limited in range; literature was almost excluded from the universities, while medicine and the natural sciences were studied in a relatively profitless way. The study of law and theology, however, flourished, and the achievements of the scholastic philosophers in these fields were enormous. Deductive logic itself was refined; the meaning of terms was fixed; and scholars were trained to close and exact reasoning.²

Emphasis was placed on Latin as a living language, without recourse to the study of ancient Latin literature for the lessons that it contained. Study of the classics was perfunctory and cursory; and more often than not, the student failed to understand the classics.³


²Frederick Eby and C. F. Arrowood, The History and Philosophy of Education Ancient and Medieval (New York, 1940), p. 791. This is a very informative book.

Humanism dictated a new curriculum and a new emphasis; and the

... dominant form of medieval scholarship—scholasticism—
was vigorously attacked by champions of the new learning.
Not only was its distinctive method—logic—reformed, but the
reformers ceased to rely almost exclusively upon it, as had
the schoolmen, and developed new methods of intellectual
inquiry—notably the historical approach. Latin of the Golden
Ages of Roman letters, so far as Renaissance scholars could
recover it, became the language of the schools and literature,
and the living Latin of the Middle Ages was spoken and written
no longer. After 1500 the Latin and Greek classics furnished
the principal part of a literary education. The spirit of
Greek humanism—the components of which were freedom of thought
and preoccupation with distinctively human activities and
values—was recaptured by many Renaissance scholars and creative artists; and others, unable to grasp the spirit of ancient
culture, imitated its forms.1

Imitation of the classics played a significant role in English education. Colet had placed great emphasis on the quality of the imitation of
classical Latin.2 Ascham goes as far as to devote a lengthy discussion
to imitation and its importance. Cicero was one of the favorite models
for imitation.3

Noting the practice of imitation, Adamson points out that

The method of studying the classical authors, which was
practiced by Sturm and followed by most schools of his day
and long after, consisted in noting the manner in which the
general rules of rhetoric were applied by writers of the
first rank, and then writing passages in imitation.4

The curriculum and the method of teaching the curriculum constituted
one of the major concerns of sixteenth-century educational thought. And
since education was advocated for the ruling classes, the writers and
thinkers of the period wanted their leaders to possess knowledge that was

---

1Eby and Arrowood, op. cit., p. 793.

2Lewis, op. cit., p. 2.


4Adamson, op. cit., p. 159.
highly commendable. Therefore, new ideas concerning what was best for them to learn kept emerging in the form of educational treatises. There were some writers, such as Elyot and Ascham, who wished to make a few changes; others, such as Mulcaster, wanted to change the curriculum almost completely.

Elyot recommends training during the nursery years and states that the first step in a child's education is the selection of a nurse not under twenty or over thirty. She must be virtuous, serious, and discreet and not given to speaking "wanton or uncleane" words. All men except the physician should be kept out of the nursery, and the child's playmates should be above reproach in character and attitude. Speaking of children in general, he says that they should be praised and encouraged to do their best; they must be lovingly handled; and they should be gradually introduced to Latin by the following method:

... trayne and exercise them in spekyng of latyne: infourmyng them to knowe first the names in latine of all thynges that cometh in syghte, and to name all the partes of their bodies: and gyuynge them some what that they couete or desyre, in most gentyl maner to teache them to aske it agayne in latine. ...

After the child has been kept under the watchful eye of a nurse and a tutor who teaches him grammar and parts of speech, he should, at the age of seven, begin to study Greek and Latin authors, along with some study in music, painting, and carving. Music, painting, and carving should be learned because they help the student to appreciate more deeply the other studies which are more serious.  

---


3 Ibid., p. 21.

4 Ibid., pp. 28-32.
After a few, quick rules of grammar, Aesop's fables should be the immediate consideration, provided they have not been taught with the rules of grammar. The fables are short and simply worded; therefore, they are likely to prove pleasant to a young mind. In addition, there are moral and political lessons to be learned from the stories. The teacher must exercise his judgment in the selection of the fables so as to encourage the advancement of virtue in the child. Then he should assist the child in understanding the significance of the selected works, which should be committed to memory.¹

Lesson two should be comprised of Lucian's dialogues, which the teacher must select. The comedies of Aristophanes may be substituted for Lucian. Next, the student should read Homer's Iliad and Odyssey along with Virgil's Aeneid, from which he can learn of physical feats and exercises befitting a gentleman.² Virgil's Bucolics and Georgics are helpful for their information on husbandry and astronomy.³ Virgil is to be preferred to all other Latin authors.

After studying Virgil, the child should read Ovid's Metamorphosios and De Fastis. The study of Ovid will aid the student in understanding other poets; on the other hand, Ovid's works contain little else worth learning. Therefore, an alternative is the study of Horace, "in whom is contayned moche varietie of lernyng and quickenesse of sentence."⁴ Horace may be studied in relation to The Odyssey, which contains the account of the prudence and fortitude of Ulysses as he returned home to

¹Ibid., pp. 35-36. ²Ibid., p. 37. ³Ibid., p. 38. ⁴Ibid., p. 39.
Troy. The master may permit the student to versify in imitation of Horace and Virgil.¹

The poetry of Silius and Lucan should also be studied, the former for his accounts of Scipio and Hannibal and the latter for his vivid accounts of Julius Caesar and Pompey. The study of poets should be concluded with a consideration of Hesiodus, who wrote about husbandry and whose works are full of pleasant, alluring fables.²

This is the curriculum that Elyot recommends for the years from seven to thirteen! He recognizes that a complete perusal of these works would represent a Herculean feat, and he makes his stand known.

And here I conclude to speke any more of poetis, necessary for the childehode of a gentill man: for as moche as these, I doubt nat, will suffice untill he passe the age of xiii yeres. In which time childhood declineth, and reason waxeth rype, and deprehendeth things with a more constant iugement. Here I wolde shulde be remembered, that I require nat that all these warkes shud be throughly radde of a childe in this tyme, whiche were almost impossible. But I only desire that they haue, in every saide bokes, so moche instrusion that they may take therby some profite.³

The second part of a "noble mannes" study should begin with the fourteenth year of the child's life. This part is more serious and deals with diverse lessons. First, the master should read to the student some works in oratory, with emphasis on the first part of logic called topicia. Either Cicero or Agricola should be the authors considered, and they should be studied for a half year. Immediately following, the student should be exposed to rhetoric either in Greek from Hermogines or in Latin from Quintilian. If the latter is used, the master should start from the third book and deal specifically with the art of persuasion.⁴ He should

¹Ibid., p. 40. ²Ibid. ³Ibid. ⁴Ibid., p. 41.
also read Erasmus' *Copian Verborum et Rerum*. The finer points of oratory should be learned from the works of Isocrates, Demosthenes, and Tully (Cicero); and when the master reads them he "muste well observe and express the partis and colours of rhetorike in them contayned, accordynge to the preceptes of that arte before lerned."¹ These should be followed by study in the areas of cosmography and history.

Cosmography is essential to the understanding of history; therefore, the student should be familiarized with the tables of Ptolemy. By studying maps of different countries, the student enjoys a simulated journey during which he sees rivers, different nationalities of people, mountains, and jungles without danger to life or limb.²

When introducing the child to the study of history, the master should explain in the most elegant and pleasant way that princes and noblemen can learn much from reading histories. Consideration should be given to such authors as Titus Livius, Xenophon, Quintus, Curtius, Julius Caesar, Sallust, and Tacitus.³

In the lerning of these authors a yonge gentilman shal be taught to note and marke, nat only the ordre and elegancie in declaration of the historie, but also the occasion of the warres, the counsails and preparations on either part, the estimation of the capitaines, the maner and forme of theyr governance, the continuance of the bataille, the fortune and successe of the holle affaires...⁴

Thus, the second part of the curriculum is rounded out.

When the child reaches seventeen years of age, the master should read to him some works of philosophy, especially moral philosophy. Special consideration should be given to Aristotle's *Ethics*, which should be read

---

¹Ibid., p. 42.  
²Ibid., pp. 43-44.  
³Ibid., pp. 44-47.  
⁴Ibid.
in its original Greek, and to Cicero's *Offices*. The first deals with the definitions and significance of every virtue, and the second deals with the duties and manners pertaining to men. The curriculum should be rounded out with the study of Plato and the Bible, along with Erasmus' *Institution of a Christian Prince*.¹

Leslie Warren, in a few succinct statements, sums up the scope of Elyot's curriculum.

Book I outlines the program of studies for 'inferior governours' which will train them from childhood in the virtues required for the conduct of affairs in a monarchy. Prudence, the 'mother' of the virtues can be learned in the course of early education.

Book II treats briefly the vices which the governour in authority is subject to and at length the natural virtues of gentleness, humanity, and friendship, which are useful in maintaining authority in the public weal.

Book III continues the governour's further training for the proper administration of affairs in the moral virtues of justice, fortitude, and temperance; and in the intellectual virtues of sapience, understanding, and experience. These virtues are essential to good counsel.²

Elyot seems to be more concerned with what a student should get than with how he should get it, or he feels that the schoolmaster already knows the desirable techniques and methods. However, he does say that the teacher should select the best parts of the works and help the student to interpret them and that he should read some works to the student. And he recommends gentleness and praise in teaching.

Ascham is much more profound in the presentation of his ideas, but he is less organized than Elyot. Unlike Elyot, he does not start the

¹Ibid., pp. 47-49.
child's training with the nursery years. He refers to the child's learning the eight parts of speech, but he neglects to say where and from whom the child must learn the parts of speech. Nevertheless, his curriculum begins at this point:

After the childe hath learned perfitlie the eight partes of speach, let him then learne the right ioyning togither of substantiues with adiectiues, the nowne with the verbe, the relatiue with the antecedent. And in learninge farther hye Syntaxis, by mine advice, he shall not use the common order in common scholes, for making of latines: wherby, the childe commonlie learneth, first, an euill choice of wordes (and the right choice of words, saith Caesar, is the foundation of eloquence) than, a wrong placing of wordes: and lastlie, an ill framing of the sentence, with a peruerse judgement, both of wordes and sentences.

First of all, he does not approve of the direct method of learning Latin; for he feels that the child will be hindered if the spoken Latin is not of the highest quality. Latin is best nourished in the child by double translation. The master should teach the child how to translate by giving him two books, one for translating Latin into English and the other for translating the English back into Latin. The child must not be prompted; instead, he should move off to himself. His translations should be compared with the epistles of Tully (Cicero), and his mistakes should be pointed out to him. He should be commended if he does well, but he should not be scolded or beaten if he makes mistakes, for gentleness is a great allurement to learning. The rules of grammar must be applied to every example. Ascham places great emphasis on this method of double translation as a means of teaching Latin, a method that has been praised and emulated by later scholars.

1Ascham, op. cit., p. 182.  2Ibid., pp. 185-87.  
3Sidney Lee, "Roger Ascham," DNB, I, 628.
The comedies of Terrence or Plautus can be translated along with Tully's epistles and should be followed by translating Caesar's Commentaries and some of Livius' orations.¹ After gaining proficiency in translating short assignments, the pupil should be given longer lessons to translate. He should be taught in nouns and verbs the meaning of the following: proprium, literal statement; translatum, figurative statement; synonyma, diversa, closely similar but not synonyms; contraria, antonyms; and phrases, phrases. The child should then take a third book and try to find in his lesson four of these six; and if they are not in the lesson, he should indicate which are not found.² He goes on to say that the child should be gently admonished if he incorrectly labels any of the six "things."

He is especially concerned with the techniques of translatio linguarum, translating (double translation, in this case); paraphasis, paraphrasing; metaphrasis, changing verse into prose and prose into verse; epitome, summarizing works; and imitatio, imitating methods of different authors. He mentions the term declamatio, but he does not reach a discussion of it before death cut short his work on this treatise. These techniques are graded as to their degree of difficulty—beginning with translating which is easiest—and are considered the best way of learning Latin or any other foreign language. The schoolmaster should be cognizant of the merits and demerits of each method; to this end, Ascham devotes all but one or two pages of the second book to this discussion.³

His last discussion entails the method of imitation that is so

¹Ascham, op. cit., p. 239.
²Ibid., pp. 185-87.
³Ibid., pp. 243-302.
essential to the understanding of the ancients. He cites Cicero, Varro, Sallust, and Caesar as the outstanding examples to imitate, concluding that Caesar is the perfect model.¹

In his discussion of imitation, he cites the major books with which the child should be familiarized during the course of his education.

... A booke, thus whole filled with examples of Imitatio, first out of Tullie, compared with Plato, Xenophon, Isocrates, Demosthenes and Aristotle: than out of Virgil and Horace, with Homer and Pindar: next out of Seneca with Sophocles and Euripides: Lastlie out of Liuie, with Thucydides, Polibius and Helicarnassaeus, gathered with good diligence, and compared with right order, as I have expressed before, were an other maner of worke for all kinde of learning, & namely for eloquence, than be those cold gatherings of Macrobius, Hessus, Perionius, Stephanus, and Victorius, which may be vsed, as I sayed before, in this case, as porters and caryers, deseruing like prayse, as soch men do wages; but onely Sturmius is he, out of whom, the tre surveuy of whole workemanship is speciallie to be learned.²

He is firm in his advocacy of gentleness in teaching, and he continually sets forth the idea by using concrete examples to emphasize his points. For example, he uses the story of Lady Jane Grey, the erudite young lady who preferred to be studying under her tutor than to be hunting with her parents. She preferred her tutor; for he was gentle and, as a result, kindled her desire to learn. On the other hand, her parents were strict and harsh: consequently, she was ill at ease around them and had no desire to study.³

He believes that

... from seauen yeare olde to seauentene, loue is the best allurement to learninge: from seauentene to seauen and twentie, that wise men shold carefullie see the steppes of youthe surelie staide by good order, in that most slipperie tyme: and specialie in the Courte, a place most dangerous for youthe to lieue in,

¹Ibid. ²Ibid. ³Ibid., p. 201.
without great grace, good regards, and diligent looking to!\(^1\)

He vehemently disapproves of travel abroad as a part of the educational process. He is particularly caustic in his attack upon travel in Italy; for, in his opinion, Italy is the epitome of vice and is, therefore, a threat to the attainment of virtue, the goal towards which education aims. Consequently, travel is a form of experience detrimental to the aims of education.\(^2\)

Ascham should not be too harshly judged because of his vitriolic attack on Italy; for as Hallam indicates, the reaction may be the result of his aversion for the "introduction of a French or Italian idiom, which the travelled English affected in order to show their politeness."\(^3\) Thus, his attack may only be an above normal reaction to the affectation of manners. Furthermore, there

... can be no doubt that Italy had degenerated from its former condition. The country which had been the foster mother of all Europe was at length exhausted.\(^4\)

Unlike Elyot, he makes no direct mention of a study of the Bible, with the exception of a quotation from Sir John Cheke, who placed the Bible first in a child's education.\(^5\) However, he does recommend the study of the classics in relation to God's true religion. Thus, we have an illustration of the humanistic practice of applying pagan literature to Christian ideals.\(^6\)

Malcaster's curriculum is comprised of five areas of study: reading,
writing, drawing, singing, and playing some instrument. And since the
Elementarie is geared to the glorification and utilization of the English
language, Mulcaster also directs his attention to the ways and means by
which other languages have been improved and by which the writing of
English could be improved. They are: (1) general rule, which concerns
the property and use of each letter; (2) proportion, which reduces all
words of one sound to the same writing; (3) composition, which teaches how
to write compound words; (4) derivation, which deals with etymology; (5)
distinction, which teaches the difference of sound and emphasis in letters
by some figure or accent; (6) enfranchisement, which teaches the correct
usage of foreign words incorporated into the English tongue; and (7)
prerogative, which teaches the use of words most agreed upon by the men
most learned in the language.¹

Reading should be the first of the five areas of study with which
the student should deal. He must be given rules to be observed in read-
ing and spelling, with emphasis being placed on readings which teach the
pupil to be of service to God, his country, and his fellowman.

... And forsomuch as the goodnesse and vertew of matter is
most fit for the young childe in the first seasoning of his
tender minde: and the matter it self is spred into two branches,
consonant vnto the main distinction of the ten commandments,
either for religion towards God, and right opinion in faith: or
for ciuilitie towards men, and right judgement in behaviour: I
will therefor cast the matter of reading so, as it shall answer
at full both to religion in faith, and ciuilitie in frindship.
Wherefor to laie the first ground of learning, which is to learn
to read, in religion towards God, and in religion it self to
observe the law and ordinances of my contrie...²

He goes on to say, "Then will I set down som other well pikt discourse,

¹Mulcaster, op. cit., pp. 59-60.
²Ibid., p. 61.
which shall concern morall behauior, and right opinions. . . ."¹

Special emphasis is to be placed on developing memory, gaining
delight, making use of full capacity, and progressing speedily: "In all
which I will haue both a speciall, & a continuall regard to these four
points in the childe, his memorie, his delite, his capacitie, and his
forwarding."²

Reading should be followed by writing, with special attention being
given to the quality of handwriting. His spelling table will aid the
writer. The pupil should be given two tables, one English and one Latin;
then he should be taught how to write English and to recognize its
Corresponding word in Latin. After he has completed the first two tables,
he should be given two more.³ Although he is primarily concerned with the
"right writing" of the English tongue, he confesses:

. . . I joyn the latin letter with the English, bycause the time
to learn the latin tung in next in order after the Elmentarie,
and the childes hand is then to be acquainted with the latin
charact is, it be not far more easie. . . ."⁴

Drawing should follow writing; for drawing encompasses arithmetic
and geometry, which are helpful in aiding a pupil in choosing a vocation.

If

. . . he chaunce to chuse the pen & pencill to liue by, this
introduction then will proue his great frind, as he himself
shall find, when he feles it in prouf. Last of all drawing is
a thing, whose thorough help manie good workmen do vse, which
liue honestlie thereby, & in good degre of estimation &
welth. . . ."⁵

The pupil is to be permitted to choose what he wishes to draw, for it is

¹Ibid.
²Ibid.
³Ibid., p. 62.
⁴Ibid., p. 63.
⁵Ibid., p. 64.
advisable that he be concerned with those things that interest him. For example, he may wish to be an architect or an engraver; therefore, his special interest should be directed to this end.

Singing and playing are to be considered concomitantly under the broader heading of music. The pupil should learn intonation in singing by starting from the first note, according to such rules as the master will set down; and he should gain proficiency in playing both the lute and virginal, according to principles unnamed here.¹

Mulcaster refers very generally to his methodology, which was reserved for the promised but not written second part of the elementary educational process.² What he does after setting forth the courses in his curriculum is to go back and develop his ideas in a manner that borders on pedantry. But he does something that the two preceding writers had not done: he set up a spelling table as a necessary part of his curriculum.³ Thus, we see one of the earliest considerations of English orthography.

The three writers differ most in their consideration of the age that a child should be exposed to an orderly curriculum. Elyot, for example, considers a greater age span than either of the other two. He recommends training in the nursery years and feels that a "governour's" education never ends; in fact, he recommends beginning a study of law after the age of twenty-one.

Ascham's pupil starts his education at approximately seven years old. He mentions no training for the earlier years. Mulcaster deals specifically with the period before the child reaches twelve years of age; he

¹Ibid., pp. 65-67.  
²Ibid., p. 67.  
³Ibid., pp. 115-249.
concerns himself with the years that the very title of his work suggests, the elementary years. Unlike his predecessors, his curriculum is basically English oriented; the curricula of Elyot and Ascham are classically oriented.

Ascham is more profound in his methodology. Although both he and Elyot recommend gentleness in teaching, Ascham refers to this method throughout his work. He would also initiate the double translation method of teaching Latin. Finally, Elyot and Mulcaster recommend study in the Bible, whereas Ascham merely refers to a statement of Sir John Cheke's. However, he redeems himself by applying pagan literature to Christian ideals.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The renewed interest in classical literature gave birth to a new discipline that opposed scholasticism, which was on the decline. Close scrutiny of the curricula of the period shows that this new discipline—labelled humanism—did not displace the scholastic curriculum, which emphasized logic, theology, natural philosophy, and the study of Latin as a living language. No attempt to imitate the Latin of the ancients was made. Conversely, the humanistic curriculum emphasized grammar, rhetoric, poetry, moral philosophy, and the imitation of classical Latin. The humanists accepted only that Latin which had a model in the classics.

Scholasticism, which had its inception in twelfth-century France at the University of Paris, arose in Italy at about the same time as humanism during the closing decades of the thirteenth century. Both disciplines existed simultaneously in the different universities, and the animosity between the two supporting factions manifested itself in different ways. One way was evident in the competitive situation at the universities. For example, if a humanist gained an authoritative position, he tried to de-emphasize the scholastic curriculum; if a schoolman gained an authoritative position, he tried to de-emphasize the humanistic curriculum. This intense rivalry often led to the wholesale burning of books.

Despite this strong competitive spirit, humanism proved to be the dominant discipline. Its spirit and vigor found currency in the lives and works of some of the best minds of the ages. Among these was da Feltre,
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the noted Italian schoolmaster who championed gentle teaching and athletics. His indomitable spirit inspired his appreciative students, who tried to reward his efforts by adhering to his teachings. Federigo, one of his prize pupils, became renowned for his wise and brilliant leadership. Castiglione based his book, *The Courtier*, the finest of courtesy books, on the life, leadership, and country of the erudite Federigo. Another avid humanist was Luis Vives, a Spaniard, who served in the court of Henry VIII. He is well known for his brilliant education treatises. He wrote on many subjects which ranged from the education of women to the advocation of teaching in the vernacular.

Two of Vives' contemporaries, Erasmus and Sir Thomas More, shared his fervent love for the classics. Erasmus is credited with being the most outstanding influence on English humanism and with making available the new knowledge to the many. He is remembered for both his voracious scholarship and magnificent writings. More, his close friend, was the personification of humanistic scholarship. His home was the meeting place of such notables as Vives, Erasmus, Lord Mountjoy, Sir Thomas Elyot, and William Roper, More's son-in-law. Chambers tells us that the industrious More even tried to educate his first wife, who proved to be almost hopelessly uneducable. He provided his children with study in Latin, Greek, philosophy, mathematics, and astronomy.¹ He once wrote to the University of Oxford in vindication of classical literature, and he wrote to his children in Latin until they were grown.² Even persons who were not members of the immediate household benefited from the educational


²Ibid.
atmosphere that permeated his household.

Other exponents of the humanistic discipline included the "Oxford Humanists"—Colet, Grocyn, Linacre, and William Lyly. They are credited with introducing the new learning into Oxford and are best remembered for their indefatigable study of the classics rather than for any momentous works. Colet is renowned for his founding of St. Paul's School.

The break-up of the feudal system, the invention of printing, and widened geographical boundaries contributed to growing nationalistic feelings. And the humanistic spirit led to the formulation of the Copernican theory of revolution, which threatened to disrupt the traditional view of man and the universe, although it was not accepted until it was verified by Kepler and Galileo.

With the advent of humanism, the changes in attitudes, and the occurrence of new and startling events, the need for a complete education was more intensely felt. Such men as Elyot, Ascham, and Mulcaster rose to the occasion. These men inherited the rich tradition of the decades immediately preceding the sixteenth century, although they reacted differently to the tradition as time passed. They also absorbed much of the critical thinking emanating from their contemporaries. For the most part, their attitudes reflect the humanistic spirit, which gave freer rein to thought.

There exist several similarities and dissimilarities in the attitudes of these men, with time being an important element in the formulation of their ideas. One basic similarity is evidenced in their consideration of the purpose of education. They agree unanimously that education should be geared towards preparing an individual for service to God, his country,
and his fellowman.

Here the writers reflect the influence of Vives, who advocated that knowledge be turned to usefulness and emphasized for the common good. They differ from Vives in that they recognize virtue as the all-important factor in the educational process. Mulcaster expands his attitude even to include the preparation for a vocation that will be helpful to the individual.

The purpose of education is so closely allied with the selection of the scholar that it is hardly recommendable to dissociate the two. Each writer is concerned with an ordered, hierarchal society in which each individual performs certain functions according to his position which is ordained by God. This concept, based on the Chain of Being, holds that some individuals are ordained rulers, whereas others are necessarily relegated to performing various other tasks. Although each writer supports this contention, he differs in his application. Elyot is primarily concerned with princes and noblemen; Ascham is concerned with princes, noblemen, and the aristocracy; and Mulcaster is concerned with princes, noblemen, the aristocracy, and the growing middle class. Thus, the progression of time is instrumental in liberalizing the attitudes; for the attitudes are expanding to include more people and are indicative of the shift in the power structure. Though society-at-large is gaining more and more recognition, the larger part of the population is still not considered in the power structure.

Each writer is concerned with the psychological make-up of the student and considers his attitude, his personality, his age, and his ability. Here again the writers reflect the influence of Vives, who also
considered the psychological make-up of the student. His basic concern was the child's wit; his successors expand his ideas to include the all-round personality make-up. However, his basic assumption that slow wits make better students than quick wits finds currency in Ascham, whereas Mulcaster holds the converse view. The emphasis that these men place on the psychological factors is reiterated in today's selection of capable individuals. Important jobs depend upon the outcome of psychological results, with emphasis being placed on quick-witted individuals. Mulcaster's ideas would undoubtedly be supported by modern-day psychologists.

Elyot and Ascham are similar in their recommendation of a school-master, but Elyot is more emphatic and is probably the most modern of the three. He considers the disposition, the earnestness, and the knowledge of the schoolmaster and points out that extremely low salaries may deter him from his duties. He must be sober, virtuous, gentle, and exemplary in his actions. Ascham's ideas are much the same, though less developed; and he places more emphasis on the gentle nature of the master. Mulcaster makes no pointed discussion of a schoolmaster, but we may infer from his repeated references to himself that he would approve of a stern master. From all indications, the concern with the selection of the master diminishes as the years pass by; Elyot gives the greatest consideration to the idea, with Ascham and Mulcaster following in that order.

Finally, they come to their major consideration, the order of learning. Here we are able to see the diversity of their attitudes, as well as the changing ideas that they reflect. Each proposes to set up a curriculum that will educate the whole man--the courtier, the thinker, the
scholar, the leader. This attitude is a reflection of da Feltre's influence, as well as the influence of the ancients. But da Feltre saw the importance of education in relation to the preparation of the whole man, whereas these writers emphasize education in relation to virtue, although they are also interested in developing the whole man. To this end, they recommend the combination of learning and exercise that tends to virtue.

Again Elyot and Ascham are similar in their attitudes; for both express nationalistic tendencies in their advocacy of shooting with the long bow, an English tradition. Both disapprove of crossbows and hand-guns; and their lists of exercise include riding, running, shooting with the long bow, wrestling, and dancing, along with several other sports. But they differ in that Elyot recommends sports for health's sake, whereas Ascham recommends sports for sports' sake and places great emphasis on sports out of doors in the daylight. Mulcaster recommends exercise but fails to enumerate the exercise with which the student should be concerned.

We see in the attitudes of these men the composite nature of Tudor education, the combination of the chivalric and the intellectual. Each recognizes the psychological significance of exercise which tends to virtue, for it relieves the monotony of arduous study and enables the child to go back to his studies with renewed vigor. The emphasis on exercise as a part of the educational process seems to be lessening with the progression of time, and the part that it plays in the development of the child is losing its vigor. Perhaps time is here the important factor, for Elyot is closest to the period during which sports and exercise played such a major role in the education of the upper classes. Therefore, this fact probably accounts for the considerable attention that he gives to exercise. The
years that follow are probably responsible for the shift more towards
the intellectual side of the educational process, for the periods are
more and more removed from the days when the courtier was considered the
perfect man.

If the Kennedy administration's recent findings concerning our
nation's physical "unfitness" are any indication, the trend has continued
toward the minimization of physical exercise in conjunction with mental
exercise.

Although these writers recommend the combination of exercise and
learning, they disapprove of combining learning and experience. Elyot
suggests that a student learn by taking simulated trips with the aid of
maps; therefore, he does not expose himself to the dangers connected with
actual travel. Ascham shows his aversion, which is the strongest of the
three, by launching a blistering attack upon travel in Italy and other
foreign countries. He is particularly inimical towards "Italianated
Englishmen." Mulcaster asserts that a student can learn more by staying
in his own country.

With the advent of the Tudors, nationalism--given the necessary
impetus by the break-up of the feudal system, the wider dissemination of
printed materials, and the widened geographical boundaries--expresses it-
self in the consideration of the status of the English language. Many
learned men of the day did not consider English a perfect language in the
sense that it was capable of lofty expression and philosophical discussion.
Consequently, there arose a movement to enrich the language by incorporat-
ing words from other languages. Some supported the movement; others
opposed it. Elyot's work indicates his support, for he incorporates many
words into the English of the Gouernour. However, English holds little or no place in his curriculum, which is given to the study of Latin and Greek authors, with emphasis on starting first with Greek.

Ascham apologizes for writing in the English tongue and satisfies his ego with the assertion that he is writing for the benefit of the many, thereby using the same nationalistic propensity that fostered wider use of the language. However, English plays a greater role in his curriculum than it does in Elyot's, for it is essential to his double translation method. Milcaster, unlike his predecessors, praises English as a "parfit tung" and devotes his entire work to the glorification of the language. The "right writing" of the English tongue is his primary concern, and he deprecates the practice of borrowing words from other languages but devotes a discussion to the handling of incorporated words.

The writers reflect the influence of Vives, who advocated the use of the vernacular, but only as a temporary means of communication between teacher and student; however, they make new applications of the idea. Elyot is most like Vives, for he advocates the use of the vernacular as a means of communication during the nursery years. He recommends this only because the nurse may misguide the child in the speaking of Latin. Ascham uses English to reach more people, whereas Milcaster accepts the vernacular as a means of teaching, as well as a means of communication. With the progression of time, the utility of English is more and more recognized.

Finally, they consider the curriculum and method of teaching. Elyot's curriculum covers the greatest age span. He recommends beginning the child's education during his nursery years. After he is taken away from his nurse, the tutor can begin teaching the child Latin by speaking it around him--the direct method of learning Latin. He feels that the child
should begin his grammar school education at the age of seven years. Ascham agrees with beginning the grammar school education at the age of seven years, but he makes no mention of the nursery years. There is one major point of difference: the method of learning Latin. Elyot approves of the direct method; and Ascham, who is inimical towards the direct method, recommends double translation. Both of these methods are concurrently used in modern-day study of foreign languages. Mulcaster, on the other hand, is primarily concerned with the elementary years, roughly those years before the child reaches twelve years of age. He is not at all concerned with the learning of a foreign language; instead, he is primarily concerned with English.

Elyot's curriculum is divided into three parts; and he places almost equal emphasis on Latin and Greek authors, although he feels that the child should begin with Greek authors. Thus, early traces of the preference for Greek are beginning to show themselves, as he reflects the humanists' veneration for Greek. His curriculum consists of such authors as Aesop, Homer, Virgil, Ovid, Aristophanes, Julius Caesar, Cicero, and Erasmus. His inclusion of Erasmus indicates the esteem in which he holds his contemporary. One is tempted to recall the gatherings at the More's household, where these two men discussed ideas related to the Renaissance. Ascham's curriculum begins with the double translation of the epistles of Cicero, a Latin author; but his curriculum shows a decided trend towards more emphasis on studying Greek authors. Although he says that he is interested in teaching the child how to write Latin, the majority of his authors are Greek. He includes such authors as Cicero, Plato, Xenophon, Isocrates, Homer, Aristotle, Pindar, Euripides, Seneca, and Sophocles, to name a few.
Unlike Elyot and Ascham, Mulcaster's curriculum deals primarily with English and is comprised of five areas of study: reading, writing, drawing, singing, and playing some instrument. Being interested in orthography, he compiles a spelling table for the student's use.

The study of the Bible holds an important place in the curricula of Elyot and Mulcaster, but Ascham limits his consideration of the Bible to a quotation from his tutor, Sir John Cheke, who placed the Bible first in the child's study. Mulcaster also places it first in his curriculum, but Elyot rounds out his with the study of the Bible. It is his belief that the child's mind is then sufficiently receptive to the deeply significant moral lessons found in the Bible. Although Ascham does not include the Bible in his curriculum, he mirrors da Feltre in his application of pagan literature to Christian ideals; thus, he still adheres to his belief that education should train the child in virtue.

Music in Elyot and drawing in Mulcaster are included for utility rather than aesthetic benefits; and the works to be read are chosen for profit rather than pleasure, pleasure being allowed only because it encourages the student to read profitable works. The effect of time on the expansion of attitudes to include more people is evident in Mulcaster's consideration of drawing, which can prepare a student for a vocation, or avocation, provided he does not wish to continue studying regular courses. Here he anticipates our vocational training programs, reflecting the concern with a greater part of the population.

The emphasis that Elyot and Ascham place on gentleness in teaching is a reflection of da Feltre, Vives, and Erasmus. Ascham also reflects the influence of Sir John Cheke, who was a gentle schoolmaster. This emphasis also encompasses the natural disposition of the schoolmaster,
his ability, and his earnestness. Mulcaster emphasizes a method that is analogous to present-day method, for he indicates that the student should be encouraged to utilize those areas of study which are of interest to him. Gentleness in teaching has also survived to this day. They all agree that the best method to use is one which leads a child to virtue, an attitude that time fails to affect.

As it has been indicated, the passing of the years undoubtedly had its effect upon the changing attitudes towards education as they are reflected in the works of Elyot, Ascham, and Mulcaster. Their works still retain their mother lode of thought, for I have only tapped a few veins. It is a Herculean, if not an impossible, task to treat fully the scope of their ideas, which lie like potential energy in the pages of their works. However, what is presented here is sufficient to show that an abundance of thought pervaded the century and reflected the ever-present tendency to search for something "just a little better."
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