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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Scholars interested in the development of educational thought soon realize that theories and practices are the product not only of the intellectual and social climate of the times in which they originated, but also of each individual educator's personal commitment to those principles and recommendations he deems necessary to the improvement of education.

A rapid glance at classic educators from ancient times to the present reveals that great educational thinkers were to a large extent influenced by their age and environment as well as by their predecessors. The new ideas that school reformers attempted to make intelligible to their fellow-men were more or less associated with the areas of thought—religious, philosophical, political, scientific, and social—popular at the time. On the one hand one finds certain school reformers in great sympathy with a society undergoing political, social and religious changes. On the other hand, one finds others reluctant to accept and incorporate societal changes into their educational theories and practices. But whether or not the
educators welcomed the thinking of their time, they were nonetheless affected by it.

In addition to these environmental factors, every educator brought to bear in the development of new ideas certain personal characteristics, such as his own character, his own moral, social, emotional and intellectual capacities, his own drive. It is a common belief that "innovators lend to whatever they invent a personal emphasis, something lifelike and occasionally extravagant."¹ A dynamic personality, a keen intellectual insight, an emotional stability, operating within the framework of a favorable environment, can rightfully be assets to the educator in the formulation and from thence the realization of new theories and practices. In fact, the two educators to be discussed in this study will substantiate this thesis. John Amos Comenius, the seventeenth-century realist, and Francis Wayland Parker, the nineteenth-century 'pragmatic' idealist, did present new educational theories and practices. Both men, products of their own times, through their wide learning, great imagination and sympathy with the intellectual and social climate of their day, offered to the world a new outlook on education--an

THE PROBLEM

The genesis for this comparative study of specifically these two schoolmasters stems from an incidental remark by Edward Dangler\(^1\) who called Parker, "the American Comenius." Dangler probably used the phrase simply in a figurative or speculative manner since he was chiefly concerned with Parker's philosophy of education. At any rate, the phrase, "Parker, the American Comenius," aroused the present writer's curiosity urging her to discover in what ways these two educational reformers could be compared.

To further delineate the scope of this study, the present writer wishes to stress that the proposed investigation is not aimed at furnishing data to demonstrate that Parker was influenced by the educational writings of Comenius. This in fact might be possible though more difficult since such nineteenth-century educators as Pestalozzi, Herbart and Froebel may have contributed more to Parker's educational thought than did Comenius. As a matter of fact,

many times in his writings Parker acknowledged Froebel as his mentor for developing his views on methods of teaching in elementary schools. Robert E. Tostberg stresses this point in his thesis when he states that

The Colonel's debt to the German schoolmaster was immense, and was gratefully and repeatedly acknowledged. Indeed, Parker's principal book, *Talks on Pedagogics*, read like a comprehensive gloss of Froebel's *Education of Man*.1

At this point one might wonder why Froebel and Parker were not the educators selected for this comparative study since Parker's educational philosophy quite naturally falls in line with that held by this German schoolmaster. The reason is simply that a careful examination of Froebel's educational practices reveals that in almost every important particular, they (Froebel's teachings) were built upon the foundations laid by the Moravian bishop . . . . His seed-thought is again that of Comenius--Educate by developing the pupil's own activity. Out of it and its corollaries the new education has grown.2

If then Froebel, Parker's guide, based his doctrine on

---


Comenius, it might be possible to assume that Comenius is ultimately responsible for giving the modern school many of its progressive practices. Some educational historians have thought this and have suggested that Comenius could be rightfully called the "Father of Modern Education." Assuming then that Comenius is the "prime mover" of modern education, a study of his educational experiences should provide valuable insights for an understanding of the educational theories and practices of later periods. On the basis of these assumptions a comparative study of the education described by Comenius in the seventeenth century and Parker in the nineteenth century would seem legitimate.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

There is no difficulty in finding a description and an analysis of the new education as advocated by Comenius and Parker when each is treated separately. The educational activities of these men are discussed in a section or a chapter of almost every book on the history of education. Also pertinent information concerning their achievement can be found in periodical articles. But a comparison of Comenius and Parker within the dimensions of the new education has not been attempted as a separate study.
An examination of all available research sources, moreover, has revealed that no doctoral study has been made on this specific topic.

Several doctoral studies related to this topic have appeared. For instance, Spinka\(^1\) in 1923 examined the irenic program and activity of Comenius. Thirty-two years later Hay\(^2\) presented a work on the apparent reflections of Comenius' philosophy in contemporary education. In more recent years, due to the 300th anniversary of the publication in Amsterdam of the *Opera Didactica Omnia*, there has been a resurgence of interest in Comenius. UNESCO\(^3\) published a commemorative volume which includes selections from his writings dealing with education and social reform. Perhaps this Comenian revival has stirred doctoral students to study Comenius for there have recently appeared three doctoral theses: Clauser\(^4\) in 1961, compared the educa-

---

\(^1\) Matthew Spinka, "The Irenic Program and Activity of John Amos Comenius" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1923).


tional practices of the Moravians in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, with those of Comenius; Pope in 1962, examined some of the principal teachings of the seventeenth century Czech educator and determined their relevance to the problems of education in the United States to-day; Pedram in 1963, presented to the educational literature a critical comparison of the educational theories and practices of Comenius and Dewey.

Studies relative to Parker's new education are extant also. Nuber examined Parker's educational activities and views in 1934; Edeiken outlined and discussed some of Parker's educational contributions in 1935; Grant made an evaluation of Parker's educational philos-


The first doctoral thesis to be made on Parker appeared in 1939. In this work Dangler studied Parker's educational philosophy. The only other doctoral study on Parker was Tostberg's, who in 1960 presented a description and an analysis of the seminal ideas and practices of Parker and Dewey during their Chicago years from 1883 to 1904.

The author's research reveals ample data to justify a comparative study of the writings of Comenius and Parker. It can fill a lacuna in the literature of educational theory.

THE PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THIS STUDY

The purpose of this study is to establish an intellectual correspondence between the educational theory and practice of John Amos Comenius, a seventeenth-century European realist, and Francis Wayland Parker, a nineteenth-century American 'pragmatic' idealist and in so doing see how these points of comparison can best serve as signs of the development of educational theory and practice.

1Edward Dangler, "The Educational Philosophy of Francis W. Parker" (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1939).

Chapter One states the problem, the significance of this study, the review of literature, the purpose, the scope and the sources of data of this study.

Chapter Two presents an overview of the educational scene of the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. By juxtaposing some of the salient features of these two centuries, an effort will be made to demonstrate to what extent Comenius' and Parker's worlds were conducive to the development of the new education.

Chapter Three studies Comenius, the sense realist of the seventeenth century and Parker, the American progressivist of the nineteenth century. A brief account of their lives will be followed by a description and an analysis of their work as educators, their theory and practice relative to the education of youth.

Chapter Four examines the educational theory of these two school reformers stressing their views on the nature of the child and the aims of education.

Chapter Five draws parallels between the educational practices of both schoolmasters highlighting such areas as curriculum, methods of teaching and role of teachers.

Chapter Six summarizes the results of this investigation along with pertinent conclusions. Such
conclusions can give clearer insight into an understanding of the nature of the development of educational thought and practice.

THE SOURCES OF DATA

In this dissertation, which undertakes to compare some of the salient educational features of Comenius with those of Parker through their writings, the evidential sources are both primary and secondary.

The primary sources used are the following: The Great Didactic, The Analytical Didactic, The School of Infancy, UNESCO's Commemorative Volume, John A. Comenius Selections, Talks on Pedagogics, Talks on Teaching.


4 Comenius, Selections.


The secondary sources include general historical works and provide background material: educational histories for understanding the main currents of educational thought and practice, literature related to biographical accounts of Comenius and Parker and to discussions on Comenian and Parkerian pedagogical principles, Annual Reports of the United States Commissioner of Education, doctoral and other research studies dealing with Comenius and Parker.
CHAPTER II

EDUCATIONAL CLIMATE: SEVENTEENTH AND NINETEENTH CENTURIES

Scanning the historical development of Western man's education since ancient times, one is struck by the numerous and countless efforts made by teacher-masters to lay the foundations of a better society by providing man with better educational opportunities. The great reformers and innovators of all ages have envisioned education as the vitalized power for assisting man become what his society conceived to be the "ideal man." To this end reformers of education have constructed new educational theories and practices, modified and altered some of the existing ones, and, in certain instances, disregarded or rejected others. In all cases, the new propositions of innovators and reformers were directed to the realization of man's potential in a growing, changing and progressing society.

However, it is apparently true that certain historical periods were more receptive to new ideas, and it did not matter much whether these were in the social, political or educational realm. In education, for instance, an innovator or reformer, living in a genre ripe for
change and capable of seizing opportunity, can, with effort, determination and perseverance, succeed in altering the course of educational practice. A knowledge of the leading trends of the times during which Comenius and Parker lived is essential to an understanding of their thought and action in educational matters.

The first topic in this comparative study will be the educational climate of the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. Some consideration will be given to those events which served as vital forces in establishing the proper conditions for a more realistic and more practical approach to education. These considerations will be followed by a comparison of the distinctive events of the two centuries to discover if the two educators under study responded to the opportunities offered them by the course of events. With these backgrounds, there may be justification for referring to Parker as the American-Comenius.

The seventeenth century can be described as an age of strife, of development and of rapid progress.¹

No doubt, it was a spirited period in which many re-

actions took place, not only in the religious and the political, but also in the scientific and the educational world. The Thirty Years' War (1618-1648)—actually a series of wars—stemmed from religious conflicts, territorial issues and struggles for political supremacy. The expansion of scientific knowledge through the use of the inductive method served to revolutionize man's traditional concept of the universe and led him to become more suspicious of book knowledge. In short, write Eby and Arrowood:

> The great advance made during the seventeenth century lay in the change from more philosophizing about nature to careful experimentation.¹

Individual reason, observation and experiment were the new tools to discover truth, at least in the natural sciences. But this new method of acquiring rational certitude was transferred to other fields and education was unavoidably affected by it. This new approach to learning had the effect of creating in the minds of the leading thinkers of the day a tremendous faith in the power of human reason. Their faith was reinforced by their observations of nature. A variety of inventions and numerous discoveries in the natural sciences testified to the

worth of inductive methods. Briefly stated, these were the intellectual hallmarks of these hundred years.

Within this framework of intellectual quickening—religious strife, political turmoil, expansion of knowledge—one wonders why a young, enthusiastic, clerical reformer like Comenius would venture to find ways and means of helping men live reasonably and peaceably together. The impetus for his gigantic constructive work stemmed from faith in God, in mankind and in education.

Kandel has presented a fairly good picture of Comenius' reaction to the religious and political upheavals of the seventeenth century:

Education was in Comenius's opinion, to be the way to peace and to universal brotherhood. For Comenius was not a dreamer; the times in which he lived were such as to impel any thoughtful man to turn his mind to plans for the amelioration of the ills which overwhelmed the world. A refugee in a world torn by religious dissensions and imperialist aggressions he saw Europe being devastated by prolonged wars. . . .

Sad prospects for man's future deeply affected Comenius and prompted him to attempt something that would help save the world from destruction. He had, moreover, an understanding of the problems at hand. Furthermore he was able to use ways and means to alleviate the suffering

---

of his society more than could any of the politicians of his age as Kandel clearly expressed:

If he (Comenius) was not original, he did at least have the ability to see the real bearings of the contributions which had been made by his predecessors and his contemporaries to human thought and to a new world order. He had insight to bring together the somewhat isolated suggestions and recommendations made by others into one program and to go beyond them in an active campaign to convert this program into a practical reality.¹

Laurie also credits the Moravian Educator with seizing opportunities and employing them for the betterment of education. He wrote:

He lived at a time when men of intellect were divided into two classes, those who looked back and those who looked forward; he was essentially a modern, and at once put his hand to the work that was most urgent in the interests of Europe, viz., an irenic icon, scientific organization, and education.²

This reformer of the seventeenth century was a man of foresight, a practical man and a dedicated man. The educational program he planned for his society was real and practical. Because of his emphasis on the laws of nature in the learning process he has been rightfully called a 'realist,' the name given to those who joined the seventeenth century movement called "Realism."

¹Ibid., p. 401.
Just where to fix the beginning of Realism is not a very important matter though an interesting one. Writers of educational history generally agree that Realism was an outgrowth of both the Renaissance and the Reformation periods. During these two periods great strides were taken to help men and women enjoy more abundantly the goodness, the beauties and the joys of this world. To implement these new aims many suggestions and recommendations concerning education were made by theorists who were thinking far ahead of their own times rather than by practitioners. As a result the new plans they suggested for an educational reform were not immediately welcomed. Nonetheless these great men did sow the first seeds of newer, more realistic educational practices. It was left to followers to continue work so enthusiastically begun. As Eby and Arrowood have brought out

One age bears within itself the burgeoning fruit of the next; so the Renaissance of the 16th century unwittingly was preparing for the Realism of the 17th century.¹

Along the same line Medlin writes:

There is truly no break between the period of Renaissance and Reformation and the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Most of the ideas in education and

¹Eby and Arrowood, p. 200.
learning . . . had already appeared in one form or another, during that exciting period of human development and creativity. But the modernity of these ideas began to take on more concrete form and the ideas themselves began actually to assume the character of movements . . . 1

It is the last point that has special meaning for this study. At last Realism became a movement rather than the endeavor of an individual. The primary purpose of the Realists was then to concretize the educational ideal already presented by the earlier humanistic theorists of education. Until then, innovators who had dared offer improved ideas for teaching and learning had spoken as individuals not as members of a movement. The climate of the seventeenth century proved ripe for the reception of these innovations. This period was more suitable to the germination and blossoming of these so-called modern educational 'seeds' than any previous age. With so much collective activity, it is not surprising to see intensive, often violent responses in education. 2 The times, then, in addition to the reforms committed to great creativity, played a major role in fashioning new and reshaping old

educational theories and practices.

Every new movement alters the spirit of an age. Comenius, whose name is associated with seventeenth-century Realism, was the outstanding exponent of a movement that created a spirit of educational reaction and social reform: a spirit of reaction for real knowledge based not only on books but also on the laws of nature; a spirit of reform for making the world a better place in which to live. The procedure that Comenius followed in developing this new spirit was, according to Monroe, very similar to that of most reformers, namely, to study the works of predecessors and borrow whatever could serve to shape their own views. But Ulich adds that Comenius as a pioneer in modern education did more for

What makes him great is the fact that he combines an unusual degree of susceptibility to foreign influences with an equally strong faculty of systematic integration.

Therefore, before directing attention to the educational innovations Comenius advocated, it might be well

1Idem.


to identify some of these "foreign influences"—or their instigators, so to speak—in order to see what contributed to Comenius' realistic and practical education. The fathers of influence most often cited in histories of education are Vives, Bacon and Ratke.

Vives (1492-1540), a Spanish educator and a forerunner of realistic education, sought to make the humanistic aims of education more practical. Like the realistic educational writers of his day he advocated the study of the classical tradition "not for its own sake, but rather for the scientific and historical information which it could contribute." Gone were the days when the sole aim of education was "the acquisition of a graceful and elegant style." Over this hue and cry for Latinate eloquence resounded the voice of Vives. He supported the study of the classics for their content rather than for style and structure and insisted on broadening the curriculum by inserting such subjects as science, history, the vernacular, physical training and play. The care of individual differences also received his attention for he pleaded "that the students be taught according to their

1 Eby and Arrowood, p. 201.
2 Monroe, p. 4.
ability to learn. . . . He advised that every boy be studied by his teachers for at least two months before instruction was to begin.¹ He realized the need for a better organization of schools and advocated education for both boys and girls. To him education was a matter of state affairs and for that matter he "regarded it as a public enterprise."² These are some of the outstanding characteristics of Vives' theory of education. No doubt the claims he made for a better education reveal him as a precursor of realism from whom Comenius did find much inspiration for organizing a school program to meet the needs of his own seventeenth-century society.

Another well-known figure associated with scientific realism was Francis Bacon (1561-1626). His contribution to the field of education differed in nature from that of Vives and Ratke. The latter were above all educators in the full sense of the word. For this reason they are better known to the student of education. Yet, Bacon did have a specific message to communicate to the world "in behalf of science and learning."³ He opened a

¹Power, p. 302.
²Idem.
new route to scientific investigation by substituting the inductive method for the deductive whereby conclusions are reached by observing nature and by using a sound method of rational procedure. This rational procedure for acquiring knowledge proved tantalizing. Schoolmasters were enthralled by the simple formula and soon translated Bacon's scientific laws of learning into pedagogical rules. Comenius adhered to Bacon by introducing into his theory of education such ideas as the proper moment to present certain knowledge, the method of sometimes beginning with the easiest and sometimes with the most difficult, the introduction of things before ideas, going from the particular to the general.

Hatke (1571-1635), a Holsteiner, is another realist who stood as a forerunner to Comenius. As an educational reformer he was primarily concerned with methods of teaching languages, with the establishment of schools devoted to the teaching of the arts and sciences, and finally with the introduction of uniform speech, uniform government and uniform religion throughout the empire.  

---

1 Compayre, p. 123.
3 Monroe, p. 29.
Apparently Ratke was unsuccessful in realizing his educational aims. But "out of his many strange performances and lofty promises, there issued some thoughts of practical value."¹ For instance learning should follow the order and course of nature; only one thing should be learned at a time; the same thing should be repeated for impression; the study of the vernacular should occur before the study of any other foreign language.

These educational practices of Vives, Bacon and Ratke served to prepare the soil for the educational climate of the seventeenth century. A new faith in the possibilities for improving the individual and for reconstructing society through education was, briefly stated, the idea generating this new spirit bent upon redirecting a world on the one hand torn by religious and political dissensions, and on the other growing through scientific and educational discoveries. To Comenius will be left "the glory of applying the new spirit to actual practices."² From the Moravian Bishop's educational writings, the reader can detect that his "attitudes towards educational problems showed that he understood and accepted

¹Compayre, p. 121.
²Ibid., p. 122.
much that the 'new' sciences were producing in knowledge."¹

Along with his predecessors, he believed that

the newly discovered sciences would be used to extend more widely the powers and greatness of man's estate, to secure the sovereignty of man over things whereby God might have more glory in the workmanship of them, and men the more fruit of them.²

Just as the seventeenth-century European climate propelled Comenius to plan for a real and practical program of education so the nineteenth-century American climate also determined Parker to dedicate his life to the cause of education in the United States.

It would seem only reasonable to expect that within the two centuries that separate the two educators some progress had been made in the development of educational theories and practices. Perhaps one would hope to find changes in the organization of schools, in the curriculum, in the methods of teaching and learning. Yet, surprisingly enough the history of education reveals that little had been achieved within this period with respect to the practical aspects of education.

On the other hand, the nineteenth century in both Western Europe and America might be described as an "extraordinary epoch" when exceptional methods were devised for

¹Medlin, p. 71.
²Kandel, p. 403.
the development of political, social, and economic theories, for the rapid expansion and diffusion of scientific knowledge, for the emancipation of men and women and the promoting of a life that stressed individual rights, duties, and responsibilities. "Faith in the worth of liberty, of equality of rights, of universal enlightenment became a passion."¹ A new enthusiasm and a renewed optimism for human progress sparked this feverish, persistent activity. However here again the activity was not the concern of single individuals as it had been, for instance, during the revival of learning found in the Renaissance. Rather, these new ideas were initiated and promoted by groups of people who took every precaution to communicate their plans to all people, not just to the few aristocrats who might have been eager to enjoy certain political, social and economic benefits. The "popular movement," the distinctive feature of the nineteenth century, encouraged the common man in particular to petition for freedom, equality, and opportunity. In fact, it was this popular movement that "provoked and sustained the revolutions which have liberated, which have given new hope and courage to the

Consequent to these claims for liberty, equality, and opportunity, the tempo of life became accelerated and hence the educational conditions of civilized lands had to be revamped to meet the new demands. America, like France, England, and Germany was affected by these new trends. Contrary to her older European forebears she set out to build not only a national but also a democratic system of education fully applicable to all her states.

To present more adequately the educational scene of the nineteenth century some consideration must be given first to changes in pre-Civil War American democracy that had an impact on education, and second, to the educational activity fermenting after the war.

At the outbreak of the nineteenth century, America was unable to attend to educational issues. Life after the Revolutionary War was marked by suffering, struggles, and deprivations. People's energies and resources—whatever was left after the war—were absorbed in providing for the bare necessities of life. Religion which at one time had been the center of American thought was being replaced by political theory. Commercial life was very slow. Few improvements had been made in farming. Added

1 Idem.
to these external struggles were internal disputes and conflicts. Now, the citizens began to have doubts on the wisdom of this independence they had so desperately sought and gained. During this crucial period, education was at a low ebb.

When the people had finally settled their political and commercial future by the War of 1812-1814, and had built up a national consciousness on a democratic basis in the years immediately following, and the Nation at last possessed the energy, the money, and the interest for doing so, they finally turned their energies toward the creation of a democratic system of public schools.¹

Beginning with the second quarter of the nineteenth century a new spirit for education animated the minds and hearts of the American people. Among the several factors serving to promote this interest in learning might be cited: the extension of suffrage to all citizens, the rapid growth of cities and industries, and the various popular movements.

From the moment citizenship became the concern of everyone, the American people earnestly sought to design a system of education that would meet their needs. Slowly but surely, especially in the North, the eligibility to vote was no longer restricted by religious and property qualifications. Each citizen was to

be offered everything which belongs to a universal human culture, and what his particular capacities demand or are able to appropriate. Only upon these two conditions can the citizen of the commonwealth be fitted for the future struggle for existence, to continue equal to the increased requirements, and fulfill ably his chosen calling.1

A sacred respect for the individual citizen was seen not only in the politicians who needed him to implement their policies but also in the educational reformers who realized how important it would be to educate all these people who were becoming more politically powerful.

Another factor that enhanced the development of educational agencies was the rapid growth of cities and industries. The shift from an agrarian to an industrial society caused quite a commotion in the lives of these common people. How were they to cope with all these new inventions and revolutionary developments in industrial and business organization and methods? Certainly the simple and quiet way of life of earlier periods was no longer suited to the tempo of living in the industrial cities. 2

---


and technology.

Rather than accepting learning as a meaningful experience and one in which interest and motive might play some part, the nineteenth century elementary school too often prohibited activities which seemed to be naturally attractive to students. The curriculum was narrow and out of joint with the times; the methods were archaic, unmindful of technique capitalizing interest and unwilling to adapt teaching to the level of student accomplishment. Initiative was curtailed, discipline, routine, silence were praised as the sign of ideal conditions conducive to learning.¹

If the schools were to prepare youth to live in power-driven centers, then something had to be done about the archaic methods of teaching and learning. There existed among the common people an awareness of the urgency of an educational system that would provide them with the essentials of knowledge. The pressures arising from the growth of cities and industries became so great during the second quarter of the nineteenth century that political and educational leaders, public-spirited citizens, and even the simple working man were forced by circumstances to use their initiative in developing new media whereby their offspring could be guaranteed the rudiments of learning. Provisions for educational opportunities available to all children regardless of nationality, religion, social status or sex were soon made.

Popular movements, the third factor promoting interest in education, were initiated by great humanitarians capable of channeling the energies and resources of the common people for educational purposes. They organized, directed and supported labor movements and various philanthropic agencies always in the hope of coming to the educational assistance of the common man. In some way these organizations such as the Working Men's Party, the City School Societies paved the way for the founding of the Common School. Little by little people became aware of the fact that an education could be had in a school other than one controlled by the Church or by some religious communities. With much effort, much determination, and much perseverance political and educational leaders convinced the public that the Common School could provide an adequate education for all the American children of this country.¹

Admitting that the three factors discussed above, namely, universal suffrage, growth of cities and industries, and humanitarian agencies, did awaken an educational consciousness and did provide some means of education for the

poor people, in no way indicates that education was then within the reach of every citizen. On the contrary, demands for such a privilege were just fermenting. Certain educational measures had to be taken before America could boast of a public school system of her own. To this effect, it is appropriate to offer some comments on the establishment of the Common School. Of all the public figures associated with the Common School Horace Mann is considered "the greatest and most influential."¹ Francis Parker who was later engaged in furthering the development of the Common School greatly praised Mann for his contribution to the education of all the children of the commonwealth through the common schools. On this matter he wrote:

The problem was entirely new, and traditional education stood firmly in his pathway. It was his task to work out with an indomitable spirit and noble purpose the crude beginnings of all that educators have valued since his day. He believed with all his heart in the great destiny of the republic; he loved children; he was controlled with the idea that by means of the common school the republic could be perpetuated.²

Like Mann, Parker manifested a staunch belief in the possibilities of human growth through education. He could never laud the Common School enough. In referring to its spirit

¹Power, Main Currents in the History of Education, p. 453.

²Francis W. Parker, "Horace Mann," Educational Review, XII (June, 1896), 69.
"he said:

It has taken from the old world all it could get, and that is much. It has received from Germany its philosophy and psychology and its methods, but there is one thing we never can get from anywhere on the face of the earth, and that is an educational system adapted to the evolution of pure democracy.¹

To conceive a plan for universal education in a democratic society and to find ways and means for its acceptance and its development, was the challenge that faced the educational statesmen of the early nineteenth century. This brand new system of education, never before heard of in civilized lands and designed especially for American boys and girls was to be free, universal, publicly-supported, and non-sectarian. Its aim was to form the citizen, who was to receive character and moral training, mental discipline, vocational and practical competence and finally opportunities for individual development. The organization of such a system began with the elementary schools, but in the course of events the whole gamut of schooling from kindergarten through state universities became included. This necessitated good administrators, well-prepared teachers, a broader curriculum, and new methods of teaching and learning. To this had to be added new and more accommodating buildings

with separate classrooms, such equipment as textbooks, visual aids, and other facilities to create a cheerful and stimulating atmosphere conducive to learning. How to win public approval of such a public school system was the major problem for educational leaders. Such a task called for a man who possessed the combined qualities of educator, scholar and statesman. Horace Mann became the obvious choice for he "possessed the characteristics needed for such an office—enthusiasm, courage, vision, lofty ideals, and practical legislative experience."\(^1\)

As Secretary to the Massachusetts Board of Education from the year 1837 to 1848, Mann was able to put into effect a program of state support for public high schools, state normal schools and increased support for common schools.\(^2\) Though the odds were against him, he was determined to push his project through. "Irrespective of the quality of his ideas, he was a resolute, even a stubborn reformer."\(^3\) He had a clear vision of what lay ahead for the promotion and protection of American democracy and a staunch faith in education for the betterment of man and his society.

---

\(^1\) Cubberley, *Public Education in the United States*, p. 222.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 224.

The first half of the nineteenth century can right­fully be described as "a period of public agitation and educational propaganda."¹ Through universal suffrage common man assumed greater rights, duties and responsibilities, thus making it possible for him to participate in government affairs. The growth of cities, the development of new industries, and the "popular" movements, all served to intensify the value of education. Hence, the impact of these factors on education was great and varied: a state system of public schools, normal schools for training teachers, professional publications, such as Mann's Twelve Annual Reports and the Common School Journal, professional organizations such as teachers' institutes, and conventions, surveys, and other similar projects. It was amid this educational ferment that Parker made his debut as a school-teacher. In the evolution of educational thought in America both reformers, Mann and Parker, had a certain mission to fulfill and they accomplished it with reverence and devotion.

The one (Mann) prepared the way for the other; the one (Parker) was the blooming of the other, and America today is enjoying the fruit of germination of the one

¹Cubberley, The History of Education, p. 672.
and the bloom of the other.¹

Now as much effort as had been expended in promoting education during the first half of the nineteenth century through the leadership of outstanding political and educational statesmen so did this same spirit of involvement prevail in educational pursuits throughout the remaining five decades. Here, as in the earlier part of this period, were found many eminent figures, such as William Harris, Charles Eliot, Edward Sheldon, Stanley Hall, all of whom could be studied for their remarkable contributions to the perfecting of different phases of the American public school system. But as it is our aim to portray more specifically the educational climate in which Parker labored, this creates the problem of choosing one or several leaders whose thinking and action on educational questions were most influential to shaping Parker's school practices at Quincy and later at Cook County Normal School. After some consideration it would seem that Edward A. Sheldon should be highlighted over the others. There are two possible reasons for this selection: first, Sheldon's practical study of education before the Civil War, at mid-century to be more

specific, served to guide such educational innovators as Parker after the war; second, both Sheldon and Parker were interested in improving the program of elementary education and the training of teachers. As the historian of education, Harry Good, said

The three leaders were Horace Mann, who led in the creation of state systems of schools and the founding of state normal schools; Edward Sheldon, who spread object-teaching and founded the Oswego State Normal School; and Francis Parker, who made of Quincy an object lesson in good teaching and became head of the Cook County Normal School in Illinois.¹

Parker himself acknowledges Sheldon's importance:

One school alone has thrown more light upon better methods than any two universities in the land—that of Oswego, and Dr. Sheldon as its prophet.²

In another instance Parker said:

I place the Oswego Normal as first in its influence upon the education of the country.³

And Dorothy Rogers added:

Indeed, the school at Quincy which brought Parker fame used Oswego's methods.⁴

⁴*Idem.*
The fact that the American ideal of a common ladder school system of education had been neatly packaged before the Civil War did not necessarily mean that its policies were implemented in all the schools and that education was now within the reach of every child. Everywhere in the land there were shortcomings and inequalities. Oswego, a little town of about twelve thousand people in the northern part of New York, was not yet providing all its citizens with a free public education. The extending and perfecting of this ideal of universal educational opportunities became the chief concern of Edward Sheldon.

Sheldon, who won the title, "the American Pestalozzi,"¹ was the public-spirited man who organized the public schools of Oswego and then founded the Oswego State Normal School, "the fountain-head of object teaching."² In this new institution of learning, the elementary school curriculum was studied from a different point of view. Instead of presenting a curriculum built around "subjects," this new course of study was built around "object lessons."

These (object lessons) were to be appropriately divided into lessons involving numbers, magnitude, form drawing,

²Rogers, p. 81.
color, weight, sounds, places, animals, plants, minerals, and liquids. ¹

Observation in union with both oral and written expression became the high points in this new approach to learning and teaching. Such a procedure kept memorization and the use of textbooks at a minimum and stimulated understanding and creativity to the maximum. To teach under such conditions called for "not only a better and broader understanding of what was to be taught, but also the ability to plan a lesson and by seemingly questions to lead it to its desired end."² With object instruction the study of arithmetic, science, geography, language, arts, music, and other curriculum areas was revolutionized. For the first time, the child was given an opportunity to discover for himself the meaning behind the facts he was asked to memorize. All materials were graded and the child gradually went from one step to the next, from one object to the next, as he was ready for it.

... the course of study was remade to shift the emphasis in teaching from the acquisition of knowledge to the stimulation of observation and inquiry.³


³Cubberley, Public Education in the United States, p. 386.
This, in short, was the chief "feature" of the Oswego Normal State School. Under the guiding spirit of Edward Sheldon, Oswego remained the "Mecca of Teacher Education" until the early seventies when Francis Parker, the Crusader of Children, appeared on the educational scene to further perfect methods in elementary education and to enhance the professional training of teachers.

Besides these two American schoolmen, Mann and Sheldon, three foreign educators whose policies also influenced the American educational system were a remarkable European team made up of Pestalozzi who furnished a humanitarian view of, and an emotional impetus to, the new democracy in elementary education, Herbart who presented a psychology of instruction for secondary school training and teaching, and Froebel who completed the work of his teammates by organizing schools for children in the early stages of life.

It has many times been stated that Parker borrowed ideas from well-known European as well as American schoolmasters. In fact, his own contemporaries often accused him of "stealing ideas." This charge he never denied,

I stole from Cleveland, Cincinnati, Aristotle, Pestalozzi, Spencer, and everybody else I could find in possession of anything worth stealing. I am going to keep at it, and I advise all of you who are earnest teachers to steal—steal all you can; and then you will not get
half enough for the famishing minds of children. What Parker actually did was to note what previous educators had theorized about education and then pick from their findings whatever most befitted a democratic society. He did not advocate imitating these great masters simply for the sake of copying them. Rather he sought their good, their practical points, and especially their "magnificent spirit of progress." It is from a preoccupation with the last point that Parker took "from Pestalozzi, and Froebel, and Herbart, all they [had] to give . . . and march[ed] on to higher and better things."3

In examining Pestalozzi's educational works, Parker did come upon certain ideas possibly relevant to furthering the development of the American system of education. For instance, Pestalozzi had described education as "growth," "the outward evolution of an inward life."4 According to


3 Idem.

4 Compayre, p. 444.
this Swiss educator, growth was best attained through a moral, practical, and intellectual education, popularly known as "the education of the heart, of the hand, and of the head." Pestalozzi as the kind father-type schoolmaster placed strong emphasis upon education as the means of helping each child discover for himself his own inherent powers and then find opportunities to develop them. A great love for children was the focal point in his theory. In his opinion love was essential to any child's success in learning. With love as the guiding force, duty and obligation would naturally follow in tow. This ensuing sense of duty and obligation Parker later called "responsibility."

In keeping with this stress on love Pestalozzi preferred permissiveness to strict discipline. His faith in this freedom was evidenced as he attempted to educate poor boys and girls through self-activity. Great attention was also given to each pupil's interests. A combination of work, study, and play characterized this master's class activities. This kind of school atmosphere Parker was also to favor. After toying with Pestalozzi's idea for some time, he took it upon himself to transform the common school "from a knowledge-mill into an educational community."

The emotional impetus that Pestalozzi so successfully gave to the new democratic education served his society well. But an education whose fundamental principle is based on "love" and not on a well-defined psychology of teaching can have its shortcomings. As the world came to demand more system and more organization for teaching, another dimension was needed and efforts were now directed toward giving education this intellectual note never before so strongly stressed. The man who was to supply this was the German philosopher and scholar, Johann Friedrich Herbart.

Though the wave of enthusiasm for Herbartian pedagogy did not sweep this country until the 1890's through the works of Charles and Frank McMurray and Charles DeGarmo, different writers claim that Parker was well aware of Herbart's popularity in the last decade of the nineteenth century. For instance, Good in speaking about the impact of Herbartianism in this country does say that "no previous ideas had stimulated such a volume of educational discussion. This was the opinion of Francis W. Parker."1 Samuel C. Parker states that "among the sources of inspiration which Colonel Parker acknowledged were the work of Herbart and

1Good, p. 347.
his followers, and the Froebelian doctrine of unity."

The basic principle upon which Herbart's methods rest was the "doctrine of interest." Only that knowledge acquired with the warm glow of interest can affect the will of the learner and his behavior. This demands an instruction that is concrete, continuous, elevating, and applicable to real life situations. What played a prominent part in clarifying further Herbart's principle of interest was his theory of concentration. He was aware that certain ideas tend to cluster. If, in teaching, it were possible to favor this clustering of ideas, then learning would be more effective and easier. To this end Herbart decided to place history and literature as those subjects most apt to foster this, since materials from history and literature would offer a "rich and vivid source of ideas about moral situations, alternative solutions, and their consequences."

Parker, on the other hand, had his own views on this matter. Without minimizing the role of history and literature in the course of study, he believed that the science of geography

---

was the discipline best capable of unifying the experiences of a growing child. Herbart's contribution to education would be incomplete without mentioning his formalized method of teaching which consisted of five steps: preparation, presentation, association, generalization and application. It is possible that Parker was attracted to this method of teaching, studied it carefully and even presented it to his teachers. That Parker had been exposed to Herbartianism, there is no doubt. He borrowed from this theory whatever could have served him for the formulation of his own educational plans.

The last educator to be discussed in this European trio is Froebel, the most prominent disciple of Pestalozzi. His theory of education became popular in this country toward the last thirty years of the nineteenth century. This champion of pre-school education introduced new concepts of learning and teaching that helped "to change the educational theory and practice in the United States."2

Among the new ideas that Froebel introduced in teaching and learning could be cited self-activity, play, social

---

1 Parker, Talks on Teaching, p. 144.
participation, self-expression. The most important technique for the harmonious development of all the individual's powers is constructive activity. Froebel greatly valued freedom and spontaneity in the classroom as a natural means for developing self-expression. It was his contention that the best way to help the whole personality of the child to unfold is "to make of the child a creator, a little artist always at work."\(^1\) Group activities were encouraged so as to develop a sense of cooperation as well as that of oneness with others. The curriculum was built upon the activities and interests peculiar to each stage of the child's development. To Froebel play activities had primary significance; when a child played, he revealed his inner nature and at the same time developed patterns of socialization. As a result he maintained the importance of, and the need for, providing kindergartens as the initial step in a child's formal education.\(^2\) While at King William's University Parker visited the different types of schools of Europe and especially the kindergartens.\(^3\) In his tours he sought that "spirit of progress" that he himself so longed for in order to quicken the

\(^1\)Compayre, p. 460.


development and improvement of the school situation here in America.

The Froebelian spirit—the harmonious development of the whole child as a unity—totally penetrates Parker's philosophical and psychological views on education and his "spirit of progress in educational practices," though not imitative of Froebel's, runs parallel to it. According to Eby and Arrowood "Parker was the educational evangelist of marked power who followed out in practice the principles of Pestalozzi and Froebel."¹ In a tribute to Froebel's contribution to the new education Parker was later to say:

For above his methods, gifts, mother-play, and the precious details of his epoch-making work, stands pre-eminent his ideal of life. He fully recognized the child as a social being.²

Parker could then have made Froebel his mentor and could have endorsed with certain modifications many of the school practices that this great educator had previously developed in his kindergarten at Blankenburg.

The work of this European trio in educational matters is well summarized by the following statement:

¹Eby and Arrowood, p. 840.

²Francis W. Parker, "An Account of the Work of the Cook County and Chicago Normal School from 1883 to 1889," The Elementary School Teacher and Course of Study II (1901-1902), 763.
Although Froebel's psychological methods were applied only in the kindergarten, his ideas on self-activity and development, like Pestalozzi's "observation" and Herbart's "interest," have profoundly affected all subsequent educational practices. No successful method today disregards them or the principle of expression which he elaborated.¹

These European educators, then, as well as the Americans, Mann and Sheldon, doubtless proved influential in shaping the thought and practice of Francis Parker.

From our analysis of the factors that seemed to have enhanced the development of better educational practices we conclude that both centuries, the seventeenth and the nineteenth, were spirited periods that exhibited, in general, personal and group reactions to religious and political upheavals, to scientific and educational expansions.

In both periods religious and political struggles culminated in wars that ultimately served to promote a more liberal, more democratic form of government in both Europe and America. In seventeenth-century Europe the word "democracy" still had a rather vague meaning. But whatever efforts were expended toward promoting its value did pave the way for the political and the educational statesmen of nineteenth-century America who were to apply "this spirit of democratic procedures" to the betterment and the improvement of society and of individuals. The developments

¹McCormick, pp. 555-556.
in political and social theory and practice caused great changes in the life of the American people. For the first time in history common man was to have an active voice in political affairs. To better fulfill his new functions as a full-fledged citizen with certain rights, duties and responsibilities, educational opportunities had to be proffered him. It seemed at the time that the democratic form of government was the type best suited to providing all its citizens with a free, universal, tax-supported education.

A rapid growth in scientific enterprises also marked these two periods. The new discoveries and inventions brought forth great changes in social and economic conditions for the people. Little by little the common man became more and more emancipated. He acquired a new faith in the possibilities for self-improvement and for reconstructing his society through education. The time for innovations was at hand. Both Comenius in seventeenth-century Europe and Parker in nineteenth-century America had a clear understanding of the problem at hand. And moreover, with their foresight and spirit of dedication both were able to seize all the opportunities at hand to create ways and means of remedying the prevailing ailments in their society by suggesting a realistic and a practical system of education. For this reason, Comenius did not disdain to use what his predecessors,
Vives, Bacon and Ratke, had had to offer by way of improving education, nor did Parker feel any qualms about adapting educational practices previously devised by such educators as Mann and Sheldon, Pestalozzi, Herbart and Froebel.

Then, against these backgrounds characterized by religious strife, political turmoil, expansion of knowledge and of educational opportunities, Comenius and Parker introduced educational reforms. History bears out that periods marked with great social, political and educational progress, have usually brought with long and difficult struggles, new and diversified developments. But for every venture made to raise civilization a degree higher, there has always been a price to pay. Only those leaders, who have been dedicated to their work, who have been willing "to dare and to do" something totally different for the improvement of the individual as well as of society, can be considered "true promoters of progress." It is our contention that Comenius, the seventeenth-century pioneer in modern realistic educational thought, and Parker, the nineteenth-century evangelist of progressive education, were worthy representatives of their society, willing to fight in the name of this "spirit of progress."
CHAPTER III

THE EDUCATIONAL CAREER OF TWO REFORMERS: COMENIUS AND PARKER

Taking a sweeping glance at the historical development of educational thought, one is apt to discover that down through the ages new concepts of education have reluctantly been accepted in the schools. There may be different reasons for this. One might be that reformers in their educational writings often did not keep a proper balance between theory and practice, between principle and application. This is sufficient to have discouraged those interested in perfecting the methods of teaching and learning and to have led them to disregard, ignore or completely reject the new concepts because they considered them unfeasible, impractical, and ineffective. Another reason for having delayed changes in the schools might have stemmed from societal needs. It is possible that at the time a reformer presented his theories society was not ready for innovations. It was occupied with other pressing needs. Or finally the cause for the slow reception of new trends might be ascribed to the type of person the reformer was and to the way he proffered his theories and practices. Whatever the cause may have been, it seems to hold that the introduction of new concepts of education in
the schools has ever been a slow process.

In the preceding chapter attention was given to the educational climate of both the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. It was found that both centuries offered many and varied opportunities for new educational developments. Within the framework of these two centuries both Comenius and Parker respectively seized these opportunities and presented new concepts of teaching and learning for the improvement of education. It would perhaps be wise at this point to see how these two reformers proceeded to present new views of instruction to their respective societies in order to discover how successful each was as an educational reformer. However, as it is difficult to understand a person's ideas on a specific point without having some knowledge of his life, it would doubtless be expedient to first trace at least the highlights in the life of the two representative educators presently under study.

JOHN AMOS COMENIUS (1592-1670)

The life of John Amos Comenius, "that incomparable Moravian,"¹ may be briefly described as one of great human

activity. Comenius was by all means "a man of aspirations,"¹ a man of great faith, hope and love for all humanity. He possessed more than any other subsequent educational statesmen this rare combination of personal characteristics: sympathy for children, power of analysis, and breadth of mind.² Because of these intellectual capacities he was able to unite religious, scientific, encyclopedic and humanistic points of view in his educational scheme. Michelet speaks of him as "that rare genius, that gentle, fertile, universal scholar."³ His theories and practices are most broad, far-sighted and comprehensive, thus making his concepts of education timeless by any standards.

As with other educational reformers, Comenius "can best be understood and appreciated when . . . associated with specific events /in his/ life."⁴ For our purposes the many different activities in his life can be grouped under three heads: a preparatory period that highlights his intellectual preparation for the future religious and

⁴ Clauser, p. 99.
educational activities; an active reformer period that concentrates on his educational reforms in Poland, England, Sweden, Germany, and Hungary; and an active writer-period that presents the old pedagogue still administering ecclesiastical duties but very busy publishing his literary and educational works.

THE FIRST PERIOD -- 1592-1628

The year 1592, a century after Columbus' discovery of America, marked the birth of John Amos Comenius, the youngest child of a well-to-do miller, in a little Moravian village called Nivnitz. His parents, Martin and Anna, were humble Christians totally dedicated to their Moravian Church, a Protestant sect founded by John Huss. The way of life of these people was a very simple one, based upon Biblical tradition. All they desired for themselves and for their offsprings was a calm, peaceful, and religious life following the principles of Scripture. "Their religious faith was marked by simplicity, warm-hearted love, evangelical zeal, deep personal piety, self-sacrifice and humility."¹ Reared in this fervent religious atmosphere Comenius remained a faithful follower and promoter of his Church and

¹Eby and Arrowood, p. 253.
saw to it that the flame of this Moravian religious spirit be kept alive in the minds and hearts of all his countrymen.

Like other Moravian children it seems most probable that Comenius enrolled in the elementary school of the village where he received his first instruction in reading and writing Czech, his native language, counting, catechism and hymn singing. It was not long before deep sorrow entered his life and marked a great part of it. At the age of twelve Comenius was left an orphan and placed under the tutelage of guardians who more or less neglected him and his early education. Concerning his early childhood experiences, he himself said:

Losing both my parents while I was yet a child, I began, through the neglect of my guardians, but at sixteen years of age to taste of the Latin tongue. Yet by the goodness of God, that taste bred such a thirst in me, that I ceased not from that time, by all means and endeavours, to labour for the repairing of my lost years; and now not only for myself, but for the good of others also.¹

It was not until he had reached the age of sixteen that he entered the Frerau Latin School, a secondary school conducted by the Unity of Brethren. Here, he did not reveal himself an exceptionally gifted student, but rather a serious, open-minded, and observant one. Being senior to his

¹Quick, p. 120.
classmates by at least ten years\(^1\) he was more tempted to
study his professors and detect the many flaws in their
teaching. In fact the description that he gives of the
prevailing methods of instruction point out that there were
irregularities and consequently a great need for reform.

They (the schools) are the terror of boys, and the
slaughterhouses of minds--places where a hatred of
literature and books is contracted, where ten or more
years are spent in learning what might be acquired in
one, where what ought to be poured in gently is vio-
lently forced in and beaten in, where what ought to be
put clearly and perspicuously is presented in a confused
and intricate way, as if it were a collection of
puzzles--places where minds are fed on words.\(^2\)

There can be no doubt as to the implications of the above
quote. It clearly indicates that methods of instruction
were rather "painful and crude."\(^3\) Without being presump-
tuous in any way it is possible to advance that it was this
discontentment with the unpleasant experience of learning
Latin--learning Latin grammar before knowing the vernacular,
memorizing rules with little or no understanding whatsoever,
translating Latin passages without adequate dictionaries--
that urged him to think of easier and better ways of making
the teaching and the learning of Latin more pleasant and
more meaningful to young boys. In fact, Keatinge, one of

\(^1\) Eby and Arrowood, p. 254.


\(^3\) Power, Main Currents in the History of Education, p. 339.
his biographers, remarks:

The defects in his early education were, . . . the seeds from which sprang the whole of his didactic efforts. Considerably older than his schoolfellows, he was able to criticize the methods in use, and speedily arrived at the conclusion that the lack of progress was due more to the inefficiency of the teachers than to the idleness of their pupils. From this time onwards, full of pity for the sufferings of his fellows, he began to devise new methods of class instruction and better schemes of study.1

After spending two years at the Prerau Latin School, Comenius decided to pursue his studies for the ministry. In 1612 he matriculated at the College of Herborn, a university renowned for its theological studies. In the midst of such an intellectual climate, Comenius met several outstanding professors, among whom John Henry Alsted, considered "the most commanding figure in the academic circles of Europe at this time,"2 became a very influential person in his life and most probably inspired him in his didactic project. Heyberger in describing Comenius' reactions to John Henry Alsted says:

Il fut vivement impressionné par Jean Henri Alstedius qui, lui, avait eu la possibilité de terminer très tôt ses études . . . Jean Amos admirait fort ce jeune savant qui, n'étant son aîné que de quatre ans, se distinguait par sa grande érudition, et en même temps,

1Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part I, p. 3.
2Monroe, Comenius and the Beginnings of Educational Reform, p. 42.
The pedagogical teachings of Professor Alsted as outlined in his work, *Encyclopædia Scientorum Omnia*, were of a nature to thoroughly persuade the young Moravian student that the organization of schools and the methods of instruction were in need of reform. Keatinge points out that Comenius followed Alsted very closely. In fact, there was only one item on which they disagreed: who should attend the vernacular schools.

This Alsted would have restricted to the use of girls, and of boys destined for a handicraft, while Comenius insists on the necessity of giving a distinct primary education to those who are afterwards to enter a learned profession.  

Despite this minor difference of opinion, it seems sage to conclude that the primary teachings of Comenius came from Alsted's work. At any rate, Alsted "assuredly played the part of a kindly foster-father to the callow educational zeal of the Herborn student."  

In addition to Alsted's pedagogical assistance, Comenius found practical suggestions in Ratke's plan of

---

3 Idem.
instruction. True he never met with Ratke to discuss methods for improving teaching and learning. But he did study attentively the public document approved by the Universities of Jena and Giessen in which were found favorable commentaries on Ratke's proposed innovations for a new education.¹

Before leaving Herborn, Comenius began the writing of a Czech-Latin dictionary which was to include a treatise on grammar. He labored on this project for forty-four years, and never succeeded in having it published. In fact all the manuscripts of this work were destroyed when Lissa was set afire in 1656.²

To complete the last two years of his formal schooling Comenius visited Amsterdam and then proceeded to Heidelberg where he engaged in the study of philosophy, theology, and perhaps astronomy. His formal training period over, Comenius returned to his people in Moravia. As he was too young to be ordained a minister of the Moravian Church, he accepted the rectorship of the Gymnasium at Prerau, thus beginning his educational career as teacher and as reformer. This teaching experience brought him into contact "with

¹Monroe, Comenius and the Beginnings of Educational Reform, p. 44.
²Spinka, p. 29.
problems of methodology and discipline, and gave him an opportunity to apply some of the theories he had formulated while a student at Herborn. He wrote a Latin grammar, a small book for beginners, and also an encyclopedia entitled, *A Theatre of All Things*, the first literary work of its kind to be published in the Czech language. These two works have not been preserved.

The year 1616 marked a new epoch in Comenius' life. He was ordained a priest in the Unity of Brethren and made pastor at Fulneck, one of the most prosperous parishes of the Moravian Church. The promising beginnings of this gifted and excellently trained pastor seemed to indicate that he would make a name for himself.

En sa qualité de pasteur, il s'occupe avec sollicitude de ses paroissiens, prend part à leur vie, et même, dit-on, leur enseigne l'agriculture, inconnue jusqu'alors dans cette région.

In addition to his pastoral duties, he taught school and later assumed the responsibility of school superintendent of the town schools. It was during his stay at Fulneck that he married a wealthy Hungarian woman, Madeleine Vizovska. At last everything seemed to indicate that

---

2. Spinka, pp. 31-32.
3. Heyberger, p. 27.
happiness, security, and prosperity were within Comenius' reach. He had settled down into a quiet and peaceful life, dividing his time and energy among the numerous activities of pastoral charges, school duties, writing assignments and family cares. This happy and quiet life lasted but five years. It was interrupted by the Thirty Years' War and never again resumed. With no mercy whatsoever the Spaniards ransacked the city of Fulneck. Comenius lost everything he possessed—his wife and child, his property, his library with numerous educational manuscripts. For the next seven years he was obliged to seek protection on the estates of noblemen in whose homes he did a little educational writing, tutored the children of his protectors, and comforted his friends and fellow Moravians.

Comenius bore up against wave after wave of calamity with Christian courage and resignation, and his writings at this period were of great value to his fellow-sufferers.¹

Finally, his protectors could no longer conceal him. So, Comenius was forced to flee from his country and find refuge in the city of Lissa in Poland. Till the end of his life he was to remain in exile, wandering from one country to another never returning to his native land. His flight into Poland can serve as the culminating event of this first pe-

¹Compayre, p. 121.
riod of Comenius' life. From now on Comenius will be ac-
tively engaged in pedagogical reforms of different countries
and will earn for himself the title, "the teacher of all
nations."

A brief summary of the highlights of this first
period of Comenius' life leads one to conclude that he was
not blessed with too much happiness, security and prosper-
ity. With the exception of his early childhood and of his
first five years of married life, we can say that up to
this time this Moravian priest experienced primarily the
sufferings, the longings and the pains of life. Happily
his early religious training together with his formal edu-
cation received first in the elementary and secondary
schools and then pursued in renowned theological centers
served him well. For later as a spiritual director and
as a promoter of a better education Comenius was always
able to show himself a religious man of thought and action.
Following these years of varied experiences it seems that
Comenius was now ready to present to the world a new
psychological approach to teaching and learning.

THE SECOND PERIOD -- 1628-1654

According to some biographers, such as Keatinge, ¹

Monroe,¹ and Spinka,² this second phase of Comenius' life may be characterized by his commitment to educational reforms. In his desire to restore learning, virtue, and piety to his fellow Moravians, Comenius "became filled with a holy and unflagging zeal for the improvement of education."³ To this end, he devoted himself as a teacher in Poland, as an adviser on educational topics in England, as a writer of textbooks in Sweden, and as a superintendent of schools in Hungary.⁴ Amid all of these educational involvements, Comenius always remained loyal to his ministerial duties. He was first and foremost a minister of God. If he did engage himself in pedagogical reforms, and we know he did, it was "more by accident than by primary design."⁵ There were pressing needs for new experiences in the schools. Comenius could not remain indifferent to these educational demands. Without delay he seized the opportunities at hand and began to systematize the process of teaching and learning.

¹Monroe, Comenius and the Beginnings of Educational Reform, p. 47.
²Spinka, p. 45.
⁵Spinka, p. 32.
and to introduce democratic principles in education. Through his actual teaching, his many and varied writings, and his visits to different countries he set out to reform the schools and improve education as a whole.

For the first twelve years of this period, Comenius was to make Lissa his home and his field of educational endeavors. After he had settled down in this small town he became rector of the Gymnasium and at once pursued his didactic studies.

Durant ces années passées à Leszno, Comenius déploie une immense activité: il enseigne au gymnase, poursuit ses recherches dans le domaine de l'éducation, écrit des œuvres pédagogiques et religieuses...1

Because of his teaching in the Gymnasium of the Moravian Brethren, Comenius "once again confirmed how unsatisfactory were the old scholastic methods, in how repellent a manner Latin was taught, and how the pupils lacked any instructions in the natural sciences."2 In his wisdom he could foresee "that the great agency for a future renovation lay in schools,"3 and was determined to pursue this matter more

1 Heyberger, p. 51.
3 S. S. Laurie, John Amos Comenius, Bishop of the Moravians, His Life and Educational Works (Boston: Willard Small, 1885), p. 25.
concretely. At once he began to reorganize the school system of Lissa upon more logical as well as psychological principles. "But he had no intention of revolutionizing method."¹ What he wanted was a practical school wherein the students would be encouraged to learn by providing for them simple and well-defined methods of instruction, better planned and more attractive books, a more comprehensive course of study including the natural sciences, different classrooms where the content of the subject matter would be graded according to levels of difficulty. Contrary to the prevailing aristocratic and humanist practices, he also demanded the same basic education for all children with no preference to social, political or economic status. With respect to the selection of students for the Latin School he based his choice on the intellectual ability of the individual rather than on any other standing. As one can easily judge, "these reforms were not only far-reaching, they were revolutionary,"² for the seventeenth-century world.

In addition to his teaching in Lissa Comenius

² Monroe, Comenius and the Beginnings of Educational Reform, p. 49.
spent much time writing. A prolific writer throughout his life, he was even more so during this particular period of his career as an educational entrepreneur. Among the publications of this time are the three well-known works: 

**Janua Linguarum Reserata** (Gate of Tongues Unlocked), **The Great Didactic**, and **The School of Infancy**.

Any one of these three would have made him first among the educators of his time. The group of them was an achievement in improving education never since matched by a single man.

As early as 1631, only three years after he arrived at Lissa, Comenius published his little book, **Janua Linguarum Reserata** "which made him and the little Polish town where he lived known throughout Europe and beyond it." His aim in writing this grammar was threefold: "first, to simplify and graduate; secondly, to teach words through things; thirdly, to teach things through words." One outstanding feature of this literary work was "that the knowledge of a language, especially Latin, should go hand in hand with the knowledge of the things explained.

---


3 Quick, p. 123.

4 Laurie, *John Amos Comenius, Bishop of the Moravians*, 1885, p. 32.
in it. To this end, some eight thousand different Latin words were cleverly worked into easy, simple sentences and arranged in parallel columns with the Latin printed on the right side of the page and the vernacular on the left. The topics treated ranged from herbs and shrubs to dialectic, rhetoric, and geometry. The plan of this little book attracted many teachers of other countries. It was translated into many languages and "soon became the standard work throughout Europe and America and retained its leading position for many decades, and one could almost say centuries." In designing this method of instruction, Comenius was somewhat influenced by Ratke and by his Herborn professors. Perhaps he was more indebted both for his method and the name of his book to an Irish Jesuit pedagogue known as William Bath. At any rate, Comenius' little book served one great purpose: to inspire teachers to use natural and psychological approaches in the teaching of Latin.

---

1 Karl Von Raumer, "John Amos Comenius," *Barnard's American Journal of Education*, V (June, 1858), 270.
2 Spinka, p. 54.
The second educational work of Comenius written during this period is *The Great Didactic*. Contrary to the *Janua* which was primarily intended to improve the teaching of Latin to Czechs and which won for him world recognition, *The Great Didactic* was meant for an international audience and was apparently a failure during Comenius' lifetime and for many years to follow. In this particular treatise Comenius enunciated the principles and methods that were to be the cardinal points of his pedagogical theory and practice. Within thirty-three short, well-planned chapters Comenius thoroughly treated all the phases of education from the most fundamental principles to the smallest details of school management. For this reason among others, *The Great Didactic* has been regarded as "one of the great classics of pedagogy." ¹ The aim of this educational work can best be expressed by the author himself:

To seek and to find a method of instruction, by which teachers may teach less, but learners may learn more; by which schools may be the scene of less noise, aversion, and useless labour, but of more leisure, enjoyment, and solid progress; and through which the Christian community may have less darkness, perplexity, and dissension, but on the other hand more light, orderliness, peace, and rest.²

¹Comenius, *The Analytical Didactic*, p. 16.
To be sure even a mid-twentieth-century educator would have no qualms about organizing a school system along these aims. But for a seventeenth-century educator the situation was different. Such aims were bound to call for radical changes in school practices. With this in mind, one can see that The Great Didactic was geared more to reformers in search of ways and means to reorganize school systems than to ordinary class-room teachers although these could find therein valuable recommendations for teaching.

The Great Didactic was intended for the schoolmaster whose interest in his work was not confined to the schoolroom, and for nobles, statesmen, and philosophers who wished to reform the schools of their country, but found no scheme ready at hand that was both practical and comprehensive.

The project as one can well imagine was great. Comenius planned the work in 1628 and completed it four years later. He must have been disappointed at the "unenthusiastic and even hostile reception given the Didactic," when he presented it to educational reformers. He did intend this plan of reform for the educational leaders of all countries. But they did not respond to The Great Didactic as they had done to the Janua. There might have been several reasons for this. Perhaps one might cite the following. The bold

---

and far-reaching reforms described in the Didactic were too revolutionary and the leaders of the day were neither ready nor willing to accept these innovations. Such recommendations as a universal, free, compulsory education for all boys and girls, the teaching of the vernacular and the natural sciences, were rather radical demands in the seventeenth century. It was only prudent on the part of leaders to question the value and wisdom of these new school practices. The language in which The Great Didactic was written might be given as another reason why this educational work remained unknown. The Great Didactic was written in the Czech language. In Comenius' time Latin was the universal language. Any literary work of value had to be written in Latin in order to be recognized. Whatever the cause of its unpopularity, The Great Didactic remained almost forgotten for nearly two hundred years. It was not until the middle of the nineteenth century, when the work was published at Amsterdam, that The Great Didactic received some recognition. Since then it has been hailed as a great pedagogical work "of invaluable principles, rules, warnings, hints, which have lost none of their pregnancy by lapse of time."¹

¹Adamson, Pioneers of Modern Education, p. 79.
The School of Infancy, the last of the three educational essays of this period, was originally written in Czech. Soon it was rendered in German and this version was published in 1633. Twenty years later Comenius translated it into Latin to reach a wider and more varied audience. The first English translation did not appear until 1858. Recently, in 1956, Professor Ernest M. Eller presented a modern English translation with an introduction and notes.

This pedagogical treatise was specifically prepared for parents and educators engaged in the training of children during their first six years of life. In some respects, this work gives the reader a foreshadow of Froebel's kindergarten. In simple and powerful language Comenius sets forth specific principles and methods that are of inestimable value for inculcating a Christian education at every successive year of pre-school life. It is his contention that "a child is not born to remain a calf, or a young ass, but to become a rational creature."¹ To this effect he proposed a scheme for the early training of the child's soul, body and mind. He expressed his views on this matter in logical terms.

¹Comenius, The School of Infancy, p. 45.
The first care therefore ought to be of the soul, which is the principal part of the man, so that it may become in the highest degree possible beautifully adorned. The next care is for the body that it may be made a habitation fit and worthy of an immortal soul.

Regard that mind rightly instructed which is truly illuminated by God's wisdom, so that man perceiving the presence of the divine image within himself may diligently guard that glory.¹

As children are not of themselves capable of getting this training, this sage thinker designed The School of Infancy, "a book for the first and most important teacher a child can ever have, his mother."² Leafing through the twelve chapters parents can find many simple, practical suggestions for moulding and educating their offsprings "in Piety, in Morals, in Sound Learning, and in Health."³ Monroe, in commenting on this particular work says:

Few books have appeared in any language better calculated to inspire and assist those engaged in the high and holy mission of teaching little children.

This trilogy then—Janua Linguarum, The Great Didactic, and The School of Infancy—may be taken as a worthy representation of Comenius' titanic endeavors for a more practical and realistic education. Particularly in these

¹ Ibid., p. 64.
² Ibid., p. 46.
³ Ibid., p. 70.
⁴ Monroe, Education, XIII (1892-1893), 217.
works the sage thinker of the seventeenth century reveals himself not so much "the reformer of method" as "the pioneer of a new and universal approach to education." He shows himself greatly concerned with the power of education, what it can do for the betterment of mankind. To one who is familiar with his writings, it was precisely during these years at Lissa that he envisioned a magnificent educational scheme, called Pansophia, meaning universal knowledge. This project was fantastic. It included a series of books—a kind of encyclopedia—written by various authors who were specialists in a particular field and destined to be a basic text in some international university. The plan was so spectacular that Comenius toyed with it for the rest of his life.

This fresh enthusiasm for new educational propositions, Comenius had also for his pastoral commitments. Made Bishop of his Church in 1632, four years after his flight to Lissa, he never tired of assisting his flock in their spiritual, intellectual and temporal needs. When the Moravian Bishop did leave them to accept duties and responsibilities elsewhere, he did so with the conviction that his wandering and unsettled Czechs would in some way receive assistance.
But the publication of his educational writings led him to travel because through them he established contacts with the influential men of the day. Kings, nobles, scholars and friends of European countries sought his advice on educational matters. Invited as a consultant he would graciously accept and by so doing became a remarkable specialist in education.

The man responsible for Comenius' visit to England in 1641 was Samuel Hartlib, an influential figure in English educational history. A scholar and reformer, he became interested in Comenius' pansophic theories through the readings of his works as well as through correspondence with this sage educator. In response to Hartlib's inquiry as to the nature of his pansophic theories Comenius simply sent him an extended description of his theory. Hartlib received this plan so enthusiastically that he had it published at Oxford in 1637 without the consent of the author under the title *Introduction to Pansophy*. Attracted by Hartlib's promises to provide him with a group of thoughtful men and financial assistance, Comenius was not too provoked by the enthusiast's misdemeanor. He himself tells of the incident as follows:

After my Pansophia had been published and dispersed through the various countries of Europe, many learned men approved of the object and plan of the work, but
despaired of its ever being accomplished by one man alone, and therefore advised that a college of learned men should be instituted to carry it into effect. Mr. Samuel Hartlib, who had forwarded its publication in England, labored earnestly in this matter, and endeavored by every possible means to bring together for this purpose a number of intellectual men... He invited me with many strong entreaties.

It is possible to believe that this unexpected assistance and publicity did stimulate Comenius to exploit his pansophic theories further. On this point Clauser remarks:

Although Comenius' pedagogical works were known throughout Europe, it was his pansophic writings which caught the attention of an English group of scholars and notably Samuel Hartlib.

Comenius then arrived in London in the fall of 1641 to assist these English intellectuals "towards the reform of human society." Acting as consultant to a group of prominent men, Comenius studied with them the possibilities of founding a pansophic college or what we might term an international research center. The aim of this proposed institution was to overhaul all human knowledge in order to eliminate error, winnow out truth, and achieve unity and harmony of the three Books of Life: The Bible, Nature, Reason.

1 Monroe, Comenius and the Beginnings of Educational Reform, p. 52.
2 Clauser, p. 113.
3 Kozik, p. 82.
4 Comenius, The School of Infancy, p. 34.
No doubt he impressed his audience with these spectacular pansophic concepts. But to his dismay, these men of thought took no action to implement these concepts. A civil war was on the verge of breaking out and the English Parliament had no time to toy with the pansophic proposals of a Czech reformer. Comenius "informed his friends of his disappointment of his plans."\(^1\) At a moment when he might have realized his lofty hopes of establishing a pansophic academy in England, the scene again turned from light to dark. Once more an unfortunate event had happened in the life of this dedicated educator and priest. As in the past Comenius accepted this trial with faith and continued his educational reforms in other countries.

As educational projects were of chief concern in many countries, employment and financial aid were soon within the reformer's reach. This time Comenius received a letter from Ludevic de Geer, a wealthy French merchant living in Sweden, requesting him to write textbooks for Swedish schools. For some time he considered the task ahead hoping that the Swedes would in some way show him their appreciation by encouraging his pansophic studies.

\(^1\)Monroe, *Comenius and the Beginnings of Educational Reform*, p. 56.
and by helping his exiled Moravians to win their independence. In 1642 the Wanderer Czech left England for Sweden. Here he met with Chancellor Oxenstierna and other prominent men to discuss further the job he was about to undertake.

In a famous discussion of two days, this "Eagle of the North," as Comenius called him, showed himself as practical as he was broad. . . . He made it plain to Comenius that Sweden wanted school-books, not pedagogic dreams.1

Comenius had little choice in this matter. Somewhat chagrined on one hand by the unenthusiastic attitude of his Swedish patrons toward his pansophic projects, and somewhat cheered on the other hand by the prospect of his new assignment which could be beneficial to his Czech people, the great Moravian condescended to the decisions of the Imperial Council "to reform all the schools in our Swedish kingdom."2 To this effect he settled down in the little town of Elbing where "for six years he labored on textbooks, grammars, and lexicons."3 His labors were not in vain. For as Von Haumer remarks:

It seems as if the clear-headed, practical Oxenstierna desired to recall Comenius from his boundless undertaking, into one more restricted, but for that reason

---

1Monroe, p. 75.
2Kozik, p. 98.
3Eby and Arrowood, p. 256.
more sure of success. 1

That success was to be found in the writing of textbooks rather than in the founding of a pansophic academy. Comeni

nus neither could nor seemed to care to envision. At the present moment his new appointment meant "to abandon his favorite pansophic project and to concentrate his efforts upon the educational reform." 2 The manner in which he responded to this disappointment rightfully serves to point out the noble spirit that was enshrined in this humble priest and great educator. Even while engaged in the writing of textbooks, he always entertained a keen interest in his pansophic studies. In one instance he is said to have wistfully exclaimed:

As for me, I shall willingly do whatsoever God through my weakness will have done: and as soon as I shall be permitted to return to these studies /pansophy/, I will make ready a Skeleton of all Pansophy and expose it to public censure. 3

This willingness to consider, to alter, to suspend, to accept his own plans as well as those of others may be one of Comenius' personality traits that served him well as a wandering educational reformer.

1 Von Raumer, Bernard's American Journal of Education, V (June, 1858), 259.
2 Spinka, p. 97.
3 Ibid., p. 99.
Earlier it was mentioned that the outstanding feature of Comenius' life during this second phase of his career was his involvement in educational reforms. In order to recapitulate the highlights of this reformer's works more succinctly we might say that Comenius was first looked upon as a schoolteacher in Poland chiefly engaged in making teaching and learning as delightful as possible; secondly, as an educational consultant on pansophic theories to a group of English scholars and influential men; thirdly, as a writer of textbooks for the Swedish government. To these three different but related roles that Comenius assumed as an educational reformer, we might add one other— that of superintendent of the Moravian schools at Saros-Patak in Hungary.

Having completed his mission as textbook writer, the wandering reformer left Sweden to return to Lissa in 1648 where he was warmly received by his fellow Czechs. Due to the integrity of his life and to his power as a world-known reformer, they elected him their senior bishop assigned to map out the future course of their own beloved church. He had barely assumed his new functions when the Peace of Westphalia ended the Thirty Years' War. Comenius greeted this news as a great omen for his exiled Moravians. After twenty years of exile they would at last enjoy peace-
ful living in their native land. The senior Bishop was shocked when he heard of the unjust terms of this treaty. The Protestant sects, such as the Lutherans and the Calvinists, were given religious toleration and territorial benefits but these privileges were in no way extended to his own church. Of this event Spinka remarked:

Throughout his years of arduous labors for his people and for the world in general, he (Comenius) was supported by the hope of the restoration of his church. . . . Comenius had centered his hopes upon the Swedish aid . . . . But, when Sweden forgot her solemn promises of defending the rights of the Bohemian exiles, Comenius' grief knew no bounds. This was the bitterest disappointment of his sad career.¹

With respect to this same unfortunate event, Eller in his introduction to The School of Infancy writes:

As it was this disappointment shook Comenius more than any of the long list of bitter defeats that wracked his life.²

As in previous misfortunes, Comenius still revealed himself a noble character and accepted the decisions of those in positions of authority. From now on he would entertain no hope of returning to his native land since "that land, devastated and half-depopulated, suffering intolerable spiritual misery was again held to ransom."³ The exiled Mor-

¹Ibid., pp. 112-113.
²Comenius, The School of Infancy, p. 37.
³Kozik, p. 116.
vians whom he tried to keep together would soon disperse in order to find the basic necessities of life.

But a spark of light was soon to enter his life. He was unexpectedly called to a Hungarian town, Saros-Patak, to assume the responsibility of reforming the schools. His new Hungarian noble patrons offered him a liberal salary together with complete facilities for the organization of a school system in accordance with his own views—including a printing establishment for the publication of required books. It was further stipulated that he might bring with him ten or a dozen Bohemian youths to be educated at the expense of the prince and his mother. ¹

Seeing a wonderful opportunity for his pansophic studies, Comenius seized it and left for Hungary in 1650 to remain there for a period of five years. During his sojourn he was engaged chiefly in school organization and educational writings.

As organizer of the town's schools Comenius drew up a detailed plan of a seven-grade school where the master of each grade was given specific directions as to what should be taught in each grade in order to prepare the students for the next class. For psychological purposes these seven classes were divided into two groups: "

¹Monroe, Comenius and the Beginnings of Educational Reform, p. 63.
first three were to be preparatory, dealing mainly with the study of Latin in accordance with his graded textbooks, and the last four were devoted to other academic subjects--philosophical, logical, political, and theological. Then Comenius requested that each master be given the proper visual aids, such as textbooks, illustrations, pictures and objects and that these be used discriminately. He encouraged the use of discussion, play, oral and written reports. To this he added a very detailed school calendar indicating the school days, holidays, vacation days; he went as far as presenting a detailed daily schedule. With respect to the physical set up of his school Laurie states:

The whole school was to be surrounded by a continuous wall, so that a little Latin state (Latina civitate) might be planted, with its own open areas and gardens--all enclosed from the outer world. . . . The masters were to preside over a large family like fathers, and there, in the course of seven years, . . . boys were to be instructed in "all things that perfect human nature" and trained to be pious Christians and wise and cultivated men.

As one can easily see, this plan was fantastic. Its organization and administration were centuries ahead of Comenius'
time. It is not surprising then that "the Saros-Patak Plan became a model for educators in many lands, and the progenitor of a long line of graded schemes of instruction which constitute such an essential feature of the educational economy of to-day."

Besides drawing up a remarkable scheme for a school the indefatigable reformer found time for educational treatises. One of his biographers stated that Comenius "produced fifteen works" during this period. Of this number we might cite *Schola Ludus*, a collection of school dramas, revised editions of his *Vestibulum* and the *Janua*, and the famous *Orbis Pictus* "designed to lay a solid foundation of knowledge in accurate sense perception."

As in the past, fate took a hand against this incomparable reformer. Comenius had expected to realize in a concrete form his pansophic dream. But the events that gradually unfolded proved unfavorable to him. Most of the harsh criticisms he received were concerned with his religious views and progressive educational practices.

---

1 Monroe, *Comenius and the Beginnings of Educational Reform*, p. 68.

2 Laurie, *John Amos Comenius, Bishop of the Moravians*, 1885, p. 47.

3 Painter, p. 257.
One of his modern approaches to instruction that seemed to have caused dissension among the civil and school authorities was his theatrical approach to learning. It was Comenius' contention that more effective learning would take place in the mind of the student were the school drudgery changed to play and enjoyment. After encountering unpleasant reactions from influential people--the die-hards of conservatism--he was granted permission to try his method by dramatizing part of The Gate of Languages. The results were most overwhelming.

Everybody was now convinced that Comenius had been entirely justified in demanding the incorporation of theatrical productions in the curriculum of his universal school. They teach life, and good deportment, they have a stronger influence than mere exhortations and lectures, they provide an impetus for the pupils, encouraging them in diligence and stimulating the ambition of their parents.

As with many of his other new ideas in education, Comenius had to pay the price. In this particular instance he had to risk an experiment with fifty students to prove his point. Fortunately his demonstration was a success. It served to show that a pleasant, theatrical and interesting approach to learning although not accepted at the time could have far-reaching merits.

Spinka, p. 129.
Kozik, p. 133.
Considering the five years spent in this little town, Comenius thought "that his real mission in Hungary remained unfulfilled."

As in Sweden and England his most cherished plans and his most promising works were not received enthusiastically. For this reason and perhaps for others the sixty-two-year-old pedagogue resigned from his directorship of Hungarian schools and returned to Lissa never again to get involved in "the reformation of a school system of a particular country."

Comenius' work in Hungary might be regarded as the culminating event of this second period in his educational career. As an active educational reformer—the distinctive characteristic of this period of his life—he could be looked up to as a model for future educational innovators. His well-defined theories and practices for new school programs reflected a vision of human respect and dignity.

When he was called upon to study and to direct the reform of the schools of one particular country, this Moravian educator did not present neatly packaged solutions.

au cours de ses libres recherches, il a constaté les défauts essentiels de l'éducation et tâché de trouver

1 Spinka, p. 133.
2 Ibid., p. 132.
nor did he expound any section of his plans without embracing a universal view of education.

Plus il observe le monde, les divers peuples et leur vie nationale, plus il devient cosmopolite, sans cependant jamais rien perdre de son patriotisme tchèque. 2

In fact one might believe that his proposals "were not dictated by reason but emanated from the heart." 3 Moreover when he perceived that his views did not meet the approval of leaders in the countries he was called upon to enlighten, he very humbly explained his position and accepted alternatives only when these did not require him "to compromise his ideals of expediency. This was the trait of integrity that makes him monumental even in his personal failure. While anyone might realize less than he hoped for, only a giant could fail as nobly and as magnificently as Comenius." 4

1Heyberger, p. 239.
2Idem.
THE THIRD PERIOD -- 1654-1670

In spite of his advanced age and many disappointments in educational pursuits, this last period of Comenius' career may be characterized by two distinctive activities: the administration of ecclesiastical affairs and the publication of the complete edition of his writings. His fields of action for these sixteen years were Lissa and Amsterdam.

When Comenius returned to Lissa in 1654 he resumed his ecclesiastical duties as senior bishop of the Unity. He had settled down for just two years when the Swedish troops invaded Poland, pillaged and burned the whole city of Lissa. In this calamity Comenius lost all his possessions.

All his books and manuscripts were burnt, among them his valued work on Pansophia, and a Latin-Bohemian and Bohemian-Latin Dictionary, giving words, phrases, idioms, adages, and aphorisms—a book on which he had been labouring for forty years. 'This loss,' he writes, 'I shall cease to lament only when I cease to breathe.'

Comenius already in his middle sixties by this time, never fully recovered from this overwhelming experience.

As a wandering exile, Comenius escaped from Lissa and after spending a short time in Germany he finally found hospitality in Amsterdam, Holland. Here in the home of the

1 Quick, p. 132.
son of his deceased patron, Laurence de Geer, the Moravian reformer was to find haven for the last years of his life.

Of this Heyberger remarks:

Quel contraste pour lui que de se trouver soudain, après tant de tristes événements, à Amsterdam, ville riche et opulente, où l'on voit chaque jour des voyageurs arriver pour en admirer les beautés et la grandeur, ... Sans doute, Comenius ne peut s'empêcher de comparer ce pays florissant, foyer d'érudition et de culture, avec sa malheureuse patrie torturée, dévastée, dépeuplée et abandonnée, et qui lui inspire une si douloureuse nostalgie. Mais son coeur ne connaît pas l'envie: 'Dieu, qui m'a si merveilleusement soutenu depuis ma jeunesse et pendant ces trente années d'exil, est mon refuge. Je me confie à sa bonté.'

It was his faith in God, in himself and in humanity that prevented the old pedagogue from going to ruin. Once more, girded with this faith he gave himself to the writing of educational, pansophic and religious works. He received financial assistance from many of his friends who provided also for the welfare of his exiled Moravians and who financed the publication of educational works representing his thought and describing the activity of his thirty years as an educational reformer.

It is during this period that a magnificent work entitled Opera Didactica Omnia appeared. This volume consisted of over one thousand folio pages separated into

1 Heyberger, p. 93.
four sections. Each section included in a chronological order the educational works Comenius had previously published during his sojourns in Poland, England, Sweden, Hungary and Holland. In addition to these educational works, Comenius published other volumes worthy of mention. For instance one may cite *The Angel of Peace, One Thing Needful, A Hymnal, A Biblical Manual.*

Of his declining years little is known. Should he have received attacks upon his character because of his writings on metaphysical and mystical topics, he must have borne them with a true Christian spirit. Of his life he has said:

> My whole life has been a pilgrimage: I have nowhere found an abiding city; but my heavenly home is open before me, and Christ has led me to its very threshold.
> The One thing needful for myself, therefore, is this, 'Forgetting the things that are behind, and reaching towards those that are before, I press forward.'

With these lofty sentiments, Comenius finished his pilgrimage on November 4, 1670 at the respectable age of seventy-eight.

This biographical sketch would be incomplete without some comments showing how the incomparable Moravian Bishop was successful as an educational reformer.

---

1Comenius, *The School of Infancy*, pp. 44-45.
Among the educational thinkers of all ages, there is no doubt that Comenius stands out as a very prominent and very influential pedagogue. In all his educational reform activities, whether concerned with the writing of textbooks, the psychology of teaching and learning, or the organization and management of schools on all levels, there exists "this universal spirit," characteristic particular to Comenius' theory of education. Briefly stated his plan of education is centered on the art of teaching everyone everything. This sounds easy and simple. But as one begins to give it concrete form, one soon discovers that the plan is difficult and complex. For Comenius "to teach everyone everything" meant a universal, free and compulsory education following the laws of nature. He defended this new idea because he believed that in every individual there were the seeds of knowledge, virtue, and piety. In his wisdom he could see that only a universal education could provide the necessary opportunities for each individual to develop these "seeds." To this noble end, he never tired of seeking ways and means of rendering this educational service possible. Through his writings, his sojourns in various countries, and his teachings he encouraged this universal spirit in education.

As an innovator living at a time when these new sociological and psychological views on education were
first making a public appearance, Comenius, this reformer who instigated such noble concepts of education, met with opposition, indifference and even rejection. Should these unenthusiastic responses indicate that as a reformer Comenius was unsuccessful? Perhaps Comenius did experience such feelings as he noticed the kind of reception some of his new concepts of education received. In fact he was fully aware of his shortcomings since he took the time to revise and re-edit most of his educational publications. But should all this classify Comenius an unsuccessful reformer?

In answer to the question of whether or not Comenius was a success or a failure, Keatinge writes:

The man whom we unhesitatingly affirm to be the broadest-minded, the most far-seeing, the most comprehensive, . . . . Comenius, we say, the prince of schoolmasters produced practically no effect on the school organization and educational development of the following century.¹

And Laurie, who considered Comenius a great educational figure, after acknowledging his contributions to education, added:

The voluminousness of his treatises, their prolixity, their repetitions and their defects of style, have all operated to prevent men studying him.²

¹Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part I, p. 98.
²S. S. Laurie, John Amos Comenius (Syracuse: C. W. Bardeen, 1892), p. 224.
The testimony of these two authorities does not directly answer our question. Both statements seem to imply that Comenius as an educational reformer was both successful and unsuccessful depending on the point of view taken. But the passing of time has led to a re-evaluation of the substance, depth and breadth of his educational thinking and certain educational historians have stressed that the contributions have far outweighed the shortcomings mentioned by Keatinge and others. Comenius, it would seem then, could be rightfully considered as a successful reformer of education. The twentieth century has witnessed a Comenian revival where scholars and educators have given recognition to his splendid works.

His (Comenius) ideas were so universal and inclusive that the dream of education he envisioned has not yet been totally fulfilled. Perhaps his influence will yet continue in a more direct channel, due to research, translation of his works, and study of his ideas in educational schools of today, so that in the decades ahead the Comenian dream of universal education, with all the added progress of the intervening centuries will be more nearly fulfilled.

Perhaps at long last, a ray of light and hope had penetrated into Comenius' sorrowful life. It seems that in this mid-twentieth century after so many years of almost

---

¹Hay, p. 208.
complete oblivion this seventeenth-century educational realist is being recognized as a successful entrepreneur.

In addition to his works that later than sooner made him successful, there are certain personality traits that served him well and should be mentioned. For instance, Comenius revealed himself a lover of mankind with a special sympathy for children, a practical man which made him "a thorough realist,"¹ and led him "to accept society as he found it and . . . teach it to reform itself,"² a religious man with a strong and enduring faith in God, in himself, and in the power of education. This faith guided him throughout his life both in helping his exiled Moravians and in accepting all the varied vicissitudes of life.

The historian, Palacky, presents a magnificent tribute to Comenius' personality.

In his intercourse with others Comenius was in an extraordinary degree friendly, conciliatory and humble; always ready to serve his neighbor and sacrifice himself. His writings as well as his talk and conversation show the depth of his feelings, his goodness, his uprightness, and fear of God. He never cast back upon his opponents what they meted out to him. He never condemned, no matter how great the injustice which


²Nicholas M. Butler, The Place of Comenius in the History of Education (Syracuse: C. W. Bardeen Publisher, 1892), p. 17.
he was made to suffer. At all times, with fullest resignation, whether joy or sorrow was his portion, he honored and praised the Lord.¹

The possession of such character traits is surely an asset to a person who was engaged in reforms. Without this rich combination of personal characteristics it would have been very difficult for Comenius to bear heroically all the misfortunes that came his way. This man of vision and action, "susceptible to foreign influences with an equally strong faculty of systematic integration,"² needed in addition to his intellectual power, a loving and understanding heart ever ready to shed light in the world he cherished.

FRANCIS WAYLAND PARKER (1837-1902)

The educational career of Francis Wayland Parker may be singled out as having been very effective in promoting the development of democratic procedures in the American public schools of the nineteenth century. As a self-educated man, Parker "prized and cultivated to the last . . . a hospitality toward new ideas."³ He de-

¹Hark, National Educational Association Proceedings, (1892), 711.
²Ulich, p. 188.
scribed the world he lived in as one "full of marvelous changes, full of progress." This intense desire for change and progress led him to do something about the kind of education little folks were receiving in the public schools. From his past school experiences, from his actual contacts with schoolteachers and children, and from his vision of the power of education for the betterment of mankind in a democratic society, he came to the realization that "all that education /had/ yet done, with its principles and methods, its reformers and its organization, /was/ but a crude step toward that which must be." Like his seventeenth-century predecessor, Comenius, Parker was also dissatisfied with and disturbed by the poor and inadequate educational policies of his time. He decided in his endeavors to concentrate primarily on the methods of instruction and on the professional competency of teachers for the elementary schools. As a result he injected into elementary education a regenerating spirit that called for a child-centered rather than a content-centered school.


2 Albert C. Lane, "Address Delivered at the Service Held in Memory of Colonel Parker at the University of Chicago, March 6, 1902," The Elementary School Teacher and Course of Study, (June, 1902), 703.
Like the Moravian pedagogue Parker believed "that we learn to do by doing" and sought to go a step further by supplying "to little children the conditions for the most rational and helpful doing."\(^1\) Parker, the nineteenth-century American educational reformer, might be looked upon as a crusader for the making of responsible little folks and a builder of better elementary schools wherein individual "children and youth could grow up more naturally in the ways of democracy."\(^2\)

In order to understand more adequately Parker's views on school practices, some consideration might be given to the highlights of his long and fruitful career. For half a century this indefatigable apostle presented new educational proposals to American society, proposals bearing particularly on the improvement of elementary education and the preparation of teachers. In all the different positions he held during these years of service to education, as a student, as a teacher or as an administrator, Parker always seemed to strive for greater effi-

\(^1\)William T. Harris, "Letters and Telegrams from Friends," *The Elementary School Teacher and Course of Study*, II (June, 1902), 718.

ciency and for higher standards of accomplishment in the elementary schools.

For our present purposes it might be well to divide Parker's educational career into three periods: in the first period attention will be given to his early education, his first attempts as district teacher and principal, and his few years of military service in the United States Army; in the second period the middle-aged American reformer will be viewed as the dynamic "crusader for individualized instruction"¹ as he assumed the varied roles of administrator in the Dayton School System, of graduate student at the University of Berlin, of reformer of the schools of Quincy, Massachusetts and of supervisor of the Boston Schools; and finally in the last period he will be considered as the full-grown schoolmaster still ardently committed to educational pursuits as director of the Cook County Normal School and the Chicago Institute, as Chautauqua lecturer, as ardent supporter of professional organizations and as author of educational publications.

¹ Mildred Fenner and Jean Soule, "Francis W. Parker, Liberator of the Schoolroom," National Education Association Journal, XXXV (October, 1946), 395.
Francis Wayland Parker was born in Bedford, a small town in New Hampshire in the year 1837, the same year that saw Horace Mann, the American reformer whom Parker greatly esteemed, appointed Secretary to the Massachusetts State Board of Education. Parker's ancestors came from a stock of strong, religious and well-educated New Englanders. On his father's side there was a distant relative, the Reverend Thomas Parker, a Presbyterian minister and his grandfather, William Parker, who founded the village where Parker was born. On his mother's side we find his great-grandfather who was once Harvard librarian and a classmate of John Hancock and his grandfather, Rand, who was the first schoolteacher in what is now called Manchester, New Hampshire. His mother was a schoolteacher before she married Robert Parker, a cabinet-maker. Following upon such a background it is not surprising to see Parker interested in becoming a schoolteacher.

In his early childhood there is very little of note. His biographers mention that at the age of six Francis lost his father and was then placed under the tutelage of an uncle, a Mr. James Walker. For some reason not mentioned, this uncle entrusted the young lad to a
Mr. Moore, a Goffstown, New Hampshire farmer. According to provisions, Francis was bound to him and to the farm till the age of twenty-one. For the first five years Francis worked on this farm and attended school in the vicinity about eight weeks during each winter. He was very much dissatisfied with the kind of instruction he was receiving at the district school and decided to take measures to enter the Academy. In his Autobiography he himself tells how he was finally admitted into this school at an early age.

Then they had an academy established there, as the village school was too full, and all the boys over ten years of age were drafted out of this school and put in the Academy, and as I thought I knew a great deal more than some of those boys, and as my uncle was on the School Committee, I cried my way into the Academy. I put my head down on the desk and bawled until they allowed me to go. So I went to the Academy at seven years of age.

Perhaps this childhood incident can serve to indicate the strong determination in this future schoolmaster. He was set on getting a worthy education. Nothing would deter, discourage or depress him in his pursuit of this worthy goal. Naturally as Francis became older and more mature his manner of responding to opposition also became sophisticated. He soon abandoned the childish temper tantrum

---

1 Giffin, p. 111.
for the adult logical process of reasoning. This he did when he reached the age of thirteen. He had made up his mind that the farm was not for him and that he was not going to remain on the farm until the age of twenty-one. He wanted to attend a good school where he would be exposed to a more systematized approach to teaching and learning. With the consent of his guardian, Francis decided to visit his uncle in order to discuss his educational projects. After walking five and a half miles he met his uncle at the gate of his home. Concluding from the following description of this incident, one can see in this young boy the earmarks of the reformer: hope, courage and optimism.

I met him at the gate of his domicile and told him my desires, and then he very earnestly and savagely told me that I was a lazy brat and did not want to work, and that that was the reason I wanted to go to school, and that the one thing for me to do was to walk back to the farm and go to work. I remember that I made up my mind then and there that I would have an education, or die for it.

Francis would get an education, so he took the means. With no approval whatsoever from relatives and friends, with no financial assistance, he took off on his own. The next three years were characterized by hardships. He struggled for essentials let alone for his education. Francis was finally accepted into Mt. Vernon School. He earned his

Ibid., p. 118.
tuition by doing odd jobs, such as sawing wood, painting or varnishing boxes. This was quite a responsibility for a boy who had been accused of being lazy and of choosing the schoolroom to avoid work.

Now sixteen years of age Francis had another project in view. He presently wanted to become a schoolteacher. Forgetting the unfortunate interview with his uncle three years previously, he returned to him to discuss the issue. Again the uncle disapproved of his choice:

He (his uncle) said there were too many schoolteachers already, and that I had better get a job and go to work on the road at eleven dollars a month if I could get it, and advised me to take it, or commanded me to. I obeyed him by starting off to school.

Parker again here reveals his determination to follow an ideal once he has been convinced of its worth and merit. Luckily this time Parker was not too long without a job. His first teaching assignment was in a small elementary school at Corser Hill, Webster, New Hampshire. Yet, how prepared was young Parker to teach a class of seventy pupils, where a large number of them were older and more experienced than he? As already pointed out, his formal

\[1\] Ibid., p. 119.

\[2\] Ibid., p. 118.
education was scanty and in many respects poor. Parker did manage to broaden his knowledge of the world about him by reading such books as the Bible, Pilgrim's Progress, Wayland's Life of Judson, and almanacs; by observing the laws of nature in the growth of trees, flowers and so forth; and by being sympathetic, sensitive and responsive to the needs of little folks. These varied activities served well his immediate teaching needs. They provided him with a broader understanding of people and helped him to cope successfully with the teaching difficulties he met at Corser Hill. Later, when speaking of his first teaching position he himself commented that

it was only by the love and sympathy of my pupils that I managed to teach out the winter.¹

It is then safe to conclude that "he had a way of getting along with the pupils."² The two virtues of love and sympathy seem to be the distinctive marks of Parker's personality. He seemed to have been gifted with an instinctive power for discerning the attitudes and feelings of those entrusted to his care. Without formal training in child and educational psychology he could easily sense what his audience was up against and think of ways and means of

¹Ibid., p. 119.
²Idem.
remedying the situation peacefully and prudently.

From 1853 to 1858 this self-styled teacher taught with obvious success in various places of his native state. After spending two winters in Corser Hill and Auburn respectively, the twenty-four-year-old schoolteacher accepted to teach in the village school of Hinsdale, New Hampshire. This school was particularly known for turning down any new professor. Parker was aware of this. To him the challenge was too great to bypass. Unmindful of the unpleasant situation and hopeful that he could do something constructive for these recalcitrant pupils, he resolved to take the risk of being cast out of the school. He tells us how he tackled the situation.

As I sat in my chair the first morning I noticed that the boys had a very firm and determined look, in fact there was a tightness of the teeth and a glare in the eyes that told me there was trouble ahead, and it pleased me so much, the more I thought of it, that I burst out into a loud laugh, and then they all smiled, and that was the end of the trouble. I never punished anybody there.¹

This is an example of the typical response Parker will get from his pupils during his whole educational career. Whether one considers him in his earlier years teaching young folks of New England or in his later years teaching future teachers coming from different sections of the world,

¹Ibid., p. 120.
one still detects that Parker's personality plays an important role in his influence.

Behind the work of Colonel Parker lay the great background of his personal character. His dominating passion was his love for little children, and in his treatment of them he was infinitely tender and forbearing. He had a humorous side which always pleased them immensely.¹

In the fall of 1859 Parker left the Granite State to accept the principalship of a graded school at Carrollton, Illinois. Here he was given one assistant and a class of students whose ages ranged from twelve to twenty-five. Again the new position presented a challenge for the inexperienced schoolteacher who had so very little formal education behind him. Without hesitation he studied the situation and immediately tried to find some remedies. He noticed that the school was very old and neglected. The surroundings were in no way conducive to fostering learning. His first project was to embellish the physical conditions of the school through the cooperation of all his students. He says of this:

I told them that my idea of a good school was to have a first class time, and that in order to have a good time they must all take hold and work together, and then they would be sure of a good time. . . . The

schoolhouse was old, and the yard was not blessed with a single shade tree, the yard was full of gypsum weed, and was a rooting place for hogs; the fence around the yard was in a very bad condition. I got my pupils to pull up the weeds, and I sowed grass seed in their place. I used to go out and play games with my pupils at recess time. . . . I gained the good will of my pupils in the two years there.¹

Again, Parker reveals his insight in discovering the problems and finding ways to remedy a difficult situation by making use of the pupils themselves. Parker did leave Carrollton, not because of teaching difficulties but because of political reasons. In the meantime the Civil War had broken out. As he arrived in the East, he joined the Fourth New Hampshire Regiment just being formed. The same zeal and industry he had shown in earlier educational endeavors, he now manifested in his duties as a soldier. He fought in the war from the beginning until the end. On August 16, 1864 he was wounded in the throat with a gunshot at the Battle of Deep Bottom. He was made a prisoner by the Confederates and released when the war was over. Then he returned with his regiment to New Hampshire and was discharged with the honorable title of brevet-colonel. Incidentally this title, Colonel, is very characteristic of Parker who is perhaps the only outstanding American educator to have received it. To this effect, Winship says:

¹Giffin, p. 122.
As a mere lad, almost, he went into the Civil War and came out a colonel, and that title was his personal pride, and professional trade-mark. He is the one man prominent in education in the North who was uniformly designated by his military title. No one ever said "Dr. Parker" nor "Professor Parker" nor "Mr. Parker". He was "Colonel Parker," the country over. It fitted him physically and intellectually.¹

When Parker returned from the war, there were many opportunities opened to him for making a name for himself.

Having married Phenie E. Hall of Bennington, New Hampshire, during his convalescence, he was now ready to assume any position the military, political and business world would offer him. Without being prejudiced in any way, it seems that he would have been successful in any one of the positions mentioned above. As Marion Washburne states in her biography:

> It is a marked characteristic of the man that while he works with the intensity of conviction he nevertheless is continually re-examining the grounds on which his conviction rests. By nature dogmatic, sure of himself, unhesitating, by principle he is open-minded and ready to accept suggestions.²

Blessed with such character traits he was to put them to use in the teaching profession for which he had a great passion. "He never wavered for a moment, not even when his best worldly interests seemed to be at stake,"³ for

---

² Washburne, p. 17.
³ Parker, Talks on Teaching, p. 7.
he preferred teaching to all other positions. He had vouched at sixteen that he was going to pursue this career till the end of his life. He will remain loyal to his word.

I do not remember the day when I did not believe that I should be a teacher.¹

And so he accepted the principalship of a grammar school in his native state, the last administrative post he was to hold in New Hampshire. Here as well as in the other schools where he had taught, he arduously worked toward better educational practices. Nuber in her study of Parker's educational views and activities remarked that after fifteen years of teaching "Colonel Parker had not yet developed an exact philosophy of education."² Despite the fact that some people might consider this a deficiency, Parker did nonetheless have some definite idea of what he intended the school to be although he had not pronounced himself in writing. What he had done so far was to try his methods in the different schools where he taught. Then, his four years in the army had also served to enlighten him in many ways. From his contacts with the servicemen he became more and more skeptic

²Nuber, p. 12.
of the merits of formalism in traditional education. With these years of experience behind him, Parker felt that the time was approaching when he could dare be more concrete in expressing his new concepts of teaching in the elementary school. As principal of the North Grammar School in Manchester he did make some attempts at managing a classroom along more democratic principles. Curti summarized some of his school practices as follows:

In the very first school of which he took charge after the war was over he abandoned the law and gospel of old-fashioned teaching, which for him was associated with the martial spirit: battalion drill, regimentation, discipline, and emulation, with its rewards and its incitements to fear and hatred.¹

As time wore on Parker was to be given more recognition, more prestige and he was to expound more and more his democratic views on school policies. He became more strong-minded, more explicit and more enterprising in his educational projects. But in the meantime the growing schoolteacher was chiefly concerned with trying out his own "hunches" about teaching and learning methods. The success he would earn as he assumed varied teaching positions would encourage him to pursue his ideal further. Due to the fact that Parker was more or less feeling his way through with respect to his new views on education as he

¹Curti, pp. 376-377.
taught in the different schools during these first fifteen years of his teaching career, it seems that his principalship in Manchester, New Hampshire, can serve to culminate the educational activities of this period. As will be seen in the next section, the nature of his pedagogical reforms will be different. From the "groping stage" the school reformer will gradually move into the "experimental stage" where he will be in key positions to act and to do something constructive about the improvement of elementary education and teacher competency.

Judging from the highlights in this first period of Parker's educational life, there seems to be evidence that the young lad from the little village of Bedford did reveal himself as a dedicated schoolteacher. Born into a family of teachers and preachers Parker soon showed certain personality traits that make him not only a successful but also an outstanding leader in the teaching profession. Early in life he was obliged to shift for himself. Living on the farm he was given many responsibilities which he did not seem to cherish. However, he did learn "to love work and to put his brains into work."¹ Later in life in speaking

¹Francis W. Parker, "The Farm as the Center of Interest," National Educational Association Proceedings, (1897), 527.
of his five years on the farm and of his four years in the service he remarked:

The five years on the farm gave me my love for study, and the work gave me physical strength and the army gave me some measure of self-control, not very much, by the way, but enough to steady me.¹

Amidst all kinds of difficulties, particularly those concerned with education, several of which have been described, he always remained courageous, optimistic and enthusiastic. He was utterly dissatisfied with the dull and lifeless schools of his day and for that reason he attempted even as a "neophyte" in the profession to improve school practices along psychological and sociological lines. Although this school reformer had received but the rudiments of learning, he saw to it that he did get an education by reading, communication, observation. During the first three decades of his life, Parker seemed to have prepared himself to become the apostle of education by his adventurous spirit in undertaking all kinds of challenging endeavors, by his great sympathy and fondness for children, and by his indefatigable industry and zeal for making teaching and learning more effective, more pleasant and more democratic.

¹Giffin, p. 117.
Due to the fact that Parker gave more concrete form to his educational reforms in the years to follow, this second period of pedagogical endeavors reveals the middle-aged schoolmaster as a reconstructionist particularly concerned with the organization of elementary and teacher education. His spheres of activity are the school systems of Dayton, Ohio, Quincy and Boston, Massachusetts respectively. In all three centers, except for his first year in the primary schools of Dayton, Parker held an administrative position which necessarily gave him more prestige, more authority and greater opportunities for experimentation. As leader in these school systems he saw the need for change and for progress. Soon his actions began to make inroads into traditional practices and like Comenius and other educational reformers he "cast doubt on outworn pedagogy, on its adoration of words, on memory and examinations."\footnote{Meyer, An Educational History of the American People, p. 252.} He was very much aware that the schools did not offer conditions for child growth and that the teachers did not understand the needs of the child and the conditions under which each individual can grow most effectively. To this end he departed...
from the then common belief that education simply meant an accumulation of facts. He thought that education should take one direction, and that is the close and careful study and appreciation of personality, and the consequent conditions for individual growth.¹

And with respect to the kind of teacher needed to fulfill this mandate, he declared that he would put into every schoolroom an educated, cultured, trained, devoted, child-loving teacher, a teacher imbued with a knowledge of the science of education, and a zealous, enthusiastic applicant of its principles.²

On the subject of striving to improve education he once said that

It is useless for any one who attempts to improve education to complain; the right way is to recognize the situation and make the best of it. Human progress is measured by the time it takes for a good idea to get into life.³

During these fifteen years this American educator will not spend his time and effort deploring the weaknesses of educational practices prevalent in the different school systems but rather, as one imbued with the true spirit of a reformer, he will study the situations and take action accordingly.


²Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 451.

³Address of Colonel Francis W. Parker in the Old Stone Temple at Quincy, Massachusetts, April 20th, the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Quincy Movement, Unpublished Pamphlet, p. 2.
In the year 1868, Parker received an invitation to teach little folks in a district school of Dayton, Ohio. Little did he realize that this new assignment among young children was going to be "the beginning of [his] great work of mind development."\(^1\) His close contacts with these young minds made him conclude that the little children were not happy in school. This got him to wonder if God intended "that this mournful plan should be the way of developing the embryotic man."\(^2\) From then on he became very much concerned about ways and means of improving instruction in the primary schools.

Without further delay, the progressive schoolmaster concentrated on methods of teaching to little ones. In addition to his own initiative and to his intuitive teaching techniques he had recourse to Dr. Edward S. Sheldon's book, entitled *Object Lessons*, which to him seemed "to show how to overcome the formalism then common in American schools."\(^3\) As expected his new ideas in instructing primary school children appeared rather shocking to a tradition bound

\(^1\)Parker, *Talks on Teaching*, p. 8.

\(^2\)Giffin, p. 127.

public. For psychological reasons he decided to teach reading by using the word method together with some phonetic plan that he himself devised. With respect to arithmetic he encouraged what is today called the discovery method because he deplored the fact that children did not understand what they were doing. Too much emphasis had been given to drill and memorization and not enough to understanding. He did away with the teaching of technical grammar and favored self-expression both in oral and written form. He stressed the teaching of the other subjects along the same progressive lines. It is not surprising that

The papers poured out the vials of their wrath against him.¹

With such an unappreciative audience one wonders how long any schoolmaster could put up with this kind of reception. Colonel Parker bravely accepted these criticisms hoping that some day he might show his critics that his teaching procedures were after all in accordance with those of leading educators. By the end of that first year, the attitude of the public had changed and he was given credit for his work.² For the next two years this New England

¹Giffin, p. 128.
²Idem.
schoolteacher served as Master of the Dayton Normal School, "having under [his] charge about seven hundred [students]."¹

As time wore on and Parker was given better opportunities for trying out his theories of education, he was also becoming more and more articulate in expounding his philosophy of education. His main tenet was that education is a science and as a science should embrace the study of the child. Although he was not the first educational reformer to blaze the path for schools centered around children's needs and interests, his contributions are nonetheless noteworthy. As all zealous reformers he sought to elevate schools to an ideal and hence like his educational predecessors he met with much opposition even from his own fellow-teachers. Miss Partridge says of Parker's relations with his teachers at Dayton that

More and more he found himself antagonizing the convictions of his fellow-teachers, as day by day he grew away from the time-honored traditions of his vocation. They would not agree to his views, he could not agree to theirs; and one party must be in the wrong—-which was it? Where did the truth lie? It would seem with the majority. But he would not give up what seemed to him so clearly right without reasons.²

Amidst these struggles, Parker lost his wife and little girl.

¹Idem.

²Parker, Talks on Teaching, p. 8.
This sorrow plus the accusations received because of his bold educational ventures led to his resigning the principalship of the Dayton Normal School. There is no doubt that the Colonel was disappointed with the unkind and unenthusiastic reception he had received from a public so enmeshed in the formalism of tradition. But like his seventeenth-century predecessor, Comenius, he was not discouraged by opposition. On the contrary, Mayo writes:

... it is not strange that, in 1872, Colonel Parker graduated from Dayton, Ohio, the most aggressive of Western American public school men.¹

The Colonel left the Dayton School System totally resolved to test the value of his new democratic concepts based on the needs and interests of children. Like Comenius he studied the educational ideas of his predecessors as well as of his contemporaries to find out in what respect his own concepts of educating American children were in harmony with their thinking.

In the fall of 1872, "upon inheriting $5000 from an aunt,"² Parker went to Germany seeking admission to King William's University, a center of learning renowned for its new teaching theories and practices. When asked by the


²Curti, p. 379.
authorities of the University the purpose for his coming and the degree for which he wished to work, he replied:

    Sir, I am working, not for a degree, but for the children of America.¹

This short reply is pregnant with meaning. The Colonel was then attending the University for but one purpose—that of finding better means to help American children become better citizens. To this end, he took courses in psychology, philosophy, and history of education. He familiarized himself with the educational theories and practices of Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Herbart. He also came "into contact with the new methods of teaching geography developed by Ritter and Guyot."² During his free time he traveled to such countries as Holland, Switzerland, Italy, France and Germany always with the intention of examining school practices in these different systems in order to find enlightenment and to gain strength in his views. After two and a half years, the Colonel returned to America "neither a young Germanized pedant, nor an international philosopher, but a full-grown American

¹Mildred Sandison, "Francis Wayland Parker," National Education Association Journal, XXVI (December, 1937), 309.
²Judd, p. 221.
schoolmaster, thirty-five years old, ready for work."  
His contacts with European masters in the art of teaching reassured him that basically his educational views founded on the nature of the child were in harmony with the thinking of the past and present educators who had and were actually engaged in developing educational theories and practices. This renewed his strength and conviction and aroused in him "a new faith in democratic, universal common-school education, through and by the artist teacher, proud of his work, and industrious to perfect it for the sake of the child."  

Just about this time the School Board Committee of the Quincy Public Schools was in the process of reorganizing their school program in order "to secure, if possible, a thoroughly good common-school education at a not unreasonable cost." The results of certain investigations led the members of this active school committee to look into the instructional program. They had culled enough evidence to

---

1 Mayo, pp. 11-12.

2 John Dewey, "Francis W. Parker: In Memoriam," The Elementary School Teacher and Course of Study, II (June, 1902), 736.

warn the public that some positive action had to be taken to improve the life and the school program of the Quincy Public Schools. Children who had attended the common school for eight years could "neither speak nor spell their own language very perfectly, nor read and write it with ease and elegance."¹ As the members of this committee were not specialists in the field of education they agreed to give this difficult and gigantic task to a superintendent of schools qualified to do the work effectively. The choice fell on Francis Wayland Parker who seemed to be "the educational expert" Quincy needed. Under his direction "the schools of Quincy [will change] from knowledge mills into educational communities."² And for the next five years, "Quincy [will become] the educational mecca of the United States."³

With no detailed interrogation by the School Board Committee as to what his educational theories and practices might be, Parker assumed the weighty responsibility of Superintendent. He launched reforms in Quincy not with a spirit of authority which forces theories of instruction

¹Ibid., p. 33.
²Edward Dangler, "Consequences of Colonel Parker's Educational Philosophy," Education, LXII (June, 1942), 611.
³Frank P. Prescott, "A Success at Quincy," The Quincy Patriot (April 21, 1900), p. 4.
upon its subjects but rather with an openminded scientific spirit which "studies human nature and life under its new aspects, and builds up a philosophy and practice adapted to the exigencies" of the time. That the American Common School needed to be re-examined with respect to its organization and administration was doubtless. Any question about the characteristic of the nineteenth-century public schools is dispelled when one reads Meyer's description of them:

To minister to its vast juvenile horde, (due to the large increase of immigrants) the emerging public school put its trust in a uniform and ordered routine. It arranged its stock of learning as graded and classified subjects, and taught them by a clocklike schedule, particular years being reserved for mastering particular assorted facts and operations. Thus, for all the sapience of the Herren Pestalozzi and Herbart, teaching was reduced to pumping knowledge into pupils, dosing them massively with homework and examinations, and, of course, prodding the loafers and punishing the unruly. The learners' accomplishments, such as they were, were recorded as marks, the best of which went not necessarily to those who toiled and panted the most, or even to those who flaunted the rare mark of genius, but to those who, from the depths of their remembrance, could produce the biggest array of facts.

Concluding from this one finds the schools artificial, conventional, not in keeping with the principles of nature nor

1 Mayo, p. 5.

to say the least with the tempo of life of the times speeded up by the growing forces of democracy, science and industrialism. To meet these challenges, the new superintendent was given full power to conduct the schools as he thought fit.\(^1\) Basically the regenerated spirit of Quincy stressed more power for both child and teacher, power to think, to do, to discern, and to express. There was a revival of faith in human nature and in the power of education.

We tried to teach them, 'not as children or as pupils, but as human beings.' Each child has his own individuality, his stream of thought, his desires, his hopes and fears, his grief and joy... A child should have one life, wholesome and complete, and the home life and the school life should each supplement each other.\(^2\)

This kind of attitude toward children called for concrete realities and worthwhile experiences which appealed to children and tended "to create a healthy individualism among the pupils."\(^3\) Lelia Partridge who was very close to Parker and his work stated that the distinguished mark of the Quincy Movement

---

\(^1\) Address of Colonel Parker, the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Quincy Movement, p. 2.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 3.

was development, not acquisition; growth instead of accretion. It was the gaining of strength, mental, moral, and physical, through self-activity. ¹

Activity became the keyword in the Parkerian schools. Innovations in the life and program of the school centered about the needs and interests of the child. To this end, in addition to teaching the three R's, the curriculum now included science, geography, art, music and other elementary school subjects. Much emphasis was placed on oral and written expression.

The pen or pencil continually in hand has made the Quincy scholars facile and felicitous in expression. ²

Freedom and informality became the pass-words for effective teaching. Routine was discouraged. Parker "condemned whatever was considered fixed and finished."³ He had little use for the actual textbooks and copybooks. In his estimation they prevented the teachers and pupils from using their own initiative. Rigid discipline--sitting still and silent--was not demanded nor expected. It was replaced by working "with all the whispering and noise compatible

¹Lelia Partridge, Quincy Methods (New York: E. L. Kellogg and Company, 1885), p. xii.


³Curti, p. 378.
with the best results."¹ These aggressive and rather radical methods aroused the educational world considerably. It is claimed that during a period of three years only, over thirty thousand visitors annually came to inspect the Quincy Public Schools.²

A proposal to check the merits of Parker's educational practices was soon made. The members of the School Board as well as other Massachusetts citizens were very eager to find out if these democratic school practices had been effective in producing better readers, better writers, and better decipherers. Superintendent Parker had stated at the beginning of his enterprise:

Let me begin at the foundation, and I will warrant the right superstructure.³

To that end the educational expert had been given full freedom, an opportunity he quickly seized.

There was an opportunity, a sensible school board, a board that conducted its affairs upon sound business principles, upon a plan that has always, in all times, brought success, a plan that the entire business world unqualifiedly indorses.⁴

¹Francis Parker, "Quincy Method," The American Journal of Sociology, VI (July, 1900), 118.
²Curti, p. 384.
³Northrop, p. 7.
⁴Parker, The American Journal of Sociology, VI (1900), 237.
He skilfully applied what he thought to be "rational methods of teaching," and boldly enough conducted an educational revolution, stressing that unity instead of uniformity is the one thing needful to organize, elevate, and improve our common school system.

The test, given to the schools of the Norfolk County, indicated that Parker's educational practices did have some value.

The examination was in reading, writing, spelling, written and mental arithmetic, geography, and history. The schools of Quincy came out far ahead of all the other schools of the county except in the one study of mental arithmetic.

This particular success at Quincy, "often referred to as the first widespread manifestation of Progressive Education in the United States," was not attributed, as Parker himself emphatically declared, to "methods, devices, and systems, tricks of the trade, or particular ways

1"Parker's Work at Quincy, Massachusetts," Educational Review, XIX (May, 1900), 509.
2Washburne, p. 48.
4Edward Dangler, "Francis W. Parker: Father of the Activity Program," School and Society, LVI (October 24, 1942), 371.
of doing things."¹ In fact to those who insisted that there must have been a "Quincy Method" the Superintendent replied that "unless we agree to call the Quincy method a spirit of study and the Quincy system one of everlasting change,"² then and only then can there be a "Quincy Method."

What Parker actually did in the schools of Quincy was to apply well established principles of teaching, principles derived directly from the laws of the mind. The methods springing from them are found in the development of every child. They are used everywhere except in school.³

All his efforts were directed to making school life functional whereby "the simple comprehensible processes of nature were to be observed. Children were to learn to read and write and cipher as they learn to swim, or to skate, or to play ball."⁴ Teachers were encouraged to use their own initiative, their own intuitive powers.

The teacher was continually thrown upon his own resources; he was untrammeled; he was allowed to do

¹Address of Colonel Parker, the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Quincy Movement, p. 5.
³Ibid., pp. 239-240.
anything tending to permanent good results, if upon correct principles.¹

And these principles were based upon nature and democratic living. Later than sooner, these principles made inroads into traditional education and eventually served to transform the whole process of teaching and learning in America making it what it is today.

After serving the Quincy Public Schools so successfully from 1875 to 1880, the forty-three-year-old renowned superintendent was offered a supervisory position in the Boston Schools. He accepted this new challenge with as much enthusiasm and interest as he had at Quincy and at Dayton. For two years he supervised the primary schools of the North End of South Boston. At the end of his term, he was re-elected. In the meantime he received two invitations: one offering him the principalship of the Cook County Normal School and the other the superintendency of the city schools of Philadelphia. Early in 1883 he left for Cook County Normal School in order to come into closer range and contact with children's minds. The work done in Quincy was a slight beginning of something far better.²

¹Washburne, p. 41.
²Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. iii.
His resignation from the supervisory position in Boston can serve as the closing event in this second period of Parker's educational career. Upon moving to the middle West to assume other important responsibilities in the world of education, Parker will serve as the typical nineteenth-century American educator continuously striving to attune pedagogical theories and practices to the American democratic way of life.

By way of summarizing the highlights during this phase of this New England school reconstructionist, one is led to give a special tribute to Colonel Parker in heralding the activity movement in elementary education. An opportunity was at hand and the "man fitted the place and the place fitted the man."\(^1\) Without hesitation, this reformer earnestly assumed his responsibilities. His doctrine was that the common school be "a temple of freedom"\(^2\) wherein all children were to be educated through self-activity and all teachers to be given the right and the privilege to use their own initiative in teaching. He based his theory on child study and forcefully encouraged


teachers to study the needs and interests of children.

The more the teacher knows of children in general and of a child in particular the better he can move his pupils in and toward an ideal. Froebel, Comenius, and Pestalozzi were students of children, hence their epoch-making reforms. All real reforms of education in the past have sprung from child study, and future educational progress will spring from the same source.¹

By focusing his democratic plan of education on the needs of little folks, he re-organized the life in and the program of the elementary school so as to enhance the total development of each individual according to his own personal resources. To this end school life was made more free, more pleasant, and more democratic. The curriculum was enriched by the study of new disciplines, such as science, history, geography and other subjects. Instruction was geared to understanding and not to drill and memorization. These new approaches to school practices created doubts among teachers and citizens alike. But before long the dynamic reformer demonstrated that these new procedures in teaching had their merit in the education of youth. His mission having been successfully accomplished, the indefatigable reconstructionist left the New England area to accept the Middle-West as the center for promoting power within the teaching profession.

THE THIRD PERIOD -- 1883-1902

The last period of Parker's life may be characterized by his intensive and extensive work in elevating teaching to the rank of a distinguished profession. For that reason it might seem convenient to consider the outstanding activities of these remaining nineteen years by examining the different aspects his leadership took as the zealous educator assumed the following responsibilities: director of the Cook County Normal School, lecturer and speaker at teachers' institutes and associations, and finally author of educational treatises.

The principalship of the Cook County Normal School appealed to Parker as an excellent opportunity to spread more widely his new concepts of educating American children. It had always been his dream to improve teaching. Even as a youngster he had sacrificed everything to have good teachers. Now that he was a schoolmaster with rich and varied experiences behind him, he envisioned great results from this new position. Before leaving for Illinois, Parker married the first assistant in the Boston School of Oratory, Mrs. Frances Stuart, who became his faithful companion and devoted co-worker. An excellent and brilliant teacher she was there when Parker needed assistance,
support and encouragement in his educational endeavors. Together they left for the Normal School in 1883.\(^1\)

There was one thought foremost in Parker's mind when he walked into this Normal School—that of making Cook County Normal School "the finest teacher-training center in the country."\(^2\) The undertaking was quite a challenge even for this forty-six-year-old veteran at school reforms. The conditions in which Parker found the school and its environment were in no way promising. The school had been founded by Dr. D. S. Wenworth fifteen years prior to Parker's coming and had had to struggle ever since for its existence. Moreover since the death of its founder conditions had not improved.\(^3\) In fact the school was just about to close its doors when Parker decided to assume its leadership. To best describe what Parker was up against in taking this new position, Orville Bright comments:

There was an ill-arranged and delapidated school building, a dormitory in like condition; there was no library to speak of, no science laboratories, kindergarten, manual training, or gymnasium; very little apparatus of any kind; and a faculty with about an equal mixture of competence and politics. The press

\(^1\)Washburne, p. 21.


\(^3\)Giffin, p. 133.
of Chicago was hostile, not only to the school but to the training of teachers in any way. The city teachers and principals were very conservative with their friendship or openly hostile, and the school was ignored by the Chicago board of education.¹

If this description is correct, one can conjecture that the stresses and storms at Englewood would prove to be many and varied. It seems that opposition came from all sides—politicians, members of school boards, and even the citizens themselves. All these setbacks in no way restrained Parker's endeavors to make Cook County School a famous normal school. There were many battles to be fought and he fought them valiantly. He studied the situations carefully and handled them as best he could. He won in accepting only those students who had completed their high school and showed a certain aptitude for teaching, in selecting and rejecting his own teachers, in opening a practice school, in developing methods of teaching and learning based on the child and his needs, in introducing manual training in the elementary school, and even in forming one of the first parent-teacher associations. In spite of all these victories, opposition was still great and difficult.

Finally after sixteen years of hard work he resigned the principalship of the Cook County Normal School to take control of the richly endowed Chicago Institute of Pedagogy which Mrs. Emmans Blaine placed at his disposal. One year before his death, this institution had become the School of Education of the University of Chicago. ¹

A noteworthy point to be mentioned here is the fact that amid all these hardships Colonel Parker was successful in realizing his one great aim—making the normal school "an educational experiment station, whose influence would penetrate, permeate, and improve all education and educational thinking."² As his students testified his work was not in vain.

Nearly every graduate of his school commenced teaching with high ideals of the teacher's mission and a quickened power to arouse in children a keen, natural interest in any work which was undertaken. His graduates became observers and students of child nature. They sought to lead the unfolding powers of childhood into channels of activity that would make them observant of things, their relations and uses.³

³Albert C. Lane, "Address Delivered at the Service Held in Memory of Colonel Parker at the University of Chicago, March 6, 1902," Annual Report of the United States Commissioner of Education for the Year 1902, Part I, 265-266.
The consensus of opinion seems to be that Colonel Parker, as an administrator of training schools for teachers, provided the kind of leadership necessary for great teaching to thrive. It seems that under his direction teachers found the courage, the protection, and the inspiration necessary to shoulder their responsibilities effectively.

It was also during this period that Colonel Parker became a national figure in American education. As lecturer he was always magnetic, courageous, incisive: dropping admirable hints, opening broad vistas, dumping illogical wisdom all over the field, and leaving everybody with greater reverence for childhood and a nobler outlook upon the teacher's work.¹

He constantly made it a point to attend county and state teachers' conferences. At all these gatherings Parker stirred the minds of his listeners. On the lecture platform he was popular. He accepted to conduct teachers' institutes at Martha's Vineyard in order to expound his theories and practices to larger audiences. No matter where Parker went he found a group of ardent professional and personal admirers. He soon became "the one great leader whom teachers in elementary schools recognized

¹Mayo, p. 13.
Another medium Parker used to disseminate his educational views was publishing. Through his writings he was able to reach a much greater audience. An active member of teacher organizations he was influential in introducing new ideas. Many of his minor works are essays in such educational periodicals as *The Practical Teacher, The School Journal, National Education Association Proceedings*, and *The Educational Review*. While he was director of the Chicago Institute, he founded a review, *The Course of Study*, known today as *The Elementary School Journal*. In addition to these articles, he wrote a series of geography books known as *Uncle Robert's Geographies*. These books were preceded by a professional text entitled, *How to Teach Geography*. His two major works are: *Talks on Teaching* and *Talks on Pedagogics*. The first consists of brief abstracts of twenty-five familiar discourses given by Parker at Martha's Vineyard Summer Institute in 1882 and reported by Lelia E. Partridge. The second is considered "a gold mine of materials concerning the new

"view of the child."\textsuperscript{1} Originally the contents of the fifteen chapters were talks given by Parker at different teachers' meetings and re-arranged in textbook form. This work presents a detailed analysis of Parker's doctrine of concentration. It was published in 1894 when Parker was director of the Cook County Normal School. Of all these works there is not one textbook of methods that represents his method, his principles or even his brand of psychology. As Mayo once remarked:

\begin{quote}
It is impossible for him (Parker) to tell an audience, by voice or pen, how he 'keeps school' as for the champion old lady breadmaker of New England to give her recipe for a cook-book. My mother, all the time, keeps stirring in judgment.\textsuperscript{2}
\end{quote}

What Colonel Parker intended to do through his writings and lectures was to regenerate in each one of his listeners this spirit of continuous growth and progress by which they could be led to see how every method of teaching, every course of study, and every exposition of principles is capable of infinite improvement.

The life of this dynamic Crusader for children and teachers came to an end too quickly. Just as he had accepted his new position at the Chicago Institute,\textsuperscript{3}

\begin{footnote}
\textsuperscript{1} Butts and Cremin, \textit{A History of Education in American Culture}, p. 383.
\textsuperscript{2} Mayo, p. 12.
\end{footnote}
his wife who had been his constant counselor, passed away. To somewhat relieve himself from this grief and loneliness he undertook his last assignment with as much enthusiasm and interest as he had some forty years earlier. For three years more he continued to educate future educators.

March 2, 1902 marked the end of the educational career of this great American schoolmaster. Of the time in which he lived he once remarked:

I love to think of the progress of the last forty-one years, in which I have been a teacher. I thank God for living now. I would not have been born later for anything in the world. ¹

Few educators have been fortunate enough to see the realization of their dreams. Colonel Francis Wayland Parker was one of those few.

After presenting separate biographical sketches of Comenius and Parker, it would seem fitting, interesting and pertinent to draw certain parallels in the career of these two educators. Though the attempt might seem foolhardy and presumptuous, it does present the writer with a challenge. Admitting that the reformers under study lived two hundred years apart and pursued their educational ideals in different countries, there still do appear in the unfoldment of

¹Parker, National Education Association Proceedings, XXXIV (1895), 191-192.
the events of their career certain traits worthy of com-
parison. There were grand and numerous opportunities for
reform. There were also two great reformers capable of
seizing these opportunities. However, as one pauses to
consider all they did offer to their respective societies
one wonders why, under such well-planned directions, the
sound psychological approaches to teaching and learning
first spelled out by Comenius and then pursued further by
Parker have been so slow in making their entrance into the
schools. However, this parallel analysis is not intended
to relieve one's bewilderment. But it seems that if this
comparative study of the educational career of Comenius
and Parker has no other value than of pointing out that
the introduction of new concepts of education is a slow
process and that only persistent and renewed attempts are
the keys to progress, it will have proved its purpose. By
taking a telescopic view of the outstanding features in
their educational policies, their media of dissemination,
and their personality traits, one notes numerous points
of similarity in these two builders of modern education.

Their biographical sketches reveal these two re-
formers as "architects" of modern education. In the first
place Comenius and Parker were crusaders for child-centered
schools. In fact their whole theory of education is based
on the needs and interests of children. To this end, they were both concerned with the organization and administration of school practices. Comenius organized a complete program of studies beginning with the early training of the child and finishing with university education. His plan was not specifically intended for his Moravian Brethren. On the contrary it possessed such universality that it could be used as a guide in designing a school program in all nations. Parker's theory, as pointed out in his biography, was not as broad in scope as that of Comenius. Though many of his suggestions could be adopted in school systems advocating democratic procedures, his theory was meant specifically for American children and for American teachers. His chief concern was the improvement of American education. It is perhaps for this reason that Comenius is referred as the "Teacher of Nations" whereas Parker is not.

Despite this difference in scope of their educational endeavors, both were schoolmasters highly interested with curriculum and methodology—perennial problems for all eminent educators. Comenius and Parker both asked who should be taught, what should be taught, and how it should be taught. As to who should be taught both agreed that all children should be given an education. By the time Parker appears on the educational scene, great strides have been
made to establish a universal, free and compulsory education. What Comenius had theorized two centuries before, Parker was seeing in the American common school. But with respect to the course of study and methods of teaching the situation was different. Both deplored the fact that the present curriculum was outdated, artificial, and unconventional. Both made attempts to modernize it by adding such disciplines as the natural sciences, geography, history, the arts and even manual training. In this respect Parker was apparently more successful than Comenius because he actually saw these subjects introduced in the schools. But one must not forget that Comenius had blazed a trail for the American educator.

As for methodology, one word stands foremost--activity. Both teachers and students were to be active. The students must be given opportunities to think, to do, to express themselves, to become more responsible for their total development--physical, social, intellectual and spiritual. Teachers should be looked upon as counselors ever ready to help each individual child discover for himself the true, the beautiful, and the good. Learning, then, becomes more personal, more pleasant and more gratifying. On the whole a new spirit had been injected into the schools.
Another interesting comparison can be drawn from the way each disseminated his views on education. Comenius and Parker assumed many and varied teaching and administrative positions. Though Comenius was primarily a minister of the Moravian Church and secondarily a teacher, he did gain popularity as an educator through the different responsibilities he accepted. He made his debut in the teaching profession at the village school of his home town. This was interrupted by the Thirty Years' War resulting in the Moravian teacher's lifetime exile. From then on we see the Moravian evangelist as teacher in Poland, adviser in England, textbook writer in Sweden, and superintendent of schools in Hungary. No matter what task he fulfilled, he defended education grounded on the needs and interests of children. The same can be said of Parker who by his travels won some of his popularity as an educator. Though he was not as well prepared scholastically as Comenius to enter the teaching profession, he did begin teaching in his own village, in a small district school. His success here and in other schools of the vicinity won him administrative positions. After fighting in the Civil War he went to Ohio as director of the Normal School, then to Quincy as the inspiring leader of the Quincy Movement, and then to Boston as superintendent of schools. These varied
experiences served him so well that he spent the remaining years of his life as a teacher of teachers at the Cook County Normal School and the Chicago Institute of Pedagogy. Though both dynamic leaders accepted similar administrative positions to propagate their theory and practice, it seems that Parker was more fortunate than Comenius in the realization of his dream. Parker had always hoped to found a center for the training of teachers. This was realized during his lifetime. Comenius had also had a great dream—that of establishing a pansophic academy or what we might term today an international research center. Unfortunately he never lived to see this project materialize nor has it even been realized up to our own time. It is hoped that the Comenian dream of universal education will some day become a reality. Whether or not these two reformers found success, they worked with an unflagging zeal to break the formalism of traditional education.

As apostles of a more realistic and utilitarian type of education Comenius and Parker used writing to disseminate their views. Although it can be affirmed that both revealed in their works the depth of their feelings and their sincerity, there is in each a sharp contrast in quantity and quality. Comenius wrote voluminously and eruditely not only on educational issues but also on
religious and political topics as well. Parker's writings are limited to the field of education. His total output consists of a few textbooks and a larger number of articles and essays that appeared in the leading educational periodicals of his day. In general, one would say that Parker was more successful in spreading his philosophy of education as a lecturer than as a writer. Even his two principal tomes were originally talks or lectures given at Summer Institutes or at meetings of professional organizations. In contrast to Comenius he was a greater "doer" than a "thinker."

Finally the personality traits of these two great educators can be compared. At the outset of this study it was mentioned that success in educational reforms is due not only to great and numerous opportunities for progress but also to a certain combination of personal character traits that seem essential to a reformer's coping with all the misfortunes that come his way. Both Comenius and Parker seem to have shared certain traits. As men of vision, thought and action, they manifested a strong faith in their Creator, in themselves, and in the power of education. They understood the conditions of their respective societies and accepted them as such. As schoolmasters they were susceptible to foreign influences and integrated into
their own educational framework only those school practices which they thought commendable. In other words they were not followers or disciples of other eminent educators. The courage and the strength which both possessed in promoting their views of education against opposition and in the midst of all kinds of difficulties distinguishes them from other prophets of education. This applies all the more to the incomparable Moravian Bishop whose life can be described as a travesty of sorrowful and heroic activities. Concerning their relations with others, it would seem that although these two educators had a great respect for the opinions of others and were ever ready to serve them, Comenius was more the conciliatory and humble type while Parker was more aggressive, dominating and at times sarcastic. A combination of these personal characteristics—a dynamic personality, keen intellectual insight, an emotional stability, operating within a favorable environment—served to bring a new life, a new outlook, and a new spirit in the educational world.

Each one's career marked by similar features in educational endeavors, media of communications, and personality traits, was fruitful. Promoters of democracy and lovers of children both Comenius and Parker generated a spirit of growth and progress in the schools.
terest, enthusiasm, and dedication, all these attributes and others made for a rich and abundant career. In the following chapters more consideration will be given to a detailed analysis of their educational activities in the hope of providing evidence that Parker can rightfully be called "The American Comenius."
CHAPTER IV

EDUCATIONAL THEORY: COMENIUS AND PARKER

Education is a process necessarily always undergoing changes. As it is meant to serve man who is himself a creature of time, education must take into account every possible kind of progress so as to better serve humanity. Hence comes the constant need for renewal and adaptation in learning and in teaching. Those educators most sensitive to the needs of the people at any one time will seek to probe existing educational theories and practices in order to discover if and how these square with that era, that historical period. As was brought out earlier, the seventeenth and the nineteenth centuries were marked by the appearances of sundry movements, and by the advent of noticeable changes in such fields as science and industry. These two periods also witnessed educators, like Comenius and Parker respectively, who not only saw the opportunities at hand but also seized them. As men of foresight they envisioned an education better suited to individual needs and capable of contributing to the improvement of society, of their own nation, and even of the world.
Being of an adventurous nature both school reformers proposed a new approach to learning and teaching that would eventually revolutionize the whole of educational practice. Before attempting an analysis of their educational practices, however, some consideration must be given to their theory of education which obviously precedes any change in school practices. Now, as an innovator's notions on the nature of the learner and the aims of the educative process play an essential role in his formulation of theory, it becomes necessary at this point to present the thinking of Comenius and of Parker on these two questions.

THE CONCEPT OF THE CHILD

Since the all-embracing endeavors of Comenius and Parker converged on the development of the infinite potential latent in every human being, an analysis of their educational propositions presupposes some knowledge of their views on the nature of the child. Without forcing any issue, it would seem plausible to expect a general core of thought in the two educators on this topic. In the development of his educational thought, each theorist has offered some idea of the nature of the child which in some instances was more or less true and complete and which, perhaps, was expressed in more or less philosophical terms.
No matter how scanty or how thorough the views might have been, the nature of the educand was treated. It is the basis upon which the educational theory rests. Because the concept of the child is so fundamental in education, it then becomes the primary task of any theorist to present the most correct and most complete concept of human nature possible. Such a concept can best be developed by consulting such sources as Scripture, philosophy, psychology, the behavioral sciences, and the observation of natural phenomena. The use that the theorist will make of these sources can contribute to a more complete knowledge of man's true nature.

A thorough study of a theorist's concept of the child, then, becomes a fundamental requirement for understanding more adequately the recommendations and suggestions he makes in his theory of education with respect to the child's total development. As both Comenius and Parker expressed ideas on the nature of the educand, the question is to study these ideas more closely in order to discover if there is an intellectual correspondence in their concept of the child with respect to his origin, his culture, and his destiny.

Who is this child to be educated? Whence does his life come? This is the fundamental question all educators ask themselves. Comenius and Parker were no different.
Like other theorists they prefaced their educational scheme with their notions on the nature of the educand. In the very first chapters of their chief works, both educators treat the origin of this little being, the child. Comenius sees in these "celestial gems" creatures made to the image of God. He speaks of the child as "a creature which is the image and joy of its Creator." Parker expresses the same religious sentiment when he says that:

He (God) made man in His own image. He has crowned him with glory and honor.

Not only do Comenius and Parker believe the child to come from God, but they also honor him in a special way by making him the most excellent being in God's creation. In reference to this Comenius opens his Great Didactic by extolling man as "the highest, the most absolute and most excellent of things created." Parker also sees the child as "the climax and culmination of all God's creations."

If Comenius and Parker looked up to the child by acknowledging that first he is created to God's image and secondly

---

1Comenius, The School of Infancy, p. 63.
2Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part II, p. 36.
4Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part II, p. 25.
5Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 3.
he is "the Lord of all creatures,"\(^1\) it seems fair to expect from these two educational theorists a great esteem and respect for the child. The little child, "God's most precious gift,"\(^2\) must be endowed with certain powers, certain potential that need to be developed if he is to achieve his task in the Creator's plan. Such godly and religious sentiments concerning the source of the child's life can only serve to engender dignity, sympathy, and reverence for the child.

Another aspect of the child's life closely related to his origin was the one concerned with his essence. Both the seventeenth-century realist and the nineteenth-century idealist saw him as a composite of a material body and an immortal soul, thus stressing the twofold nature in the child. Because of this duality both educators were highly concerned about making provisions for the harmonious development of the child's body and rational soul. On this account Comenius held that

\begin{quote}
He (God) did not simply command man to exist, as He did the rest of His creatures; but, after solemn consideration, He formed a body for him with His own fingers and breathed the soul into it from Himself.
\end{quote}

\(^1\)Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part II, p. 37.
\(^2\)Comenius, The School of Infancy, p. 59.
Our nature shows that this life is not sufficient for us. All our actions and affections in this life show that we do not attain our ultimate end here, but that everything connected with us has another destination.

And again the need for man's total unfolding was expressed when Comenius commented on man's natural craving for knowledge. To this he added:

Indeed, man is nothing but a harmony, both in respect of his body and of his mind.

This same idea concerning the child's harmonious development recurred time and again in Parker's works. When referring to the true end of education the American educator was definite and clear in advocating the education of the whole child. It was his belief that "the harmonious development of the human being, body, mind and soul" is the chief purpose of education. In speaking about moral training, he forcefully engaged his teachers to find "one comprehensive method of developing harmoniously the powers of body, mind and soul."

---

3Parker, *Talks on Teaching*, p. 18.
4Ibid., p. 181.
That the two educators, Comenius and Parker, believed in the child's twofold character and advocated the harmonious development of the whole child, there is no doubt. How to effect this harmonious development seems to be the crux of the problem. Naturally this calls for a method or a procedure whereby this total unfolding can best be guaranteed. To devise such a method, the designer must have certain basic principles to direct his thinking. It is generally from these basic ideas that a certain course of action will follow. As Comenius and Parker were involved in a method or procedure for bringing about this total development of the child, it is highly probable that they also had fundamental ideas upon which to rely for guidance. In fact, after reading their works carefully, it seems that one can almost state categorically that their whole theory of education revolved about or centered upon two basic concepts: God and the world of natural phenomena. God and Nature seemed to have been the two vital and fundamental forces in their educational schema. The emphasis and the place that these forces—God and Nature—received in each one's educational propositions leads one to believe that if there is some degree of difference as to the kind of education that resulted from them, this difference can be greatly attributed to the extent of the role that either
God or Nature has been assigned in the development of their educational thought. In order to best understand the kind of education promoted by these two educators who believed in the harmonious development of the whole child, let us examine more closely just how Comenius and Parker saw these two basic forces as operative in their central core of thought.

The child Comenius planned to educate was a rational and responsible being, capable of achieving truth and of directing his own life whose final goal was not merely social usefulness and temporal happiness but rather a supernatural and eternal union with God. To realize the purposes for which the child was created, Comenius recommended a knowledge of one's self and of God along with fundamental principles derived from the study of Nature.

Know thyself, 0 man, and know Me. Me, the source of eternity, of wisdom and of grace; thyself, My creation, My likeness, My delight.¹

With respect to the universal principles of instruction, Comenius suggested that we "follow the method of nature."² Thus God and Nature in the sense of natural phenomena become the pivotal ideas upon which his theory of education

¹Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part II, p. 25.
²Ibid., p. 112.
is founded. As a result, when Comenius says that the seeds of knowledge, virtue, and piety are naturally implanted in each child, but the actual knowledge, virtue, and piety are not so given. It is possible to infer that according to the laws of nature, the child can acquire not only secular knowledge, the social virtues, and natural piety but also religious knowledge, moral virtues and filial piety. Comenius' is a God-centered concept of education where God and Nature are seen in their proper perspective, that is, each of these two fundamental forces is given the place and the emphasis due it. Heyberger aptly summarizes the kind of education Comenius had in mind:

Dès lors Comenius propose un homme nouveau à toutes les nations, l'idéal du "surhomme" chrétien, l'homme chez qui toutes les forces intellectuelles, physiques, morales, et religieuses sont en harmonie, qui est lui-même en plein accord avec les lois de la nature, instrument de Dieu et avec tous ses semblables.  

The thought behind this statement would seem to denote that Comenius did consider God and Nature as two important factors in the education of the child. By referring to the principle of hierarchy he placed God above Nature, thus viewing these two forces in their true and proper perspective. This is most understandable when one knows how deeply

1Ibid., p. 52.
2Heyberger, p. 237.
religious Comenius was. God for him was more than just a transcendent Being who sustained man in existence. God in Comenius' view was a living, divine person, the source of all things and the One in whom all things were to find eternal rest and happiness. In his approach to knowledge of God, he did not limit himself to reason and observation alone. Rather he made use of such sources as Revelation, Scripture, philosophy, religion and science. Nature, in his opinion, was just another means, a striking one at that, to get to know, love and serve the Creator and nothing more. He did not make a "god" of Nature, but simply saw it as a reflection of God. And so in speaking about the harmonious development of the body and soul of the child, the Moravian Bishop did make use of knowledge of God and of Nature as two important factors in determining the kind of education he would advocate. In so doing, Comenius presented a rather Christian approach to the development of the whole and entire child.

Parker seems to be in complete agreement with Comenius in seeing the child as a composite of body and soul. "What is this little lump of flesh, breathing life and singing the song of immortality?" He also seems to

1 Parker, *Talks on Pedagogics*, p. 3.
I share with the seventeenth-century thinker the same idea with respect to the child's need for knowledge and truth.

There is but one study in this world of ours, . . . the study of law and the study of God.¹

And furthermore, as Curti remarked, Parker did propose a philosophy of education that "should be devoted, not to temporal matters alone, but . . . that it should minister to the spiritual life of the individual."² For the sake of emphasis one could insert how one of Parker's desires was to bring the child closer to his Creator. Did he not recognize in each individual "divine potentialities that early manifest a desire to search for understanding, knowledge, and truth?"³ And did he not earnestly urge his teachers to behold "the child's divine power and divine possibilities and . . . to present conditions for their complete outworking"⁴ according to the laws of nature? Surely no one would dare doubt Parker's concern with God and Nature as two fundamental forces in determining the process of educating the child. Since both Comenius and

¹Tbid., p. 46.
²Curti, p. 375.
⁴Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 24.
Parker believed in the twofold nature of the child and made use of knowledge of God and of Nature as basic to determining the method of achieving the total development of the child, are there then any differences in their views?

Perhaps a word concerning Parker's religious beliefs might throw some light upon this issue. That Parker was highly sensitive to the fact of God's existence there is no doubt. His works are there to testify that Parker possesses a concept of God. But his views on God seem quite different from those of Comenius. For one thing Parker spoke of God as a personal God, a rewarder, one capable of sustaining man and of differentiating His energy in matter. He never mentioned a word on such orthodox Christian beliefs as the Trinity, the Redemption, Grace, hell and others. In fact he had little use for all theological doctrine. On these points Comenius differed greatly. Since he had a great respect for theological doctrine, his concept of God was more in keeping with the Christian concept. His works are permeated with statements on such fundamental Christian truths as the Trinity, the Redemption, Grace.

Moreover, with respect to the approach toward a knowledge of God, Parker differs from Comenius in that the former limits himself to reason and observation and some
Scriptural passages. In his estimation the key to all wisdom and even to a realization of God is the study of Nature. An Emersonian transcendentalist at heart he writes

Where shall we look for the highest source of the good, the true, and the beautiful? To the thoughts of God in nature... The study of the thoughts of God in nature, filling the mind, as it does, with things of beauty, prepares the imagination for clear and strong conceptions of the higher and spiritual life.1

Nature, then, is the touchstone in his educational theory. The provisions he will make for the development of the two-fold nature of the child will be primarily Nature-centered not God-centered and based primarily on observation and perception rather than on Revelation and Scripture. As a consequence, the child's opportunities to know his Creator as a real and loving Father will be somewhat limited. In doing this, Parker had no intention of omitting God in the spiritual formation of the child. On the contrary, as Grant so aptly stated:

God still remained a burning ideal but an ideal which was at the same time deprived of vital, personal, meaningful contact with the educand.2

Thus, it is evident from the foregoing that it is precisely this personal and meaningful encounter with God

1Parker, Talks on Teaching, p. 175.
2Grant, p. 122.
that Comenius sought in formulating his theory of education and that Parker did not even seem to have grasped for himself, let alone stress in his educational theory. What could one then expect from an educator who placed Nature as the prime factor in his educational scheme? If Nature occupies the foreground and God remains in the background in an educational theory, there is bound to result a different kind of education even though the two educators began with the same premise that the child is composed of body and soul and created by God and in His image. Although Parker was a religious man who "time and again lyricized the immanence of God in all things" he did become "all unwillingly a link in the trend of education as it moved away from God and began to confine its aims more and more to the here and now." Comenius, on the other hand, at a crucial moment in history when the Sciences were causing radical changes in man's thinking, tried to uphold the idea or view that both God and Nature or Religion and Science were in no way incompatible but rather complementary in the education of the child. The Moravian Bishop says in speaking of these two factors that

When bodies are being formed, nature omits nothing that is necessary for their production. . . . In the

\[Ibid., p. 59.\]
same way schools, when they educate men, must educate them in every way, and suit them not only for the occupations of this life, but for eternity as well. Indeed it is with a view to the future life that all strenuous human effort should be undertaken.

Not the sciences alone, therefore, should be taught in schools, but morality and piety as well.¹

Therefore, although both educators, Comenius and Parker, believed the child to be composed of a material body and an immortal soul and endowed with certain 'divine' powers, they do not agree as to the kind of education that was best suited for the harmonious development of the child 'whole and entire.' A difference on such fundamental issues, as the concept of God and the emphasis placed on God and Nature in the educational scheme is sufficient to determine a different type of education. And this is what really happened. Comenius continued to provide the child with a supernatural and religious education while Parker introduced the child to a natural and secular education.

Another interesting and pertinent aspect of the child's origin, in addition to the two already discussed, namely, the child as a creature of God and as a composite of body and soul, is the one dealing with the fallen nature of man. As both Comenius and Parker expressed views on this issue, it might be well to note what each one thought

on this matter. Briefly speaking one could claim that both Comenius and Parker looked upon man and hence upon the child as one "deprived" rather than "depraved", imperfect but capable of becoming perfect. Unlike most Protestant and Catholic leaders of their day who regarded human nature as having more evil tendencies than good, these two educators sought the good in human nature and emphasized man's good tendencies without however seeking to minimize his evil tendencies. Each conceived human nature as rich in possibilities for growth and improvement. To see the child as "a copy of God's simple individuality" led them to hold his nature in high esteem and entertain an earnest hope of helping him realize and fulfill the purpose for which he was created. A few statements culled from their works could serve to substantiate what has been advanced.

Comenius, as a pioneer of the realistic approach to learning, did develop a new mode of acquiring knowledge, whereby he abandoned the traditional concept of learning based on memory to endorse the modern concept of learning heavily based on the use of the senses. This particular emphasis on sensory experience served to foster an education more in accordance with the natural mode of learning.

¹Spinka, p. 109.
As a result the total nature of man began to assume greater importance in the development of educational thought. Educational theorists came to the realization that man is not all evil, nor is he all good. Comenius whose theory of learning was chiefly founded on the laws of nature could in no way remain aloof to the doctrine of man's total depravity. Though he "entertained the conventional Christian conviction as to the fallen nature of man"¹ he did not forget by any means to bring out the fact that there are good tendencies in human nature. He so considered the good in human nature, that one can say with Needham that his whole philosophy of education is centered upon man's good tendencies.² Acknowledging that man is born with original sin, he hastens to say that "no matter how disorganized man is by his fall into sin, he can, through the grace of God and by certain methods, be restored again to harmony."³

As Brubacher aptly pointed out, Comenius in no way "held human7 nature in low esteem." ⁴ It was his contention that

weakened humanity could be restored "by means of the care-
ful education of the young."¹ Throughout his Great Didactic
he constantly pleads for the training and guidance of the
child, hoping to reshape him to the image of His Creator.
In one instance, commenting upon the seeds that are natu-
really implanted in each human being, he emphatically de-
clared that

Man is not good but becomes so, as, mindful of his
origin, he strives toward equality with God.²

And elsewhere, when speaking about man's conception of God,
he added:

It must be confessed that the natural desire for God,
as the highest good, has been corrupted by the Fall,
and has gone astray, so that no man, of his strength
alone, could return to the right way.³

Another statement shows that Comenius felt strongly about
man's potential strength due to the grace of Redemption:

It is base, wicked, and an evident sign of ingratitude,
that we continually complain of our corrupt state, but
make no effort to reform it; that we bring forward
what the old Adam can work in us, but never experience
what the new Adam, Christ, can do.

There is then no doubt of Comenius' position with
respect to the fallen nature of man. He acknowledged man's

²Ibid., p. 40.
³Ibid., p. 49.
⁴Ibid., p. 50.
nature as corrupted by Adam's sin but he also upheld that man's corrupted nature could be perfected through education and raised to the image of its Creator. When he spoke of the schools as "the forging places of humanity," he had in mind institutions of learning where man's wounded nature could be restored "so as to be such as [it] ought to be throughout [man's] whole life." To this end he forcefully recommended that true virtue and piety be fostered in each child. This he claimed to be the true work of the school.

It is that study of wisdom which elevates us and makes us steadfast and noble-minded—the study to which we have given the name of morality and piety, and by means of which we are exalted above all other creatures, and draw nigh to God Himself.

These aforementioned statements seem to indicate that Comenius' views on man's fallen nature were the views of a loving, humble and well-educated clergyman whose greatest desire was "to re-educate the heart of man, so that in the coming Golden Age the spirit would assert its domain over the body and order would triumph over chaos." His un-

---

1 Ibid., p. 211.
2 Comenius, The School of Infancy, p. 69.
3 Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part II, p. 211.
4 Comenius, The Analytical Didactic, p. 18.
bounded faith in human nature led him to emphasize the good
tendencies that are in every man and to provide through edu-
cation the training necessary for man's total fulfillment.

With respect to Parker's views on man's fallen na-
ture notions similar to Comenius' can be pointed out. As
Parker lived in a period when American intellectual life
was undergoing great strides, it is not surprising that his
thinking on the nature of the child was influenced by the
advent of ideas during this time. As in the Comenian
Period, the sciences contributed many new concepts relative
to man's growth and development. Of the several factors--
the philosophy of idealism, the ideas presented and methods
propounded by European educators, and the advent of child
study--that obviously served to fashion Parker's concept
of the child, the philosophy of idealism is perhaps the
most striking.

Rapid material growth and progress in American
society during the latter part of the nineteenth century
provoked by way of reaction a return to the philosophy of
idealism with its emphasis upon the spiritual rather than
the material aspects of man and of the universe. The
close-to-overnight changes wrought by discoveries in the
various sciences caused such a stir on the question of
man's place in God's universe that some course of action
seemed essential. Man's origin and destiny as well as his material and spiritual needs were questioned and analyzed in view of establishing his rightful place in the cosmos. As a result the proponents of idealism held "that the essence of the universe was spiritual and not material"\(^1\) and that man was essentially a spiritual being. In addition, some of the idealists, among whom was Parker, included in their system the evolutionary concept as the means of explaining the growth and development of the universe and of man under proper conditions. The theory of evolution served to emphasize all the more that both the universe and man experienced a process of growth with respect to the end for which each was created. One can easily surmise how such a system of thought can have a marked effect upon the formulation of one's concept of the child and upon the development of an educational theory and practice. Since the child is believed to be simply a finite spiritual expression of the infinite spirit, the good rather than the evil tendencies in the child will receive maximum attention; the personality of the child and the proper conditions for its complete unfoldment, for its evolution, will become the chief business of the educator. It would seem that

\(^1\)Butts and Cremin, p. 329.
these two fundamental propositions are reflected in Parker's views concerning the nature of the child.

As an idealist and a follower of Emerson, Parker never tired of stressing the good tendencies found in the heart and mind of each child.

God never puts a tendency in the human heart but He wants it developed. ... The child loves to do good ... and it is our duty to foster that tendency. 1

In his view of human nature he ceaselessly speaks of the good tendencies in the child. As soon as the child comes from the hands of His Creator he is endowed

with a fund of God-given potentialities, which if not perverted or crippled, would develop, according to 'natural' laws in such a way as to serve the best interests both of the individual and the larger social group. 2

At birth the child possesses all the "seeds" needed to bring him to his full development if these "God-given potentialities" are "not perverted or crippled." Elsewhere, in speaking about the study of Nature as the means for developing the child's spiritual life, Parker expressed similar views. Children who filled their minds with that which is good and pure about them should have "no room for wicked-

---

1 Francis W. Parker, "The Child," National Educational Association Proceedings, (1889), 480, 482.
2 Tostberg, p. 56.
ness and sin." ¹ His optimistic belief in the tendencies for good in the child is also reflected in the following remark relative to good school government.

Spend no time in presenting the wrong; always present the right and the true. . . . Good is always predominant, good is always beautiful, and the nature of the child where the training has in any degree been normal, inevitably gravitates towards good.²

At this point, Parker may be too "naive in his faith in the goodness of human nature."³ One gets the impression that maintaining the good in the child will depend exclusively upon placing him in favorable external circumstances. Environment, the proper conditions for growth and progress, all seem to be of prime importance for the total realization of the child's potential. "The child is good if he has a chance, an environment of goodness."⁴ Is the providing of a favorable environment and proper conditions for growth the only factors necessary for the child's total unfoldment? Parker seems to think so. He attached tre-

¹Parker, Talks on Teaching, p. 175.
²Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 354.
³Curti, p. 375.
mendous importance to creating a suitable environment as chiefly responsible for assuring the child's progress. No matter what phase of growth he is discussing, Parker stresses the need for "proper conditions." Though he may use various terms, like "the exact adaptation of the subject taught,"\(^1\) or "the means of growth must be exactly adapted at every step to the varying conditions of the child,"\(^2\) and even the "method is the special adoption of educative conditions to individual needs,"\(^3\) setting up the proper environment seems imperative to fostering child goodness, growth and progress.

Although Parker invariably stresses the good and the good tendencies in the child, he does concede that there might be evil tendencies. However to spend time presenting the evil so that the child might know and avoid it, he considered "pernicious to the last degree."\(^4\) When the child is unable to distinguish between good and evil, he suggests that the positive and the good be presented to him so strongly that he would make his own choice which should be the choice of the good.\(^5\) He does mention "that we are

\(^1\) Parker, *Talks on Teaching*, p. 168.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 156.
\(^3\) Parker, *Talks on Pedagogics*, p. 251.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 353.
\(^5\) Ibid., p. 354.
all somewhat defective"¹ which is only a new way of stating the old doctrine of original sin, but puts very little emphasis upon it. Parker rebelled against the Calvinistic principle of man's total depravity. In his opinion those who subscribed to such a doctrine did so only as an excuse for [their] ignorance of the divine nature of the child. The fundamental reason why children do not act right is because they do not have right conditions for action.²

There could never be a bad child as far as Parker was concerned, unless, of course, environment made him so. This is substantiated by Miss Cooke who once said:

> With much force, Colonel Parker emphasized that every child should be given a chance to grow to his fullest educational stature so that he might become an asset to himself and his community.³

Again here one can detect Parker's insistence upon the good in the child, the unlimited possibilities for the good in him, and the proper conditions necessary to his development.

As an admirer of the child, Parker so championed "the good of the child's soul"⁴ that he perhaps minimized,

²Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 372.
⁴Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 168.
if not ignored to some extent, the effects of original sin and hence omitted to make provisions in his theory of education for the spiritual restoration of the wounded nature in the child. On this account he differs from Comenius who never tired of saying "that if the corruption of the human race is to be remedied, this must be done by means of the careful education of the young." ¹

To summarize what has so far been presented on the origin of the child we can say that in general Comenius and Parker had similar views on this issue as each believed that the child came from God and was created to His image. Also both conceived the child to be a composite of body and soul. However, with respect to the procedure for a harmonious development of the child's body and soul, they differed. The place that God and Nature occupied in each one's theory and practice of education was different. As Comenius placed God in the foreground of his educational schema so did he emphasize the supernatural and religious training of the child. However, as Parker placed God in the background of his educational theory so did he stress the natural and secular training of the child. On the question of the fallen nature of man, both Comenius and Parker subscribed

to the "doctrine of natural goodness" both for different reasons and with certain distinctions. On one hand Comenius seems to welcome this doctrine of natural goodness as a means of counteracting the "doctrine of total depravity" introduced by the Protestant reformers. Yet he entertained the idea that the nature of man was wounded by original sin. He therefore defended his point by insisting that man's corrupted nature can be restored both by God's grace and through personal effort according to the laws of nature. On the other hand, Parker advocates the "doctrine of natural goodness" as the weapon against the then rampant materialism which denied anything spiritual in the nature of man. He saw man as predominantly good and supplied with a "fund of God-given potentialities" capable of being realized if and only if proper environmental conditions are present. By their respective standards, one can conclude that Comenius and Parker saw the child as a living image of God, capable of shaping, misshaping and reshaping himself according to the laws of nature but with this important distinction that Comenius gave more consideration and recognition to man's corrupted nature by original sin than did Parker.

Having up to this point described Comenius' and Parker's views on the nature of the child, we will now
consider another important aspect in the development of one's concept of the child, namely, the place held by culture. The abstract term "culture" has come to be used in various ways and to possess shades of meaning. What is important is to discover what Comenius and Parker thought as they used the term "culture" while setting forth their views on the child.

In a more restricted sense we sometimes hear in education the phrase, "literary culture." By this we mean that attention is focused specifically upon one aspect of the child's development, namely, his intellectual grasp of literature and of writers. In a more comprehensive sense, however, the word "culture" embraces all that has to do with the development of the whole individual, his social, physical, aesthetic, emotional, intellectual and spiritual growth. This can be briefly described as "the symmetrical development and the perfect control of all the powers and faculties of the individual."¹

As to the diverse meanings attributed to the word culture, one finds it to mean a philosophy of life which is developed from certain common practices, beliefs and

attitudes, and which is assured to promote individual and societal growth, progress and happiness. Maritain offers another possible meaning of "culture" which seems in this writer's opinion to have some affinity with that held by Comenius and Parker as they made provisions for the education of the child in their respective cultures.

Culture itself consists in knowing how and why to use these things (wealth, material resources, industrial, technological and scientific equipment) for the good of the human being and the securing of his liberty. Culture is essentially the inner forming of man.... It implies the pursuit of human happiness.... The richest and most beautiful of cultures is nothing if moral development does not keep pace with the scientific and artistic development, if man is not conscious of the reasons he has for living, and the reasons he has for dying.

In these few definitions of the term "culture," there seems to be one dominating element, one recurring thought—the perfection of the human being for a richer and more abundant living but in a given society. It is precisely for this—to help each child realize his infinite possibilities but within the framework of a certain society, of a certain culture—that Comenius and Parker seemed to have strongly defended universal education. In analyzing their writings with

1Butts, p. 2.

respect to their concept of the child one can readily discern recurring claims for this natural unfolding of all the child's potential which are nothing else than "the designed development of the child."¹ As Maritain saw culture as being "essentially the inner forming of man" which can be achieved "by the development of those inner powers"² so also did Parker look upon culture as being the agent for "the realization of man's possibilities for good and growth"³ while Comenius stated that culture can be achieved by developing those "seeds of knowledge, virtue, and piety"⁴ "as gently and pleasantly as possible, and in the most natural manner."⁵ Let us examine more attentively the cultural, the societal aspect of the child's nature to indicate some of the guidelines that led Comenius and Parker to stress education as the effective cultural agent capable of fashioning the child, of helping him become the perfect creature of his Creator but within his own culture group, his own society.

¹Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 348.
²Maritain, p. 154.
³Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 348.
⁵Ibid., p. 81.
Under the guidance of Comenius and Parker, pedagogical institutions of the seventeenth and the nineteenth centuries developed a new spirit of enthusiasm for the education of the child. Both educators entertained great expectations in the child's possibilities for the betterment of himself and hence of his society. It was Comenius' contention that the school be looked upon as "a true forging place of men . . . where all men are taught all things thoroughly."¹ In defending his position that all the young go to school he argued:

If this universal instruction of youth be brought about by the proper means, none of these will lack the material for thinking, choosing, following, and doing good things.²

This universal education can best be realized through providing common schools for all youth. In advocating the "common schools" Comenius remarked:

We wish all men to be trained in all the virtues, especially in modesty, sociability, and politeness, and it is therefore undesirable to create class distinctions at such an early age, or to give some children the opportunity of considering their own lot with satisfaction and that of others with scorn.³

¹Ibid., p. 76.
²Ibid., p. 69.
³Ibid., p. 266.
In the same vein, Parker saw the "common schools" as "the camp and training ground for citizenship" above whose entrance he would inscribe the motto: "Everything to help and nothing to hinder." Just what did Parker mean by this statement? In one of his addresses delivered to future teachers, he did spell out in more definite terms just what he thought schools should do. Perhaps the argument might be presented here to give more precision to the meaning of this statement and conversely indicate that Parker's dream for education was similar to Comenius'.

You may dig your treasures from the earth; you may fill your storehouses full to overflowing with ripe fruits,—everything in the way of material welfare may bless you; but without the development of the human soul, without the evolution of human character, without training into devotion to the good of all in the common school, there is nothing, neither can there be. Education for the purpose of realizing the child's potential seemed to be a main concern for Comenius and Parker as both saw the schools as an indispensable medium capable

---

1 Address of Colonel Francis W. Parker in the Old Stone Temple at Quincy, Massachusetts, April 20th, the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Quincy Movement, Unpublished Pamphlet, p. 2.

2 Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 338.

of providing the child with what he should know in order to
be what he should be both for and in himself and for and in
his society, his culture. This seems to imply that the child
has the ability to think, to choose, to do good things, in
a word, to develop all the powers and faculties of his human
soul. Since these aspects of the human soul are part and
parcel of the child's nature, then effort must be made to
provide for their development. Schools worthy of the name
could then become a fine cultural agency for the education
of the child and for the transmitting of culture from one
generation to the next.

Another guideline that led Comenius and Parker to
encourage this new spirit in the education of the child
was their desire to cultivate the mind of every human being.
Both conceived the mind of the child as having great possi-
bilities. Comenius' remarks on the mind of the child are
very enlightening. They can serve to point out in concrete
form all that the mind of the child can do by its very
nature. In short, Comenius sees the mind capable of all
knowledge.

for our mind not only seize on things that are close
at hand, but also on things that are far off, whether
in space or in time; it masters difficulties, hunts
out what is concealed, uncovers what is veiled, and
wears itself out in examining what is inscrutable;
so infinite and so unbounded is its power.¹

Parker also agrees with Comenius that "the faculties of the mind are capable of infinite development."²

This he readily explains by observing the actions and the tendencies of the child. In the first chapter of Talks on Pedagogics, entitled "The Child," the American educator presents a detailed analysis of the child's natural actions and tendencies toward the world about him. He successfully leads one to become acutely aware of the child's "quiet, persistent, powerful tendencies"³ as he learns to live in his environment. "These spontaneous activities of the child," claims Parker, "spring from the depths of its being, spring from all the past, and the seed of all the future."⁴

To be rather more precise as to the meaning attributed to "spontaneous activities" of the child, let us quote Parker himself as he summarized his views on this topic.

To sum up, the subjects of the child's spontaneous study and persistent interest include all the central subjects of study—geography, geology, mineralogy, botany, zoology, anthropology, etc. In fact, the child begins every subject spontaneously and uncon-

¹Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part II, p. 41.
²Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 362.
³Ibid., p. 23.
⁴Idem.
sciously. He must begin these subjects, because he lives, and because his environment acts upon him and educates him. Of course, the difference in environment makes a great difference in the child's mental action, the child's individual concepts; still, in all children there are the same spontaneous tendencies. The boy, for instance, on the farm may have a large range of vegetation to study, and the poor little child in the dark city may worship with his whole soul some potted plant and from it draw lessons of inspiration and love. The child studies the clouds, the sky, the stars, the earth, vegetation, animal life, history, every hour of the day.

Such thoughts on the child's natural reactions to his environment can only serve to stir one's thinking concerning the great potential in the child and provoke him into finding means that will enhance this development of the child's spontaneous tendencies waiting to be cultivated "with the greatest care." This calls for educators who are able and willing to "understand these tendencies and continue them in all these directions." Parker was a schoolteacher capable of understanding the child's needs and interests and of making the proper provisions for their realization. Hence, the title, "lover of little folks" came to be his.

A new spirit of optimism for the child's development came to be the trademark of both Comenius and Parker. In

1 Ibid., p. 16.
2 Ibid., p. 23.
3 Idem.
their concept of the child, they never tired of speaking of the child's possibilities and tendencies for the good, the true, and the beautiful. It is precisely this—their unbounded faith and trust in the infinite God-given gifts placed in the child at birth—that led them to study the child as a child and to design a theory of education centered upon his needs and interests.

By way of concluding this discussion on Comenius' and Parker's views on the cultural aspect of the nature of the child, we can say that education, in their eyes, was basically a cultural service to the child as the child, according to his own nature, is not created to live alone but in a society. Education was a means of helping each child fashion himself to a perfect man, for teaching each child how to love and to prize all that is good, true and beautiful, and for showing each child how to respect in himself and in others human nature and conscience. Schools, then, which are designed to encourage such an education can only serve to transmit as well as to create culture from one generation to the next. Indirectly all this information seems to throw some light on each one's concept of the child. Both conceived him as a creature of God capable of great progress and destined to live in a society marked by a certain culture.
In the preceding pages two of the major aspects of the child's nature, namely his origin and his culture, have been dealt with specifically and at length. To complete this discussion with respect to Comenius' and Parker's concept of the child, a third and last aspect of the child's nature will be treated, namely, his destiny. Obviously, in theorizing on education, an individual will be concerned not only with the origin of the child and his place in a culture group but also with the end or destiny of that child.

With reference to the sublime destiny of man, we can conclude, with minor distinctions perhaps, that both Comenius and Parker believed the ultimate end of man to be the union of his soul with God, his Creator. As both men conceived the child to come from God and to be created in His image, they were basically interested in bringing each soul closer to its Maker, and hence to its perfection and happiness. Comenius was greatly concerned with finding the surest way of leading man to "understand the art of making the very best use of [his] life."\(^1\) Parker claimed that a study of God's laws was indispensable "to approach that image."\(^2\) Since these two educators were intent upon making

---

\(^2\) Parker, *Talks on Pedagogics*, p. 46.
the child more God-like through bringing him to make the best use of his life, the slight divergences in their views might be seen more clearly if we ask ourselves the following pertinent questions: Did both Comenius and Parker see this temporal life as a preparation for the life hereafter? Did both Comenius and Parker believe that this union of the soul to its Creator was possibly begun in this life?

Comenius considered this temporal life as a pure gift from God. In his estimation life is nothing but a preparation for eternity, and exists in order that the soul, through the agency of the body, may prepare for itself those things which will be of use in the future life.\(^1\)

Because he believed life in this world to be "short" and future life to be "everlasting without end,"\(^2\) he constantly stresses that the education of each individual tend toward leading him to see, to praise, and to recognize God everywhere, and, in this way . . . go through this life of care with enjoyment, and . . . look for the life to come with increased desire and hope.\(^3\)

He reiterated this same view when he remarked:

This will be achieved if men learn to make use of this life, and not only enjoy it; in this way our present

\(^1\)Comenius, *The Great Didactic*, Part II, p. 32.


transitory life will be not only the precursor but also the preparation for the future eternal life. According to Comenius' thought, then, this life serves as a preparation for the life hereafter. Man is destined to live eternally and happily with his Creator if and only if he prepares himself during this temporal life which is freely given to him by his Maker.

Meanwhile Parker looked upon temporal life with an apparently greater optimism and enthusiasm. To him life was considered a God-sent gift to the human soul for the purpose of realizing the development of "its divine potentialities." Self-activity, individual freedom and personal responsibility became the guiding principles permitting the human soul to become what it ought to be—the perfect image of its Creator. To best facilitate this "approximating unity of the human being to his Creator," Parker endlessly recommended that all human beings receive a development of intellectual, moral, and spiritual power that will enable them to fight life's battles, to be thoughtful, conscientious citizens, and prepare them for all that may come thereafter.

He was more emphatic when he declared

1 Comenius, Selections, p. 125.
3 Parker, Talks on Teaching, p. 181.
that the end of all education should be to promote man's happiness, not only during his present transitory existence, but throughout the eternity which is to follow.\(^1\)

Basically the ideas behind the above statements do not seem to be different from Comenius'. Like Comenius, Parker did consider life as something "passing" and eternity as "lasting." Both conceived the human soul to be blessed with a temporal and an eternal existence, and with certain powers and faculties to fulfill the end for which it was created.

However, to have a clearer insight into Parker's views on man's destiny, it might be wise to bring forward another of Parker's ideas. Such an idea might enhance our ability to detect Parker's Emersonian spirit. In one particular instance, when the American educator was strongly defending the sacred call of teaching, he did make a remark which in this writer's opinion is basic to his theory on the destiny of man. He once ended a discussion with the following words:

\[\text{The dignity of life is the feeling of eternity behind and before; that the soul is one with eternity.}\]  

Though the statement is rather short, it seems to point out more accurately just what Parker believed man's destiny to

\(^1\)Curti, p. 380.

\(^2\)Parker, *Talks on Pedagogics*, p. 388.
be. Life, whether temporal or eternal, is seen as a "unit," as "one." There is no dichotomy between the soul's "transitory existence and eternity." "All life for one life" declared Parker. Temporal life is a sharing in or a partaking of eternity since the "soul is one with eternity."

Hence, life is not seen, as in the case of Comenius, so much as a preparation for eternity but rather as a beginning of eternity. The very subtle difference might simply mean that in educational practice Comenius will place greater emphasis upon the individual's adherence to divine laws to assure later eternal happiness whereas Parker will lay stress on individual initiative, individual expansion, individual freedom which will grow to perfection in the pursuit of eternity.

By way of summarizing all that has been discussed on this topic, one can conclude that, in general, Comenius and Parker shared a core of common thought with respect to the child's nature, his culture, and his destiny. The few differences in belief or in stress that were pointed out were to bear some impact upon the "kind" of education each was to advocate. But by and large both Comenius and Parker struggled for the good of the child because each had great

\[\text{Ibid., p. v.}\]
faith in the good inherent in the child's nature. As lovers of little folks, both educators cherished one great dream—to see each child arrive at the highest possible degree of the good, the true and the beautiful. This, in their belief, meant to lead the child toward becoming a more perfect image of His Creator.

THE OBJECTIVES OF EDUCATION

As objectives are fundamentally essential in giving direction to and assuring the success of any enterprise, it then follows that objectives in the educative process will be indispensable to successful operation and worthwhile achievement. Objectives, on the one hand, present a long range perspective and offer a general sense of direction, which at times perhaps make one feel that they are extraneous in the immediate task of educating the child. But on the other hand, whether one speaks of ultimate or of immediate objectives, the objective rightfully serves to determine where to start studying any problem and what steps to follow in order to arrive at a sound solution. And, this is particularly striking in the field of education. Here objectives are of inestimable value to the theorist as well as to the simple educator as he plans for the quality and the quantity of education he intends for the educand.
Objectives serve as guidelines in directing him to a predetermined end. The success of one's educational endeavors will depend in large measure upon his objectives both ultimate and immediate. Hence objectives must be consciously planned, clearly stated, and rather strictly followed. Since both Comenius and Parker considered their times as ripe for a more practical and realistic system of education, both must have had in mind certain ultimate and immediate objectives toward which they sought to direct their endeavors. Without categorically affirming that they possessed common objectives in their educational theory, we can nonetheless note certain similarities in the ends each proposed in educating the young.

Since educational objectives are countless and various, it would seem expedient at the very outset to set some norm or standard for judging of their value and position. Otherwise such a study could become endless and confusing. But, what is of greatest importance is that amid all the possible objectives there must exist a final or ultimate one toward or around which all other objectives converge. This ultimate or final objective will then become in some respect the decisive one from which all minor or subordinate objectives will get their validity, their raison d'être, and which to a certain extent will contrib-
For this important reason we will attempt to determine the final or ultimate objective set by Comenius and by Parker as each attempted to design a more practical and realistic approach to education.

All that Comenius ever undertook was concerned first with the establishment of the kingdom of God, and then with the salvation of mankind. God and man were the two focal points in his life's work. As Eller so aptly remarked:

His teaching, his reforms, his revolutionary works on education, his encyclopedic activities, his efforts for Christian unity—all these were designed to promote the end of his chosen calling: the salvation of man.

In all of Comenius' works then and particularly in his titanic achievements in the field of education, there is this persistent and recurring plea "not so much to make men learned as to make them wise, to give them understanding of their own ends and of the end of all things." Unlike such Church reformers as Luther, Calvin and Knox, who had espoused the more democratic aim of preparing youth to take

---

2 Comenius, The School of Infancy, p. 9.
his place in a religious society, Comenius stressed foremost the needs of the individual himself and stated that he "was concerned with education for life and not merely for Church." Hence this seventeenth-century reformer directed all his efforts toward an educational program whose final or ultimate objective was principally to prepare each individual to live a rich and abundant personal life here on earth and that this should somehow lead him to live happily and eternally in heaven. This ultimate objective of education was best expressed when Comenius defended the need for a universal education.

Our first wish is that all men should be educated fully to full humanity; ... in all things that perfect human nature ... in all ways ... that is to say, in order to make men as like as possible to the image of God, in which they were created; truly rational and wise, truly active and spirited, truly moral and honourable, truly pious and holy; and thereby truly happy and blessed, both here and in eternity. ... In a word: to be wise for eternity, but not to be unwise here. ... For if all men were to learn all things in all ways, all men would be wise and the world would be full of order, light and peace.

An even more pregnant statement on the ultimate aim of education is the one taken from The School of Infancy wherein the seventeenth-century educator highlights the

1 Butts, p. 257.
2 Pedram, p. 28.
3 Comenius, Selections, pp. 97-100.
privilege teachers and parents have in contributing to the education of very young ones. Here he strongly exhorts them to carefully train children.

Do you wonder why God did not at once produce these celestial gems in the full number he purposed to have for eternity, as he did angels? He has no other reason than that in doing so he honors us by making us his associates in multiplying creatures: Not only that from this source we may draw pleasure, but that we may exercise zeal in rightly educating and training children for eternity.

These statements then serve to point out that Comenius was led by strong religious motives in planning his educational system. It stands to reason that the ultimate objective in his new approach to education would be strongly tinged with religious sentiments and that his whole educational scheme would revolve around those things which best prepare man to eventually live eternally with His Creator. "There is a life beyond this life and . . . existence on earth is therefore merely preparatory." Ulich has expressed Comenius' ultimate objective of education by saying that for the Moravian Bishop

Life is in a continual state of development toward the divine.

1Comenius, The School of Infancy, p. 65.
3Ulich, p. 191.
In other words, what Comenius really intended was to make it possible for every individual to perfect his human nature in this world so that he might arrive at the next.

All our actions and affections in this life show that we do not attain our ultimate end here, but that everything connected with us, as well as we ourselves, had another destination.¹

One can easily conclude that for Comenius the ultimate objective in education is the same as what he had conceived the ultimate objective of life to be, namely, the establishment of a union between the human soul and its Creator. Since he believed the child to be a composite of body and soul, coming from the hands of God and destined to live with Him eternally, he outlined a program of education that would have as its ultimate objective the transformation of each creature into a child of God united with Him forever. The method he suggested is simple.

We advance towards our ultimate end in proportion as we pursue Learning, Virtue, and Piety in this World.²

In summary one can say that the ultimate objective of education for Comenius offered no complication. With his gaze fixed upon the happy future life of each human being, he directed his educational efforts toward the ul-

²Ibid., p. 39.
timate end of man—the union of his soul to that of his Creator. According to his theory of education, this union is best arrived at through the pursuit of "learning, virtue, and piety." Hence, the ultimate objective of education is the pursuit of "learning, virtue, and piety" which will lead the individual to union with God.

Now Francis W. Parker also held to an ultimate aim in the educative process. But unlike Comenius "who became an educational reformer more by accident than by primary design,"¹ Parker had early manifested an intense desire to commit himself to teaching. As a great lover of children, he embraced the teaching profession with an indefatigable zeal determined "to know the child and to supply the conditions for his highest growth and development into character."² As Bishop John L. Spalding once remarked concerning Parker's theory of education:

He was not a man of rich and varied learning, not an original thinker, not a logical reasoner, not a master of style, but he was one whose faith in the power and value of education was deep and living.³

¹ Spinka, p. 32.
² Parker, National Educational Association Proceedings, XXXIV (1895), 425.
If then Parker placed so much faith in the power and value of education, what ultimate objective could he have had in mind in his pursuits? Like Comenius, the American educator sought to fortify and to ennoble human life by making it possible for each individual to realize whatever plan God had designed for him. Like the seventeenth-century realist Parker adhered to the belief that each individual is in a continual state of development toward the divine and that each individual should live in close union with his Maker even here on earth. But how did this nineteenth-century American school reformer express what he considered the ultimate end or objective of education?

Before presenting an answer to this question, some consideration of the aims of education in general during the nineteenth century should be offered. The educational aims in American schools during this particular century can be stated in many ways. But as Butts claims "the ideal of character development through religion"\(^1\) probably remained the dominant objective toward which most school reformers worked. Even with the secular movement gaining momentum in the schools, most educational theorists still continued to incorporate "character formation" as the essential aim.

\(^1\)Butts, p. 498.
in their theory of education. Despite the fact that formal
religion courses were not scheduled as such in the public
school curriculum, the ideals of Christian character still
remained in the foreground in all educational systems.
Following the thinking of most educators during his time,
Parker also stressed character formation along Christian
lines as the ultimate objective in his educational program.
Like his contemporaries among schoolmasters he examined edu­
cation under its different aspects and defined it accordingly.
An examination of a few of his definitions of education
reveals that "character formation" did play an integral
function in his theory of education. Time and again the
American schoolmaster cites the development of character
as the end of education.

Parker in his pedagogical creed saw education as
the surest means of discovering and appreciating the
"divine" pattern in all of God's creation, especially in
the human being. Since "there is a design in each indi­
vidual being" Parker argued, then education is the means
for the "working out of the design of a human being into
character."¹ The development of this "human being into
character" takes place according to the laws of nature,

¹Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 25.
the most important being, according to him, that of self-
activity. Parker reiterated the same idea when he presented
his views on human growth. On this account he defined edu-
cation as

the fulfilling of God's design of changing being into
character. The human being is latent energy organized
and under laws. Laws are translated into actions;
actions change latent energies into power.¹

For the nineteenth-century American school reformer, the
formation of character has no other meaning than the real-
ization of God's design in each individual and this is ac-
complished primarily through self-activity. The task for
both teacher and student is to uncover this "divine pat-
tern" designed by the Creator. In short, Parker is ulti-
mately aiming at the formation of a good moral citizen who
will act according to sound Christian principles. But one
must admit that his concept of a good moral citizen is based
more upon the natural moral virtues than upon religious
truths as is the case with Comenius. Yet he does minister
to the spiritual life of the individual and shows that an
intensive spiritual communion with the Creator can be
achieved here on earth by leading a rich, natural and
abundant life.

¹Francis W. Parker, "Human Activity," National
Educational Association Proceedings, (1887), 381.
Secondly, in discussing methods of teaching, the nineteenth-century school reformer still sought the formation of character as the end of education. As a teacher of teachers he highly encouraged both cadet and in-service teachers to use their initiative and creative ability in devising means to teach the child effectively. He deeply respected these different approaches in teaching provided these methods of communicating knowledge to the child would ultimately be directed to the making of a good man. This thought was particularly brought out in one of his talks to teachers where he clearly expressed his one and only motive for dedicating himself to teaching.

I have had but one motive in my heart, and that is that the dear children of our common country may receive at our hands a development of intellectual, moral, and spiritual power that will enable them to fight life's battle, to be thoughtful, conscientious citizens, and prepare them for all that may come thereafter.¹

To lead every child to become the best of what he can was his most cherished objective. Methods of teaching were one of the means to bring forth growth within the individual and give power to both the mind and the heart of the child. Hence nothing should be spared to actuate whatever creative ability prospective teachers might have to

¹Parker, *Talks on Teaching*, p. 181.
develop newer and better approaches to teaching. Methods should not be stereotyped. They should vary with the teacher, the learner and the subject taught. But in making use of these newer methods of teaching one should not forget that the most worthwhile are those which are ultimately directed to "the development of character."¹

Another instance where Parker spoke of character formation as the end of education is when he described the ideal school in the ideal community. Such a school can be "ideal," he said, if "character is the end of education."²

That Parker saw the ideal of character formation as the foremost aim in his educational program, there seems no doubt. Had Comenius so stressed "the ideal of character formation" as the main objective of education? It seems fair to say that the seventeenth-century school reformer had supported a similar idea when he stated that "all men should be educated fully to full humanity."³ But, his emphasis on character formation was certainly not as great as Parker's. One does note upon close scrutiny that Comenius' education is more God-centered whereas Parker's is

¹Ibid., p. 168.


³Comenius, Selections, p. 97.
more virtue-centered. Comenius places more emphasis on the preparation for eternity, Parker stresses more the natural, moral life of man in the here and now. And yet in giving parents direction on how they should educate their children Comenius had also included in the total development of the child what nineteenth-century educational theorists termed "character formation."

Hence parents must see that their children are exercised not only in faith and godliness but also in the moral sciences, the liberal arts, and in other necessary things. Thereby, when grown up, children may become truly men wisely managing their own affairs in the various functions of life, religious or political, civil or social, that God wills them to fulfill. Thus having wisely and righteously passed through this life they may with greater joy migrate to heaven.  

But with Comenius the religious, the supernatural element in the development of the child was dominant. In fact all of Comenius' undertakings--civil or social, religious or secular, political or educational--were permeated with a supernatural spirit. With Parker the case is different. When the nineteenth-century educator speaks of character formation as the "end of education for American children," he seems to limit it to the "secular," to the natural aspect.

1Comenius, The School of Infancy, pp. 64-66.  
2Francis W. Parker, "The Plan and Purpose of the Chicago Institute," The Course of Study (July, 1900), 10.
He describes it in these words:

All knowledge and skill of an individual, all he thinks, knows, and does, is manifested in his character. Character is the summation of all these manifestations. Character is the expression of all that is in the mind, and it may be analyzed into habits.  

He recognized the fundamentals of character formation as being "love of truth, justice, and mercy, benevolence, humility, energy, patience, and self-control." And furthermore, he explicitly stated that these elements of the ideal character should be manifested "in terms of citizenship, of community life, of society in its best sense, in short, of complete living..." At this point one might conclude that Parker is interested primarily in preparing the child either with or without religious training to be a good citizen. But in his conclusion to the doctrine of concentration Parker did admit that Character, whose essence is love for God and man, alone can save us, and lead us to the time when obedience to divine law shall be the one rule of action.

If then the essence of character formation is "love for God" as well as for man, some religious training must

1Parker, Talks on Teaching, p. 164.
2Idem
3Parker, The Course of Study (July, 1900), 10.
4Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 399.
have been envisioned. On this particular issue, Parker is certainly not as explicit nor as emphatic as Comenius. His approach to religion was not as orthodox nor does it seem to have been as convincing as that of Comenius. But as Mayo pointed out in his essay on "The New Education and Colonel Parker," Parker did include in his ultimate educational aim of character training "the Christian method of love in the noblest Christian meaning of that mighty word."¹ Like Comenius, the American teacher did direct his educational efforts toward the unfolding of the "divine" in each child, in order that the child might live eternally and happily with his Creator but the stress on specifically religious training was decidedly less in both extent and importance.

With respect to the ultimate objective of education in relation to these two school reformers, one can conclude that generally speaking both directed their "new" education somewhat toward the same ultimate end--the union of the soul with its Maker. Influenced by the atmosphere of their respective centuries--the seventeenth century more religious, the nineteenth more secular--both Comenius and Parker succeeded in maintaining that teaching and learning should

lead to God. For the Moravian Bishop the task was easier. He could explicitly state the ultimate objective of education as that of bringing each human being closer to God and thus to his own perfection and happiness. For the American schoolteacher the situation was somewhat different. Conforming to his own principles and to the world in which he lived, Parker rather stressed the ideal of character formation as the ultimate end of education. By this he meant that each child would become through education "an efficient citizen of his little community" knowing God's truth and being able to apply it in the world of which he is a part.

Without question these ultimate aims so essential in planning and in directing a system of education can only be realized through concrete, practical, everyday experiences. At this point any specific theorist's views on education will take on newer, more detailed, more complicated, more individual characteristics. His chief concern will be to spell out those immediate objectives of actual learning situations that will best and most successfully tend toward the realization of the ultimate objective he has set forth. Theorizing on a new realistic approach to education, Come-

Comenius and Parker both having proposed somewhat similar ultimate objectives to education proceeded to draw largely parallel immediate objectives for the education of youth.

Of course the question of immediate objectives is no simple one. If, as already pointed above, educational theorists have listed many and varied ultimate objectives for the quality and quantity of education they intended for the educand, it then follows that with respect to immediate objectives educational theorists will offer an even greater number and variety of them. For clarity's sake then one might advantageously group the immediate aims of education under two broad headings: those concerned with knowledge and skills, and those dealing with right conduct. In turn, these two classifications can lead one to formulate three questions which will permit a more systematic and definite method of analyzing Comenius' and Parker's immediate aims of education. The first question could be: to the acquisition of what kind of knowledge did Comenius and Parker immediately aim at in seeking to help the educand make a success of his life? The second: what were some of the conditions that these two schoolmasters insisted upon for the successful development of the fundamental skills of learning? And finally, what were some of the habits that these two educators highly recommended for the betterment...
of the educand? The answers to these queries should fully serve to point out whether or not there are certain similarities in their thinking with respect to the immediate objectives in a realistic approach to the education of youth.

As a basis for the kind of knowledge Comenius thought should be immediately aimed at in education he advanced his belief that man by his very nature is capable of being prepared to live a rich and abundant life. Convinced that the ideal human being is not born but made, he believed that the surest way to help man perfect himself is through education. His immediate concern was to teach him that knowledge he needed to live a richer and fuller life here on earth so that he could eventually enjoy eternal blessedness with his Creator. To acquaint man with a wealth of both secular and religious knowledge then became one of his immediate objectives.

Let all the arts and sciences be taught in their elements in all schools, and more fully at each successive stage of the pupil's progress. It is by knowledge that we are what we are.¹

And with respect to the need for knowledge of God, the Moravian Bishop argued thus: if man is a partaker of God's divine image and an inheritor of the same eternity, then

¹Laurie, John Amos Comenius, Bishop of the Moravians, p. 211.
man, and every man at that, should be given some knowledge of his Maker. ¹

But then what specifically did Comenius mean by "all knowledge"? No doubt the seventeenth-century schoolmaster was aware that a knowledge of all the arts and sciences "would be neither useful of itself, nor, on account of the shortness of life, could it be attained by any man."² From his own experiences he knew that individuals have different abilities and powers. And for that reason they certainly cannot all profit from the same quantity of knowledge.

For there is as great a difference between the minds of men as exists between the various kinds of plants, of trees, or of animals; one must be treated in one way, and another in another, and the same method cannot be applied to all alike. It is true that there are men of great mental power who can compass every subject; but there are also many who find the greatest difficulty in mastering the rudiments of some things. Some display great ability for abstract science, but have as little aptitude for practical studies as an ass has for playing on the lyre. Others can learn everything but music, while others again are unable to master mathematics, poetry, or logic. What should be done in these cases?³

This experienced teacher answers his own question in a very simple but forceful manner. Speaking to the teacher he

²Ibid., p. 70.
³Ibid., p. 181.
advises him never "to force a scholar to study any subject" if he sees that it is uncongenial to his natural disposition for in so doing only "disgust is produced and the intelligence is blunted."\(^1\) This type of reaction is in no way conducive to the promotion of knowledge so essential for good living. Let each man "develop in the directions of his natural inclinations (in accordance with the Divine will), and \(he\) will serve God and man, in his station in life, whatever that may be."\(^2\) To best serve God and man, Comenius calls for the basic knowledge of the "principles, the causes, and the uses of all the important things in existence\(^3\) so that man

shall go forth energetic, ready for everything, apt, industrious, and worthy of being entrusted with any of the duties of life.\(^4\)

Comenius then intends to give man that particular kind of knowledge which will help him be not only a keen observer of what is going on around him but also an active participator in all the affairs of man and of his world.

\(^1\)Idem.
\(^2\)Ibid., pp. 181-182.
\(^3\)Ibid., p. 70.
\(^4\)S. S. Laurie, John Amos Comenius (Syracuse: C. W. Bordeen, 1892), p. 200.
He so wants to equip man that he will never be at a loss in making his life a worthwhile one.

For we must take strong and vigorous measures that no man, in his journey through life, may encounter anything so unknown to him that he cannot pass sound judgment upon it and turn it to its proper use without serious error.

All this leads one to conclude that the knowledge that Comenius wishes for all men is none other than the practical and useful knowledge essential to the making of everyday choices.

Whatever is taught should be taught as being of practical application in everyday life and of some definite use.

And elsewhere, when referring to the conciseness and rapidity in teaching, the educator repeated the same idea:

Nothing, therefore, should be learned solely for its value at school, but for its use in life.

Or again,

In all activities the school should be made practical for life and pertinent to an upright religious life.

Therefore, knowledge for its own sake is not what Comenius has in mind when he speaks of a scheme for a universal education. From the few passages cited above, it becomes evi-

---

1 Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part II, p. 70.
2 Ibid., p. 189.
3 Ibid., p. 181.
4 Butts, p. 279.
dent that the kind of knowledge he is advocating is none other than this useful, practical knowledge. Whether secular or religious this knowledge had to teach man the art of living a rich, full and "divine" life. Through his study of arts and sciences then, and more specifically of those arts and sciences his mind could absorb, man would be rendered capable of cultivating and developing all his latent God-given talents. There is never a doubt in Comenius' mind that human nature can be made more perfect by using useful and practical knowledge. In fact throughout his educational writings, there appears this persistent plea for teaching man all the arts and the sciences so necessary to developing and putting to use all of man's latent powers and energies. Then and only then can man's life be a successful one. And he will then be in a better position to make the world in which he lives a better one.

So then Comenius sought to direct teaching toward providing the educand with that practical knowledge—religious and secular—essential to actuating each man's potential to living a fruitful life. This he saw as the immediate aim of education. Parker also formulated immediate objectives in his theory of a realistic type of education. Like the seventeenth-century schoolmaster he considered leading the child to a richer and fuller life through
exposing him to a well-selected body of knowledge as the immediate aim of education. But it is essential to return to the first question asked in studying his immediate aims of education, namely, what kind of knowledge should be taught.

In answer to this query one must remember that in and out of season the indefatigable American schoolteacher never tired in promoting the best for the children. "There is absolutely nothing too good for the children," he often repeated in his formal and informal gatherings with teachers and administrators. He had noticed that young children were fascinated with the world about them. The marvels of nature intrigued them and sooner than later they would seek to know more and more about the wonders of their surroundings. These spontaneous reactions to man and nature Parker saw as natural in every child. Hence he believed that nothing should be spared in developing this quest for knowledge. And to this end Parker sought to dedicate his entire life. His most cherished dream was "to see growth and improvement in human beings." And to realize this he wanted the school to be organized as a "model home, a complete com-

1Dewey, The Elementary School Teacher and Course of Study, II (June, 1902), 704.
2Giffin, p. 133.
Community, an embryonic democracy." The immediate aim here was to create better living conditions for self-development, to make instruction more meaningful and more efficient and to stress the quality of knowledge. All this with the intention of giving the child the proper means for achieving self-fulfillment and for living correctly. At one time he did make the following comment which further indicates that he was highly concerned with perfecting the child's nature.

The children are not in school to get knowledge; they are there to live and to learn to live.

By this statement Parker in no way intended to depreciate the value of knowledge. On the contrary by consulting the first two chapters of Talks on Pedagogics one can see that the schoolmaster places no limits to the subjects he outlines for the child.

The subjects of the child's spontaneous study and persistent interest include all the central subjects of study—geography, geology, mineralogy, botany, zoology, anthropology, etc. In fact, the child begins every subject spontaneously and unconsciously.

Parker never intended to deny the child any knowledge. Rather what he seems to stress is that "to live and to learn to live" is more important than the mere acquisition of

---

1 Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 450.
2 Parker, National Educational Association Proceedings, XXXIV (1895), 428.
3 Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 16.
knowledge for its own sake. For Parker, knowledge is only a means to an end, which end as was stated earlier is the formation of character. Knowledge not having any immediate use will sooner than later wither and die.

The value of knowledge can be apprehended only through its immediate use, and its appreciation is the highest stimulus to action.¹

And again speaking in favor of the acquisition of practical knowledge as an immediate aim of education he offered the following statement:

That the knowledge acquired through an understanding of its immediate value and use in society is incomparably better than that gained by making the knowledge an end in itself.²

Hence, once again as in the case of Comenius, the kind of knowledge this American educator recommends is none other than practical knowledge for good citizenship. Or as he himself called it in one instance, "that knowledge and skill which make the social life of each individual as full and as rich as possible."³

In his opinion complete


²Parker, The Course of Study, (July, 1900), 10.

living calls for "that knowledge which best nourishes the activities of the child at every stage." Here, Parker's thoughts are much similar to Comenius'. Both educators glorify knowledge by the function it serves. Enough time, energy and talent have been wasted with the kind of knowledge that the child never uses for his personal betterment and the improvement of the world. Their whole concern seems to revolve around one main idea: Is the child made better through the use of this or that knowledge? Both educators hoped that their efforts made in this direction would only serve to help each individual to live more fully, richly, and divinely. This, in short, is the kind of knowledge that both Comenius and Parker sought as the immediate aim in the education of the child.

However, though both are immediately concerned with this useful and practical knowledge for the improvement of man and of his world, there is a slight distinction to be made with respect to each one's approach to a knowledge of God. The American transcendentalist limited the study of God to "the manifestation of His thought in the universe and man."² Being a man of deep religious convictions the Mor-

¹Parker, The Course of Study, (July, 1900), 11.
²Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, pp. 26-27.
vian Bishop did not hesitate to incorporate within the scope of his educational system several methods of arriving at a knowledge of God. In addition to the study of man and of nature, he encouraged the study of Scripture, of religion, of Christ. By including knowledge of such subjects Comenius' concept of a rich, full and divine life seems to have differed somewhat from Parker's. Comenius' concept would be more in accordance with the orthodox concept of Christian living. Still both did see life on earth as related to the life in heaven and did aim at giving the educand all the knowledge needed for leading the good life right "to the hilt." Yet, with Comenius the specifically religious, the supernatural aspect of life seems to have dominated, whereas with Parker the stress was on the secular, the natural aspect of life. Notwithstanding this difference the two reformers were essentially concerned with the perfection of man's nature and with the improvement of the world of which he is a leading figure. They aspired through education to remake man to God's image.

Having first discussed as an immediate aim the type of knowledge that Comenius and Parker envisioned as necessary for the success of one's life and the improvement of

the world, the present writer will now go on to examine the second question of immediate objectives of education with respect to the development of skills.

That skills must be practiced and acquired is an obvious fact, and that they should be developed and improved in the most economical and effective manner seems also clear. However obvious and clear this might be, a survey of educational theories down through the centuries does point out that outstanding schoolteachers did not always present the same views on this matter. Some maintained that skills should be taught by rigid and unrelenting drill. Others totally neglected the systematic practice of fundamental skills. Still others chose the middle course by insisting that the development of skills needs drill but drill stemming from meaningful activities. It would seem that the latter group would be more successful in promoting the development of skills since they advocated a more pleasant and a more natural way of learning. Whatever method adopted skills still have to be taught and learned, and this must be done in the most economical and effective manner possible. As schoolteachers both Comenius and Parker were aware of this problem and took measures to solve it.

One of Comenius' and Parker's immediate aims in the teaching of any skill whether physical, mental, social or
spiritual was to ascertain that the child recognize the meaningfulness of that skill to happy living. On this matter Comenius advances that "whenever instruction is given the pupil should be taught to apply his knowledge practically, as in the case of a language by speaking, and not merely to assimilate it mentally."\(^1\) Elsewhere he phrased it in more general terms but still insisted upon the need for real life situations in the development of skills.

Education cannot attain to thoroughness without frequent and suitable repetitions of and exercises on the subjects taught.\(^2\)

For Parker the possibility of developing skills was immeasurably enhanced when "the entire time and power of the pupils in school \(\text{was}\) concentrated upon intrinsic thought, the thought embodied in the central subjects."\(^3\) The mechanical and technical difficulties in the learning of any skill could be overcome when "the necessity and desire to manifest thought" directs the hand, the heart and the mind of the child. "We learn to do by doing, to hear by

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 154.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 156.
\(^3\) Parker, \textit{Talks on Pedagogics}, pp. 289-290.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 290.
"hearing, and to think by thinking,"¹ claimed Parker. He was here repeating almost verbatim what the seventeenth-century educator had said two hundred years before him:

Let practice always bring practice to perfection. Doing cannot be learned except by doing. Hence the saying, 'We create by creating.' One becomes a writer by writing, a painter by painting, a singer by singing, a speaker by speaking; and so it is with all external acts."²

The more the child practices what he learns in school, the more he will tend to use it in his daily experiences outside the school. What these two educators are then basically advocating is the need for the practice of skills in activities that the child can see as meaningful to life. This can be pointed out more specifically by considering some of the passages taken from their writings.

Neither Comenius nor Parker ever thought of imposing or forcing a skill upon any child. On the contrary both made it a point to study the needs of the child before teaching him any new skill. They also made sure that the skill could easily be implemented in the child’s life. Theirs was a very realistic approach to the teaching of skills. Today this question of providing natural and

¹Parker, Talks on Teaching, p. 115.
meaningful situations for the development of skills seems to be less of a problem. But for Parker, and more especially for Comenius, conditions were quite different. These two educational innovators were not always received favorably by their contemporaries. However they did succeed in making a dent in that traditional way of teaching skills by showing through their own experiences that the child can learn much and retain better if whatever he is taught is immediately used in actual life activities. For this reason Comenius proposes that even the very young learn the rudimentary skills of grammar, first by "learning to speak the mother-tongue correctly, that is to say, in pronouncing with distinctness the letters, syllables, and words." Later when the child became older, he would learn the rules for writing accurately, more speedily and confidently but always on the condition that "these rules . . . be written in a popular form, and the boys . . . be exercised in them."\(^1\)

The same notion held true for the teaching of basic skills in arithmetic. Here again, the seventeenth-century schoolmaster insisted upon real situations.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 268.
The seeds of arithmetic will be planted if the child understands what is meant by "much" and "little," can count up to ten, can see that three are more than two, and that one added to three makes four.\(^1\)

He advocated that the child "count with ciphers and with counters, as far as is necessary for practical purposes."\(^2\)

To profit from the exercise or practice of a particular skill the child had to be placed in a meaningful setting. Otherwise, he could see no reason for going through the drudgery of learning skills that offered him no meaning.

The immediate aim and object in teaching the child any skill is to see that he "will thus find [himself] all the fitter to use [his] understanding, [his] powers of action, and [his] judgment"\(^3\) in real life situations. Or as Comenius so aptly remarked in defending the practical application of what the child was taught:

> The task of the pupil will be made easier, if the master, when he teaches him anything, show him at the same time its practical application in every-day life. This rule must be carefully observed in teaching languages, dialect, arithmetic, . . . , etc. If it be neglected, the things that you are explaining will seem to be monsters from the new world, and the attitude of the pupil, who is indifferent whether they exist or not, will be one of belief rather than of knowledge. When things are brought under his notice and their use is explained to him, they should be put

\(^{1}\)Ibid., p. 260.
\(^{2}\)Ibid., p. 268.
\(^{3}\)Idem.
into his hands that he may assure himself of his knowledge and may derive enjoyment from its application.¹

Parker seems to endorse a similar belief in the development of skills. Like Comenius he advocates "the practice of skills with understanding" as the most expedient and effective way of developing them. He phrased his guiding principle mostly on this matter thus:

Constant effort in the direction of adequate thought expression is the one way and means by which adequate skill is acquired.²

What does the American school reformer really mean by the phrase "constant effort in the direction of adequate thought expression"? Perhaps the best way to explain this is to use two of his illustrations, one dealing with the teaching of grammatical skills, the other with the teaching of arithmetical skills. According to the traditional teaching of grammar, Parker points out, the power to understand and use language was acquired "by the isolated and formal study of grammar."³ The teaching of language was basically directed to the formation of a skill. The learner became skillful in recognizing endings, in placing words in correct position,

¹Ibid., p. 140.
²Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, pp. 301-302.
³Ibid., p. 288.
in constructing sentences. But there was little or no emphasis on the understanding of the thought the author wished to convey. Without completely doing away with the teaching of grammatical skills, Parker rather advocated what is today commonly known as the functional approach to the study of language. He believed that technical grammar, with its modifications of etymology, syntax, and prosody, may take enduring form and shape when welded under the white heat of absorbing thought. Hence, the learner would more easily acquire grammatical skills if he saw how thought and syntax were related within a sentence.

With respect to the teaching of number skills, the American school reformer in no way encouraged meaningless drill. Drill without understanding he never tolerated in his educational theory. He abhorred any mechanical training that in no way served to probe "the immediate impulses of intrinsic thought." He believed that efficient arithmetical power and skill may be acquired by the continual exercise of judgment and reason in the necessary application of numbers essential to a knowledge of the central subjects.

\[^{1}\] Ibid., p. 290.
\[^{2}\] Ibid., p. 288.
\[^{3}\] Ibid., p. 290.
Whatever he advanced as necessary for the correct development of language and number skills, he also advocated for the development and improvement of all other learning skills. For him skills are most expediently and more effectively developed in meaningful settings related to actual life experiences.

From the above discussion one can conclude that both Comenius and Parker shared similar views on the second point in this discussion of immediate aims, namely the development of the basic skills of learning. Fundamentally the two school reformers supported a program of teaching skills well adapted to the varying needs, abilities and interests of the learner. In addition they both maintained that understanding and meaningful settings are essential to the practice and perfection of skills. Improvement in these skills would generally result from the stimulation of thought in the learner. However, in order to be stimulated to think, the learner had to be properly motivated and urged to effort. As true educators who wanted the best for each child, both Comenius and Parker insisted upon fostering the right motivation and setting up conditions proper to the full development of learning skills.

So far consideration has been given to answering a first question pertinent to what type of knowledge Comenius
and Parker thought should be taught and a second relative to the conditions these two educators deemed necessary to the successful development of fundamental learning skills. Answers to these two queries served to reveal what these two men considered as immediate aims of education. To complete this study of immediate aims, some thought must now be given to the third question that pertaining to these two educators' views on the formation and development of the good habits so essential to constructive and abundant living.

It is an accepted fact that a certain amount of basic knowledge and a number of skills are needed for the management of one's affairs in life. It is likewise recognized that the acquisition of good habits and proper modes of behavior are indispensable to sound living. Human beings, as is well known, have a natural tendency of developing fixed ways of reacting to particular situations. The fixed ways of reacting are called habits. Habits are good for they can facilitate learning and promote fine modes of behavior. Since habits are linked with growth and development and are formed by doing, then certain principles of action are undoubtedly necessary to enhance their formation. On the question of the formation of habits Comenius and Parker placed strong stress on two leading principles of living, namely, that of self-activity and that of
Repeating a point made early in this work and often reiterated, the present writer returns to Comenius' and Parker's shared belief in the divine nature of the child. Consequent to this both school reformers held the greatest respect for the activities and the ideas of, the expressions of individuality in even the youngest children. They sought to encourage whatever they thought would best shape the tender minds, hearts, and hands of these little folks. "Children do not train themselves up spontaneously," to nobility and wisdom, remarked Comenius, but are shaped "only by tireless labor." To this the American transcendentalist subscribed wholeheartedly:

> God made the child, and put His sweetness and light and love in its heart, and it is our duty, the most important of all duties, to discover, direct, and develop it. "

And for emphasis, the schoolmaster added "the little child loves to do good at the beginning and it is our duty to foster that tendency."

According to both educators one of the guiding

1 Comenius, *The School of Infancy*, p. 67.
principles that would most expeditiously and effectively serve to mould the "divine" in the child was that of self-activity. Through self-activity sound habits would be developed. "Give the child the power to act forever"\(^1\) cried the American schoolmaster. The Moravian educator wrote:

For who is there that does not always desire to see, hear, or handle something new? To whom is it not a pleasure to go to some new place daily, to converse with some one, to narrate something, or have some fresh experience.\(^2\)

Hence human growth and development would come only through human activity. Applying Comenius' famous principle that "things that have to be done should be learned by doing them"\(^3\) Parker chose the school as the proper agency for teaching the child to form habits of good behavior that he would be called upon to exercise in his everyday activities.

In the school we find all the primary elements of society, but lacking the conventionalities of the grown-up world; and here the child acts out his nature freely... The order, the writing, the reading, the number lessons, the play-ground, all furnish countless occasions where the child may be led to act in the right way from right motives.\(^4\)

\(^1\) Parker, National Educational Association Proceedings, (1887), 382.
\(^3\) Parker, *Talks on Teaching*, p. 165.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 168.
The school could also provide many opportunities for the practice of the social virtues where

Selfishness may be turned to benevolence, cruelty to love, deceit to honesty, sullenness to cheerfulness, conceit to humility, and obstinacy to compliance by the careful leading of the child's heart to the right emotion.¹

Perhaps Dangler was right in calling Parker's schools "educational communities"² where the chief concern was the "personality-building of the young."³

Whatever was attempted in Parker's schools was to lead and train "the child to work, to work systematically, to love work and to put his brains and heart into work."⁴ It was his contention that if the task is adapted to the child's capacity, the child will then engage into it wholeheartedly and thereby form sound habits.

God has so created the mind that healthy moral, mental, and physical exercise produces pleasure; this truth I believe cannot be gainsaid. If the work be not adapted to the grasp of the pupil, this pleasurable stimulant is lacking, and artificial stimulants must be used.⁵

¹ Idem.
³ Dangler, School and Society, LVI (October 24, 1942), 370.
⁴ Parker, Talks on Teaching, p. 161.
⁵ Ibid., p. 170.
To this end he ceaselessly sought to use concrete and worthwhile experiences that appealed to children and for which they were ready. "Childhood is full of activities of every kind, stimulated by external energies and shaped by internal power."¹ It is then left to the educator to capitalize upon these natural and spontaneous activities in order to foster self-activity so important in cultivating proper habits of living.

Likewise the Comenian schools can be looked upon as centers of great activity. Under organized and systematized teaching, the child was directed toward the acquisition of knowledge, virtue and piety. The schools after the homes offered the best opportunities for fashioning the child to adulthood. Here were the centers of true living where the minds of those who learn are illuminated by the light of wisdom, so as to penetrate with ease all that is manifest and all that is secret, where emotions and the desires are brought into harmony with virtue, and where the heart is filled with and permeated by divine love, so that all who are handed over to Christian schools to be imbued with true wisdom may be taught to live a heavenly life on earth; in a word, where all men are taught all things thoroughly.²

Little more could be added as a function of the school. Everything seems included herein. It amounts to saying

¹Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 21.
²Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part II, p. 76.
"that the aim of the school—if it is a real school—is to develop the whole man, his body, his mind and his soul. Whether or not the children fully understand the total consequences of all this development is not for the seventeenth-century educator a main issue. What he seems to stress is that the child's exposure to knowledge, virtue, and piety should serve to help them develop good habits.

At first the children will not understand the true nature of what they are doing, since their intelligence is still weak; but what is of importance is that they learn to do that which subsequent experience will teach them to be right. For, when they have got into the habit of acting as they should, it will be easier to explain to them why such conduct is good, and how it is best carried out."

Therefore the immediate aim of this principle of self-activity is to lead the child to a "good life" which to some extent is more a matter of acquiring good habits of conduct than of imparting knowledge, stimulating virtue or fostering piety.

These few considerations rightfully serve to indicate that Comenius and Parker highly esteemed the principle of self-activity as essential to the development of habits, one of the immediate aims of education. However, one might single out this difference. In studying the corpus of their works and in particular those sections

[1] Ibid., p. 221.
specifically concerned with the principle of self-activity, one can advance that Parker was more realistic than was Comenius in reducing the activities needed for the development of good habits to concrete and workable forms in the classroom. Perhaps this is to be expected from the nineteenth-century educator who actually experienced in a democracy better living conditions than did Comenius. At any rate, Parker who was destined to be called the "Father of the Activity Movement" did recognize that he was indebted to the Moravian schoolmaster who had in his time encouraged the use of self-activity in the fostering of good habits, one of the immediate aims of education.

Another principle that seems to have been significant in the development of good habits of life is the commonly known one of "self-responsibility." According to the dictionary of education, self-responsibility is defined as

the trait that grows with the opportunities to share in a democracy mutual tasks for the orderliness and welfare of the group as well as for personal independence.

1 Dangler, School and Society, LVI (October 24, 1942), 370.

From this definition it does not seem strange to consider "self-responsibility" instrumental in the formation of habits envisaged by Comenius and Parker. One can easily see how "self-responsibility" can have an important function in the development of habits. Both Comenius and Parker incorporated this principle of self-responsibility into their educational theory and practice. But, the manner in which they employed it as an effective means in developing good living habits was different.

Though there are several ways of showing the differences, the present writer has chosen to do so by distinguishing between the conditions for and the functions of self-responsibility as this serves in the formation of good habits, an immediate aim of education. By conditions is meant those stimuli--external and internal--which enhance the acquisition of good habits; by functions is meant those conscious acts or activities of the individual geared to the acquisition of good habits of living. Though the condition for and the function of self-responsibility are mutually inclusive in the formation of a responsible being, it is this writer's contention that if one--conditions for instance--is stressed more than the other--functions--a different type of responsible being will result. A study of the thinking of Comenius and Parker on this subject
should throw further light on the distinction presently being made.

No one would ever question that Comenius intended to form responsible human beings. His dream was "to educate and unify mankind, to bring it closer to God, and thus to its own perfection and happiness."¹ Such a religious man so deeply committed to the education of everyone must have had in mind the "shaping of responsible beings" as one of the ways of achieving human perfection and happiness.

But before anyone can be confident that certain actions rather than others will be more conducive to the development of good living habits or that this life situation rather than that one will enhance self-responsibility, one might pause to consider if the establishing of environmental conditions favorable to good living habits would be essential. An examination of Comenius' work seems to reveal that he placed great stress on the setting up of conditions favorable to the development of self-responsibility. He sought those principles of education which would provide the best conditions for leading man to live more abundantly. In concluding on the conditions to be established the schoolmaster "borrowed from no other

¹Broudy and Palmer, p. 102.
source but the operations of nature."¹ In this perspective he advanced the following principles:

Following in the footsteps of nature we find that the process of education will be easy if it begin early, before the mind is corrupted, if the mind be duly prepared to receive it, if it proceed from the general to the particular and from what is easy to what is more difficult, . . . , if progress be slow in every case, if the intellect be forced to nothing to which its natural bent does not incline it, in accordance with its age and with the right method, if everything be taught through the medium of the senses, and if the use of everything taught be continually kept in view, . . . These, I say, are the principles to be adopted if education is to be easy and pleasant.²

Should these conditions be fulfilled, then it seems, according to Comenius, that the man so educated would in some way become a "responsible being." He does not use the term, "self-responsibility,"--a term not in vogue in his time--but he does want each man to be given the opportunities conducive to forming the best that is in him and this for his own sake as well as for that of society of which he is a member. "Nothing" says Comenius "may be borne towards its ends unwillingly and reluctantly."³ Thus by setting the proper conditions, man can earnestly and pleasantly be set to the task of developing those seeds of knowledge, of

¹Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part II, p. 100.
²Ibid., p. 127.
³Ibid., p. 41.
virtue, of piety that are naturally implanted in him by his Maker. Soon it is hoped man will recognize "what a marvelous instrument of wisdom he is." If Comenian schools aimed "to educate man in every way," then surely Comenius intended to foster self-responsibility in each one of his students. Though someone might claim that the principle of self-responsibility is not found in Comenius' educational theory and practice, the present writer believes that it is there implicitly but that it can easily be bypassed because so much attention is given to the conditions necessary to develop good habits of living.

But Parker, the educational missionary laboring for democracy in American education, in no way neglected those conditions essential to the development of good living habits, an immediate aim of education. Perhaps more than any other single American educator he searched for those principles of education that tend to blend intelligently material and spiritual needs. In his endeavors towards this end he constantly reiterated that "the conditions of knowledge and action must be adapted to the development

1 Idem.
2 Ibid., p. 144.
of the whole being." Like his trail-blazing predecessor, Comenius, Parker was to continue the work already begun by improving the conditions of learning and by supplying better, more concrete school situations where the child could develop a sense of responsibility for his own development. Parker advanced that unless the child be given the proper conditions and the proper opportunities to act, he would never attain true adulthood. Like Comenius, Parker singled out certain conditions for the easier acquisition of knowledge and its implementation in action. In his opinion this could best be realized if the work be adapted to the state of mental and physical power and ability, if every onward movement brings success, and if the work be real (that is, upon real things, and not drudgery), then let the child learn to do by doing, for the pleasure of doing and its resultant successes best fits a man to control himself, and master all the difficulties and obstacles that lie before him.  

Though not stated in Comenian language, one can sense here the Comenian spirit. Like the seventeenth-century realist, Parker chose Nature as the great teacher. The best place to discover these natural laws and to make provisions for

1 Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 435.
2 Parker, Talks on Teaching, p. 161.
their exercise is the school. "The school is the best place for doing, not preaching," declared the American proponent of the activity movement. And moving from this key notion, "he supplied the little children with the conditions for the most rational and helpful doing." He deemed it advantageous from all points that the child be trained early to act according to the dictates of his own reason that tells him that such and such an act is right and another wrong. As a promoter of democratic school practices he advocated an informal atmosphere for learning where both teacher and pupil could share interests more freely. This, in his thought, would greatly assist the child in becoming the free, independent being capable of making choices and assuming responsibility for them. Unless the child be afforded opportunities for being himself and acting according to his own views, it is doubtful that he could ever become a responsible citizen in a democratic society. "A fundamental principle of democracy," declared Parker, "is the responsibility of each for all, and all for each." If then responsibility,

1 Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 445.


3 Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 419.
and especially self-responsibility, is fundamental in a democratic society, then it becomes the immediate concern of educators to create opportunities for practicing this activity, so compelling in its demands for individual initiative, judgment, self-control, and correct choice of conduct, and so in harmony with the natural laws of child development that hold that every child will respond to influence and act from good motives and from good habits of thought and action. Within this perspective, Parker did not hesitate to transform the cold, formal, and strictly disciplined school into one that is warm, informal and more liberal and where children were allowed to assume responsibility for what was done as well as for their own conduct. This idea seems to be very well illustrated by Jackman as he aptly describes one of Parker's daily activities with the little folks.

No one who witnessed it can ever forget the scene as he (Parker) used to rise at the close of the 'morning exercise', just before dismissing the pupils for the day's work, and say, 'What is the great word?' instantaneously the answer would come back from the whole school in a happy shout, 'Responsibility.' Bending forward in a listening attitude, he would say, 'I scarcely heard it; say it again.' Twice and thrice would the

1 F. J. Cook, "Colonel Parker as Interpreted Through the Work of the Francis W. Parker School," Elementary School Teacher, XII (May, 1912), 399.
word be repeated with deafening vehemence. Then he would add, 'Yes, that is it; this little boy here before me, this little girl, each one is responsible for the whole school today,' and with an answering smile they appeared to assume the trust.\footnote{Jackman, \textit{Annual Report of the United States Commissioner of Education for the Year 1902}, Part I, 232.}

Whatever benefit Parker's audience might have derived from this activity, it rightfully serves to prove that Parker did possess a deep concern for and an interest in the immediate aim of helping each individual lead a better and happier life through self-responsibility. To take time to greet little folks daily and to remind them of their responsibility for what goes on in the school each day cannot but stimulate them to become more conscious human beings. According to Parker this idea of becoming a responsible being in a democratic society calls not only for conditions proper to leading a good life and being a responsible citizen but also, if not more to the creating of functions or activities that will assist the child in performing his work with more awareness and more consciousness. The child will then be led to see that there are more parallels between those activities performed at school and those practiced in the home and the community. For instance, Parker claimed that a school truly fulfills
its function if

it made the children more polite, more anxious to
take cheerfully their share of the school and family
tasks, and generally more sensitive to all the demands
that community, school, and home life places upon
the individual. ¹

However rudimentary this might seem today, the nineteenth-
century schoolmaster was simply seeking concrete situations
and worthwhile experiences for the child permitting him to
exercise whatever principle he was taught in school. And
with respect to the principle of self-responsibility, he
emphasized activities or functions more than the conditions
essential to promoting good behavioral life patterns although
he did not neglect the latter.

From the foregoing analysis one might venture to
draw the following comparison. The Comenian child may be
looked upon as "a responsible being" who has been exposed
to and has profited from the establishment of conditions
proper to good living but has not had sufficient actual
life situations to implement this knowledge. The Parkerian
child, on the other hand, may also be considered "a re-
sponsible being" who has been exposed to and profited
from the establishment of conditions proper to good living
with this difference that he has been favored with real

¹Ibid., p. 234.
life situations permitting him the practice of good living.

Hence the child trained in a Parkerian school should have less difficulty transferring the principles of good living taught in school to a new home and community living than would the child taught in a Comenian school. And this can be attributed mainly to the fact that the Parkerian child was given not only the proper conditions for developing self-responsibility but also the activities or functions whereby he could through repeated and meaningful acts acquire this habit of self-responsibility.

Although this study on the objectives was limited to a brief discussion of the ultimate aim and of a few of the immediate aims of education, like that of the immediate aim of the kind of knowledge to be taught, of the skills to be developed and of the good habits of living to be fostered, the few reflections presented should serve to a further understanding and an appreciation of the indefatigable work done by Comenius and by Parker in the pursuit of their ideal of a modern approach to education. As was mentioned at the outset objectives are the guidelines needed to direct the theorist as well as the teacher in deciding upon the quantity and the quality of education intended for the educand. As objectives can be so countless and varied, the selection necessarily made was in
terms of those aims which best represented the kind of education these two educators had in mind.

On the question of the ultimate objective of education, both Comenius and Parker believed that education should ultimately aim at uniting the soul of each created being with its Creator and thereby assist the soul in achieving its own perfection and happiness. But there is this slight difference in the two educators which may be expressed thus: Comenius prepared the child to be a good, religious-minded citizen in this world thereby preparing him for the next, whereas Parker had the child actually experience living as a good, secular citizen of this world doubtlessly thereby preparing him for the next.

An attempt was then made to consider the immediate aims of education under three aspects—knowledge, skills and habits. Keeping in mind that Comenius as well as Parker placed the child at the center of their education plan, what they earnestly labored for was to provide that child with the essentials for living a rich, fruitful and abundant life. And so both advocated a realistic kind of education and moreover a practical one. In and out of season they emphasized the need for useful, practical knowledge with this slight difference that Comenius incorporated the need for religious, dogmatic teaching, whereas
Parker felt less than more the need for this. Yet both were highly concerned with providing that knowledge essential to the promotion of man's perfection and the improvement of the world. With respect to the immediate aims on skills it was found that both schoolteachers endorsed the same attitude toward the development of skills. They supported a program of teaching skills well adapted to the needs, abilities and interests of the child. In addition both stressed the need for understanding and for meaningful settings as prerequisites for the practice and the perfection of skills.

The study on the immediate aims of education was further examined by a short discussion on the formation of habits. This was carried on by analyzing the views Comenius and Parker expressed on two important principles of living, namely, the principle of self-activity and the principle of self-responsibility. Both educators considered the principle of self-activity as the most economical and the most effective means in developing the good habits of living as well as good habits for acquiring knowledge and skills. Although both considered the school as an ideal place where man can learn the art of right living, it seems that Parker was more realistic, more creative, but perhaps because he was freer than Comenius to use
classroom situations to implement this principle of self-activity. As was pointed out earlier, the educational climate of the nineteenth century lent itself to self-activity, and Parker was wise enough to capitalize on this opportunity. By so doing he improved what the seventeenth-century schoolmaster had dared to start.

It was also found that the principle of self-responsibility as a means of developing good habits did hold an important place in the educational theory of Comenius and Parker. As a pioneer in democratic practices, Comenius presented a rather complete outline of those conditions essential for the normal growth and the total development of each individual. With this work already done, Parker carried things a step further by advocating activities or functions for the immediate practice of the principle of self-responsibility in the regular classroom, thereby establishing parallels between the home, the school and the community.

In conclusion one can say that in general Comenius' immediate aims of education were rather idealistic, definitely more sectarian, and certainly more definite than Parker's. Yet, they both used objectives as guides and incentives in directing their efforts and urged human being to be just as active in seeking a direction in their own lives.
CHAPTER V

EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES: COMENIUS AND PARKER

In the formulation of any system of education first of necessity must come the educator's theory of education followed by his suggested recommendations for the implementation of this theory via concrete and specific school practices. So far this comparative study has tried to present the theoretical aspects of Comenius' and Parker's system of education. An analysis of their notions on the nature of the educand and the aims of education was presented in order to determine whether or not enough parallels could be seen in the theory of education of these two men to warrant calling Parker, the American-Comenius. Generally speaking Comenius and Parker did share common views on the nature of the child and the aims of education. There were, however, differences that were singled out.

Obviously a study of theory without mention of its concomitant practice would be incomplete. So that this investigation might be sufficiently adequate some consideration must be given to such practical aspects of the educational system as the curriculum, the methods of
teaching, and the role of the teacher. The information culled from a study of Comenius' and Parker's pronouncements on these three factors should serve to show how strongly parallel were the educational practices advocated by these two educators.

THE CURRICULUM PATTERN AS DESIGNED

BY COMENIUS AND PARKER

Dewey once remarked that "experience" is a "weasel word." Perhaps one could say the same thing about the word "curriculum." To some educators curriculum means content, subject matter or courses of study schematically arranged for leading a person to broad understanding and to sound practical judgment. Such a concept leads to the use of such expressions as academic curriculum, general curriculum and vocational curriculum. Others use the word curriculum in a more restricted sense. For them it denotes a specific structured discipline and is used in such expressions as mathematics curriculum, scientific curriculum and humanities curriculum. Within this latter concept there is very little or no consideration given to extracurricular activities. In this case the word curriculum is strictly confined to a given field of knowledge with emphasis placed upon the understanding of principles rather than upon the acqui-
sion of information. Here one finds a significant difference from the concept of curriculum held above. Again to still other educators, particularly the advocates of child-centered schools, the word curriculum has been considered in terms of "activities." Possessing such a concept the word curriculum will be put in such contexts as "the learning activities of the child," "the persistent life situations"¹ that take place under the direction of the school, "the problems of the child's life." With such different meanings given to the word curriculum, it would seem essential to spell out the meaning that any educator has in mind when he uses it in his theory of education.

But upon further examination of these different broader or more narrow meanings of the word curriculum one idea seems to persist: curriculum whether meaning the content, the subject matter, the course of study, the structured discipline or the activity, is basically concerned with knowledge and truth that will best serve the individual in the society of which he is an important figure. Accordingly then three basic ideas form what may be referred to as the sources of the curriculum pattern.

namely, the individual with his particular needs, interests, abilities and goals, the society with its institutional and social demands, and finally whatever subject might be called part of the cultural heritage and values a society cherishes and wants to perpetuate. Briefly stated any curriculum maker's necessary instruments are the individual, the society, and the subject matter. If top priority is given to any one of these three sources, then different curriculum patterns will result. Hence, one commonly encounters such expressions as subject-centered curriculum, the child-centered curriculum, the learning activities program and so forth.

With these general notions on curriculum in mind, an attempt can be made at examining more closely the rationale behind the curriculum pattern of Comenius and Parker. Due to the fact that a welter of forces like politics, economy, science, religion and nationalism, did create changes in the respective societies of our two educators, it is not surprising to find the two school reformers questioning the worth and value of the "old curriculum pattern" which had had its merits at some time or other but which no longer seemed to be fitting for the making of the good citizen living in the seventeenth and in the nineteenth centuries. If the schools were to live up to
their standards of being educational centers for assisting each person become more human, then some action had to be taken to provide a curriculum that would best meet this requirement. A study of Comenius' and Parker's views on the development of the curriculum pattern will touch upon three topics, namely, the nature of the curriculum, its organization and some of the innovations it introduced. It is hoped that these few considerations will help to determine whether or not one can rightfully call Parker, the "American Comenius."

With respect to the nature of the curriculum, one can assume that Comenius and Parker did share similar views. In keeping with their fundamental belief that all persons must be educated because they are human beings created to God's image and destined to be with Him forever, both educators necessarily advocated a rather broad, liberal and practical curriculum. Convinced that the child can learn anything and everything provided the right method was used, they set no limits to the quantity of subjects that should be included in the plan of study. But what the two school reformers did insist upon most was the incorporation into the curriculum of only those subjects or activities that would best serve the individual in his becoming a full-fledged Christian citizen. Quality rather than quantity
seems to have been their foremost concern.

To this end, the seventeenth-century realist proposed a curriculum that embraced "all those subjects which are able to make a man wise, virtuous, and pious." These subjects remain the same throughout the entire schooling of the student. Although Comenius did provide for four different kinds of schools, he maintained that these different schools are not to deal with different subjects, but that the teacher should treat the same subjects in different ways, giving instruction in all that can produce true men, true Christians, and true scholars; throughout graduating the instruction to the age of the pupil and the knowledge that he already possesses. For according to the laws of this natural method, the various branches of study should not be separated, but should be taught simultaneously.

Fully aware of the new knowledge coming to the fore during his time, Comenius pleaded for schools where the arts and the sciences in addition to the study of languages, morals and religion would be given due attention. He argues that

If the scene of the world is to be changed, it is essential that all man's education should be changed. . . . whatever men are taught and learn should be: (1) Not piecemeal or partial, but whole and complete; (2) Not superficial and apparent, but real and solid; (3) Not bitter and forced, but mild and pleasant, and therefore durable.

1 Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part II, p. 81.
2 Ibid., p. 256.
3 Ibid., p. 71.
4 Comenius, Selections, pp. 135-136.
Gone are the days when the curriculum "consisted of reading, writing, the Catechism badly taught and Latin—nothing but Latin, with here and there, but chiefly in the universities, Greek and scholastic logic—even reading and writing being for the few, and further education only for the select among those few." \(^1\) What the educational reformer proposed was a curriculum that is broad, realistic, practical, and as thorough as possible. He did insist upon those subjects that would contribute to the betterment of each individual.

But what do we mean by education in all ways? Not education for appearance's sake, but in truth, to the real profit of this life and the next. So that every man trained to wisdom, eloquence, science, manners, civility and piety should become not curious, but informed; not talkative, but eloquent; not a boastful beginner of tasks, but an efficient man at carrying them out; not a mask of virtue, but virtue itself, and finally not a hypocrite affecting piety, but a pious and holy worshipper of God in the spirit and the truth.

His greatest grievance against the then existing curriculum seems to center around the teaching of the Latin language. He was disturbed by the way this subject in particular was being taught and he forcefully let his audience know his thinking on this question. For instance, the following is a typical passage where he clearly spells out his views on this issue.

\(^1\) Laurie, *Studies in the History of Educational Opinion from the Renaissance*, p. 150.

The study of the Latin language alone (to take this subject as an example), good heavens! how intricate, how complicated, and how prolix it was! Camp followers and military attendants, engaged in the kitchen and in other menial occupations, learn a tongue that differs from their own, sometimes two or three, quicker than the children in schools learn Latin only, though children have abundance of time, and devote all their energies to it. And with what unequal progress! The former gable their languages after a few months, while the latter, after fifteen or twenty years, can only put a few sentences into Latin with the aid of grammars and dictionaries, and cannot do even this without mistakes and hesitation. Such a disgraceful waste of time and of labour must assuredly arise from a faulty method.

Comenius then sought to remove from the curriculum subjects he no longer deemed essential while inserting others he thought of great value for children of his day. It was very difficult for him to break entirely from the old traditional curriculum. Yet, as a school reformer of the seventeenth-century living "in the twilight between the old and the new" he duly acknowledged the efforts of his predecessors in revising the curriculum to meet their needs and in turn forcefully recommended a new curriculum pattern in harmony with the demands of his own day and age. The content of his new program of studies was strongly oriented toward religion—a residue of the curriculum of the Middle Ages—

1Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part II, p. 79.
2Ulich, Education in Western Culture, p. 66.
but it gave an honorable place to all the secular sciences—the subject matter to gain tremendous prestige in later education. Furthermore one readily notes that Comenius' curriculum is designed to fit the individual rather than the individual having to fit the curriculum. One can then rightfully affirm that though this educator's curriculum was both child and content centered more emphasis was placed upon the child.

Like the predecessors who had committed themselves to educational advancement, Parker also saw the need to update the school curriculum in his day. Recognizing that the child wants to learn and "is spontaneously interested in all subjects of thought" the American schoolmaster made the following reply to the question of what the child should study.

The child should have that which he can apprehend, assimilate and use. The school which he enters should be a broader and deeper life. Stimulated by companionship and by social demands, directed by his teacher, his soul longs for that knowledge which he can use for the good of others.¹

The spirit that animated Parker was very much like that of Comenius. Like the seventeenth-century schoolmaster Parker

¹Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 16.
²Parker, The Course of Study (July, 1900), 12.
labored for a school curriculum that would contribute to the total development of the individual, thus helping foster better and richer living. The curriculum of his day had become too limited, too restricted and too rigid.

There was no nature study, no science, little 'learning through doing', and no explicit attempt to correlate the various studies that were taught.¹

Dissatisfied with these conditions, Parker sought "to vitalize these schools whose curriculums were confined chiefly to the three R's, and whose classrooms were completely autocratic."² He set up centers of learning where all children under the guidance of a competent teacher were introduced to the study of everything around them. "I have urged," said the American school reformer, "that all subjects taught in any university shall be begun in an elementary way, with the little child of six years of age, and that exercises in all the modes of expression shall be continued or initiated."³ Elsewhere he is more specific on what he means by "all subjects."

There are two main subjects of study--man and nature . . . . There are no dividing lines across this domain, except those drawn by man. . . . The child begins no new subject, for subjects are always new; nor does he

¹ Tostberg, p. 12.
² Sandison, National Education Association Journal, XXVI (December, 1937), 309.
³ Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 388.
ever drop a subject because it is old.\textsuperscript{1}

This passage and those previously quoted reveal much of Comenius' views on a curriculum pattern designed especially to introduce subject matter of real significance to the child. To make the educative process more of an adventure and less of a drudgery both sought to keep the child, his nature and needs, before them as they planned a course of study. Through deductive reasoning, observation and personal experimentation Comenius and Parker were able to present a curriculum pattern different from those already existing in their time but definitely directed toward satisfying the needs of their day.

In general, one can say that Comenius and Parker shared similar views on the nature of the curriculum. If there is a difference, it is one of stress. The two educators sought to incorporate all the subjects into their curriculum pattern, but the two educators did not treat them in the same fashion. Comenius centered his entire course of study predominantly around God and the cultural subjects whereas Parker centered his curriculum pattern "mainly around the natural and social sciences."\textsuperscript{2} In the

\textsuperscript{1}Parker, The Course of Study, (July, 1900), 12.

curriculum patterns of both men an effort is made to place the child rather than the subject matter, as focal.

Having studied the nature of the curriculum pattern the present writer will now examine the manner in which all these liberal arts and sciences were organized for school presentation. Perhaps on this particular issue one will find that Comenius and Parker are more greatly at odds and hence that no attempt should be made to see parallels. However, a survey of the organization of their elementary curriculum pattern seems imperative and moreover should shed more light on the difficulties that both Comenius and Parker faced as each dared offer a curriculum pattern different from his predecessors and his contemporaries. One possible way of studying the organization of the curriculum is to examine the curriculum patterns with respect first to their vertical arrangement in order to note points of contrast, secondly to their horizontal arrangement on the elementary level in order to note points of comparison.

As an entrepreneur on a grand scale Comenius launched a far-flung program of studies for developing the intellectual life of the individual. Examining the curriculum vertically one notices that his scheme for a perfect educational course was to "begin in infancy and . . ."
continue until the age of manhood is reached."\(^1\) To this end he organized, graded, and integrated the content of his curriculum according to the age, the ability, and the aptitude of the child. According to the vertical arrangement of his curriculum pattern then the Moravian school reformer presented a complete, continuous school program. He divided the ladder of education into four sections, each offering six years of training in all the arts and sciences.

The whole period, therefore, must be divided into four distinct grades: infancy, childhood, boyhood and youth, and to each grade six years and a special school should be assigned. . . . A Mother School should exist in every house, a Vernacular School in every hamlet and village, a Gymnasium in every city, and a University in every kingdom or in every province.\(^2\)

On the first rung of the educational ladder was the Mother or nursery school for children up to the age of six. Here with the mother as the first and foremost of teachers, the child was to be exposed to all the subjects "in a general and undefined manner."\(^3\) Aware that parents are not always capable of providing a systematic study of these areas of knowledge, Comenius wrote *The School of Infancy* in which he gave valuable hints in guiding parents towards contrib-


\(^2\) Ibid., p. 256.

\(^3\) Idem.
The chief aim of the Mother's Knee School is to direct the child "to learn by association of things with words." Comenius writes:

In the Mother-School the external senses should be exercised and taught to distinguish the objects that surround them.

Without going into detail on how Comenius reasoned out this type of learning, let us nonetheless bring out a few of his suggestions taken from his Sketch of the Mother School. For instance, in the realm of physics he remarked that

a boy, during the first six years of his life, can be brought to know what are water, earth, air, fire, rain, snow, frost, stone, iron, trees, grass, birds, fishes, oxen, etc. He may also learn the names and uses of the members of his body, or at any rate of the external ones. At this age these things are easily learned, and pave the way for natural science.

With respect to the study of geography and history, Comenius declared:

We know the elements of geography when we learn the nature of mountains, valleys, plains, rivers, villages, citadels, or states, according to the situation of the place in which we are brought up.

The commencement of history consists in recollecting

---

1 Power, Main Currents in the History of Education, p. 343.
3 Ibid., p. 259.
and reporting what has recently happened, or how this or that person has carried out this or that matter; though this exercise should only relate to some incident in the child's life.\footnote{Ibid., p. 260.}

He said about the same thing on such other subjects as metaphysics, astronomy, chronology, mathematics, rhetoric, the social sciences of economics and politics, morals, and finally religion and piety. The child can learn much about his world through firsthand experiences provided his first tutor—in this case his mother—is willing to make him aware of what he sees, hears, touches and so on. What Comenius particularly stresses about this first rung of his educational ladder is that "at this age instruction should mainly be carried on through the medium of the senses\footnote{Ibid., p. 264.} and that parents who are the child's first teachers should "through example, instruction, practice and discipline\footnote{Comenius, The School of Infancy, p. 21.} encourage him to associate things with words in his daily life experiences.

On the second rung of the educational ladder Comenius places the Vernacular School where all children between the ages of six and twelve were to gather to receive their first normal instruction. The distinctive mark of this
school was the training given to the "internal senses, the imagination and the memory, in combination with their cognate organs, . . . , and this by reading, writing, painting, singing, counting, measuring, weighing, and committing various things to memory."¹ In addition the principles of morality were to be taught and implemented. Children were also to be given the basic notions of economics and politics in order "to understand what they see daily at home and in the state."² They were also to be presented the important facts of general world history along with geography and topography. And finally, Comenius introduced the principles of the mechanical arts so that "the children may not be too ignorant of what goes on in the world around them, and that any special inclination towards things of this kind may assert itself with greater ease later on."³ For many the Vernacular School would bring to an end their formal schooling. So that all children might be prepared to carry on in the world of work and even in the pursuit of higher studies Comenius saw to it that all would be fit "to use their understanding, their powers of action, and their judgment."⁴

¹ Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part II, pp. 256-257.
² Ibid., p. 268.
³ Ibid., p. 269.
⁴ Ibid.
to any way of life they would choose. In reality the aim of the Vernacular School was "to teach to all the young . . . such things as will be of use to them throughout their whole lives."\(^1\) What is important to note here is what Power has pointed out, namely, that "at this point in Comenius' educational plans we note the emergence of a 'theory of education for life'."\(^2\)

Furthermore, Comenius prepared a neat schedule for the proper operation of these Vernacular Schools. He divided the program of studies to fit six classes, assigning a specific task to each class but always with a strong emphasis placed on the teaching of the vernacular. Then he even made available a daily schedule which consisted of four teaching hours—two in the morning "devoted to the exercise of the intellect and memory" and two in the afternoon "to that of the hand and the voice."\(^3\)

Similarly to what curriculum makers do today Comenius completed the organization of his curriculum pattern for the Vernacular School by offering recommendations on the kind and use of textbooks for children.

\(^{1}\)Ibid., p. 268.

\(^{2}\)Power, Main Currents in the History of Education, p. 344.

\(^{3}\)Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part II, p. 272.
Specifically prepared books should be supplied to each class, and these should contain the whole subject matter of the literary, moral, and religious instruction prescribed for the class. These class-books should be six in number, corresponding to the number of the classes. Care must be taken to suit all these books to the children. The titles of these books should be of such a kind as to please and attract the young, and should at the same time express the nature of their contents.

These two-hundred-year-old suggestions for choosing textbooks could be of assistance to modern day curriculum makers provided certain modifications were made.

Hence, Comenius' curriculum pattern for the Vernacular School was organized in an orderly, systematic and functional manner.

On the third rung of the educational ladder in this vertical arrangement of curricular patterns, Comenius proposes the Latin School today called the secondary school and this for "those who aspire higher than the workshop." At this stage the curriculum pattern becomes more complicated, more complex, more sophisticated. Extending beyond what the traditional seven liberal arts program had offered, Comenius here sought to prepare youth not only for such professions as that of grammarians, dialecticians, rhetoricians, mathematicians, musicians, and astronomers, but

1Ibid., pp. 269-270.
2Ibid., p. 258.
also that of physicists, geographers, chronologers, historians, moralists and finally theologians. Thus he offers a six-year curriculum for the six classes that the boy will attend. Placing the grammar class first, "since it is the key of all knowledge,"¹ he proceeds to enumerate the others as follows: "the Natural Philosophy class, the Mathematical class, the Ethics class, the Dialectic class and the Rhetoric class."² Through this organized and formal training, he hoped to give these boys "a solid foundation for any more advanced instruction that they may receive in the future."³

Comenius completed his sketch of the Latin School by again making a few remarks concerning textbooks and time schedule. With respect to books, he recommends "that each class should have its own hand-book, dealing with some special branch of study."⁴ And on the subject of the school's horarium, he made the following remark:

The four hours of daily class instruction should be arranged as follows: the two morning hours should be devoted (as soon as morning prayer has been held) to the science or the art that forms the special

---

¹Ibid., p. 276.
²Ibid., pp. 275-276.
³Ibid., p. 275.
⁴Ibid., p. 280.
subject of the class. Of the afternoon hours the first should be given to history, and, in the second, the pupils should be made to exercise style, declamation, and the use of their hands, in accordance with the requirements of the class.¹

These are some of the highlights found in the organization of the curriculum of the Latin School.

To complete his curriculum pattern, Comenius proposed for the last rung of the educational ladder the University School, or what might be termed today, a Research Center. This school was exclusively opened to the brightest boys who had passed the public examination upon finishing their Latin School course, and who had proved themselves "diligent and of good moral character."² The chief aim of this institution of higher learning was to prepare candidates for the ministry, medicine, law, state government and teaching. On this level "the curriculum should be really universal, and provision should be made for the study of every branch of human knowledge."³ Comenius recognized the importance of research for the advancement of the arts and sciences and highly urged the faculty members of this "Universal College"

¹ Idem.
² Ibid., p. 282.
³ Ibid., p. 281.
to thoroughly establish the foundations of the sciences, to spread the light of wisdom throughout the human race with greater success than has hitherto been attained, and to benefit humanity by new and useful inventions; for, unless we wish to remain stationary or to lose ground, we must take care that our successful beginnings lead to further advances. For this no single man and no single generation is sufficient, and it is therefore essential that the work be carried on by many, working together and employing the researches of their predecessors as a starting point.  

In addition to this stress on research as an integral part of university training, Comenius, patterning himself on his predecessors, encouraged traveling as an effective means of obtaining direct information concerning human nature and its institutions.

In the light of the above description of the organization of Comenius' curriculum, it is evident that this thorough-going and practical seventeenth-century educator did present a rather distinctive and complete plan for the education of youth. For each age group he offered a neat arrangement of subjects to be taught along with the many specific details on how these subjects could best be handled. Therefore from the point of view of the vertical aspect of the organization of his curriculum, one can conclude that Comenius designed a well-defined, continuous and comprehensive curriculum pattern.

1 Ibid., p. 285.
With the many and varied changes wrought and the movements introduced within the two hundred years that separated Parker from Comenius, again there recurred need to reconsider both the vertical and horizontal aspects of the school curriculum. In America where the public school system had come of age, the problem was even greater. To accommodate the large influx of children attending elementary schools most school administrators had pinned their hopes on a neatly packaged course of study.

Its offerings it arranged as graded subjects, teaching them by a rigorous timetable, and assigning certain years for coming to terms with certain facts and operations. The effect was that, for all the massed wisdom of the world's foremost pedagogical minds, teaching in the public school was reduced to drumming knowledge into pupils, belaboring them stiffly with homework and examinations, goading the slow and exacting penalty from the loafers and skylarkers.¹

But soon innovators arose who challenged this neat scheme of organization and attempted to introduce a new curriculum pattern directed primarily toward making learning more meaningful and more appealing to all children. Parker was one of those pioneers who sought to plan a curriculum along more democratic principles. Because his plan of study was so new, the American teacher and administrator began cau-

tiously and offered a curriculum that was designed simply for the elementary school with most emphasis upon the primary grades and then, in accordance to this, he devised a curriculum for the normal school that was to prepare qualified teachers for these elementary schools. Unlike Comenius, Parker did not present a comprehensive, pansophic, continuous course of study. But what he did offer was a rather intensive and extensive elementary school curriculum that would adequately prepare the student for higher studies. It would seem pertinent at this point to briefly analyze the vertical aspect of the organization of Parker's curriculum.

Parker officially became involved in curriculum making in the year 1873 when he assumed the position of superintendent of the Quincy School System. Prior to this, he had spent two years visiting the European schools of the renowned schoolmasters. He returned to America with many new ideas concerning school organization. Although he did not adhere strictly to the rules of the Continental pedagogues, he did adopt some of their ideas, combined them with his own and produced a functional program of studies for American grade schools.

Fundamentally Parker's aim was to re-organize the eight-year elementary school curriculum so that it would
more effectively foster the growth and development of grade-
school children. Like Comenius, Parker set no limit to the
number and kinds of subjects to be taught, provided that
each subject had "its relations to other subjects; its
place as a means of mental development; and its utility
in the affairs of life."¹

Parker considered it the duty and responsibility of
each and every individual "to contribute all in his power
to the best good of all."² Thus reading, writing and
arithmetic were to be included in the curriculum not as
isolated subjects but rather as important parts of the
other activities in the school program. The following
remark about reading affirms Parker's views that the
school subjects are not separate subjects:

Reading in itself may be made; next to observation,
the greatest factor in education. Reading opens all
the historical records of the past, all the discus­
sions and discoveries that have been made throughout
the ages.³

Parker sees the subject of writing as "the second great
means of expression."⁴ In his opinion writing is instru-

¹Parker, Talks on Teaching, p. 92.
²Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 337.
³Parker, Talks on Teaching, p. 189.
⁴Ibid., p. 71.
mental in helping the teacher "get at and develop the individuality of the child." But writing, he says, is not the only mode of expression. Others are "gesture, voice, speech, music, making, modeling, painting, drawing." These are considered means, rather than ends, "to be continually used throughout the course of eight years . . . to intensify intrinsic and educative conscious activities." Even the study of numbers is to be approached with the notion that arithmetic is not an isolated subject. This is clearly illustrated in the following passage:

Arithmetic is an essential factor in every step of human progress. . . . Nothing useful can be made or constructed without the use of that mode of limitation called numbering. Not the simplest article of furniture, not an instrument, tool, machine, nor building, can be made without the measurement of weight and bulk of articles. There could be no relation of values without number. All progress in science, as has already been said, is absolutely dependent upon number. Any knowledge of Geography, Geology, Chemistry, and above all else Physics, is impossible without accurate measurements of volume, weight, force, and time. That mode of judgment which we call numbering enters into every activity of life, and into every relation of science or business.

---
1 Idem.
3 Ibid., p. 381.
4 Ibid., pp. 64-65.
In addition to study of the three R's as related subjects, Parker presents an extensive and a well-detailed view on the study of geography. It is his contention that geography is the core subject of all the physical sciences. He proves his point by advancing that:

The study of the structure of the earth's surface forms the natural basis of the study of all other Physical Sciences. A knowledge of the surface is the elementary study of the crust of the earth, and leads directly to Geology, and that to Mineralogy. Drainage determines the soil, upon soil and climate depends vegetation, thus leading directly to Botany. Upon the vegetation depends animal life, the study of which gives us the science of Zoology. The movements and phenomena pertaining to the structure give us both Physics and Physical Geography; the measurement of form and movement of the earth, Mathematical Geography; its parts and composition, Chemistry.¹

He added that geography is a subject "that delights children at every step, ... trains [them to] close observation, lays the foundation for the development of imagination, and forms the elementary steps of all physical sciences."²

History, as well as geography, had a distinctive place in Parker's curriculum. The study of history was indispensable among the "central subjects." He points out that history has its grass roots in the family, and then

¹Parker, Talks on Teaching, pp. 121-122.
²Ibid., p. 129.
in the school, and like geography is interrelated with many other subjects. On this matter Parker stated:

The study of family life is the child's beginning of the study of anthropology and of history. . . . Every human being with whom he comes in contact is a new study to him. The looks, the manners, the dress, the attitude, and the facial expression lead him to make his childish inferences. Then comes the kindergarten and the school . . . . Here the study, not only of history, but of civics, begins. . . . The child's home measure of life, the government of 'is home, give him democratic, monarchical, or socialistic principles. Whatever the rule of the home or school may be, that rule is ever afterwards either loved or hated by the child. Thus the child spontaneously begins the study of anthropology, ethnology, and history.1

Parker also showed how such other subjects as grammar, art, music, drawing, physical education and manual training were interrelated with other subjects. He also said the same of moral education. The principles of morality were simply the basis of better living and hence were to be taught throughout the entire curriculum and practiced at all times.

Every act of expression under true teaching is made an ethical act. . . . Education consists entirely in the presentation of conditions for the exercise and outworking of moral power. Therefore moral training which comprehends all education, consists in that teaching and training which leads to the designed development of the child; the realization of possibilities for good and growth.2

1 Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, pp. 11-12.
2 Ibid., pp. 347-348.
Hence, Parker proposes his doctrine of unification and correlation of all subjects of studies. In and out of season Parker repeats that "all study is a unit."\(^1\) It is the "convergence not \(\text{the} \) divergence\(^2\) of subjects that best promotes meaningful learning. "An ideal course of study," Parker stated, "consists of the presentation and arrangement of conditions and all the conditions, adapted to the steps and stages of a being's development."\(^3\) The most effective way to arrive at this is to train teachers in the science of education and in the art of teaching. From thence followed Parker's commitment to the professional training of teachers. In brief, then, Parker did work out an intensive-extensive curriculum for elementary schools. The distinctive mark of this curriculum is that it was organized along broad central lines of study so that all subjects would be interrelated, each one would advance learning and also contribute to the development of the whole child. In so doing, "Parker aligned himself with the Herbartians of his day, and built a course of study upon the doctrine of correlation and concentration

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 46.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 394.

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 398.
of studies."

With respect to textbooks Parker was very much dissatisfied with the then existing materials. In his experimental study at Quincy he abandoned the reader, the speller and the grammar texts to mention but a few. What he encouraged instead were "reading leaflets" made by the children, or other reading materials gathered from magazines, newspapers, and other sources. In the study of any subject he made use of direct experiences whenever possible. If books were to be used, the child was no longer to limit himself to one text but rather go to many in order to compare the information found and thereby stimulate the child to quest for truth. The library became the center of the child's intellectual life. Like Comenius, Parker advocated textbooks written for the child at his particular level of understanding but he added that they were to be made attractive, were to be well illustrated, and directed toward the fostering of meaningful learning. How to Study Geography was Parker's own contribution to the writing of a child's textbooks.

The only other level of instruction for which Parker proposed a curriculum of study was the normal school. From 1883 till the end of his life, his work and influence were greatly felt in the Cook County Normal School at Chicago and in its famous Practice School. He proposed a four-year college course and a two-year period of professional training in a school or college equipped for that purpose. With respect to the professional education of prospective teachers he suggested that such courses as history of education, psychology, pedagogy, content and methodology be given. No longer could incompetent and unprofessional teachers be tolerated. What he demanded were students who were thoughtful, earnest, scientific . . . ; students, who open and ready to accept all the past has to bring, at the same time have a profound faith that there is no abiding in the onward march toward higher and better things.

Teachers needed more effective and economical ways of teaching the new content cut along the lines of "central subjects." Also instruction in the art of teaching these

---


2 Parker, National Educational Association Proceedings, XXXIV (1895), 422.

3 Ibid., 421.
interrelated subjects became a must. It was for these reasons that Parker with the help of his faculty initiated the Practice School "as an indispensable means of close and careful study and investigation"¹ of the science of education and of the art of teaching. Under the leadership of a diligent, enthusiastic and openminded Director, working with a dedicated faculty, the Normal School with its Practice School became institutions for the training of teachers and "a national center of pedagogical reform where the experiments and investigations of the Practice School long antedated the schools of observation and practice in other public teacher education institutions."²

In juxtaposing the two curriculum patterns with respect to their vertical arrangement, one notices that Comenius' plan of education was more all embracing than Parker's. Whereas Comenius included the modern fourfold division of education—the kindergarten, the elementary, the secondary, and the college—Parker concentrated all his efforts on elementary and normal schools. Both educators introduced the whole gamut of subjects in their respective curriculum. They graded them according to the

²Bugg, p. 407.
level of the different age-groups. Then they organized them such that once a subject was introduced it was carried along so as to provide for continuity. With respect to the integration or correlation of studies, Parker was somewhat more concrete than Comenius. More in keeping with the traditional way of treating subjects, Comenius only implies the principle of correlation and this is pointed out in the following passage:

Great stress \(\text{should}\) be laid on the points of resemblance between cognate subjects.\(^1\)

And elsewhere, he stated:

All things that are naturally connected ought to be taught in combination.\(^2\)

But with Parker, the situation is different. He grouped the subjects according to broad areas of concentration which he called "central subjects." Perhaps one might see Comenius' arrangement more neatly packaged where order, system, and precision prevail. Without denying the advantages of such a curriculum, Parker saw certain disadvantages and this is what he noted in the existing course of study of his day. He found it too rigid, too dogmatic, and too inflexible with little or no room for expansion.

\(^1\)Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part II, p. 143.
\(^2\)Ibid., p. 164.
and improvement. What he advocated was a more flexible curriculum where the subjects would be classified along broader lines but where there would be introduced more freedom, more initiative, more personal responsibility in the use of subjects as means toward better education of youth. On the vertical arrangement of curriculum patterns then one can rightfully state that Comenius' curriculum was well-ordered, well-detailed and ready-made, whereas Parker's was more flexible, more democratic, more open and constantly changing to meet the needs of the child. These points bring out the contrasts found in the vertical organization of their curriculum patterns.

Now if one proceeds to examine the organization of the curriculum patterns according to the horizontal organization and that simply for the elementary level as Parker went no further on the education ladder except for the normal school in terms of elementary schools, one will soon discover that the two educators do have much in common. For instance, the list of the subjects to be taught at this level was basically the same. The three R's were considered important tools in learning and much was done to make these three subjects attractive to the child. Both masters highly encouraged the social and natural sciences. Drawing, painting, modeling were also added to foster
manual dexterity and individual expression. Manual training was considered a vital activity in the curriculum, for both saw the child as a worker whose "love and respect for hard, persistent work"\(^1\) should be sustained. Although there is the difference of correlation of subjects as mentioned above, both Comenius and Parker view all subjects as "means" to guide the child in his discovery of truth. Quality of knowledge rather than quantity was the concern of both schoolmasters. As far as the organization of the child's secular education, Comenius and Parker shared similar views. Again, as mentioned throughout this study, they differed somewhat in their views on the religious formation of the child. According to Comenius' program the child will learn of and about God chiefly through the study of religion, of nature, and of the Bible. In Parker's case, the child is led to knowledge of God chiefly through the study of nature. Except for these differences in the horizontal arrangement of the curriculum of the elementary school, there are enough points of similarity to advance that in general Comenius and Parker offered a parallel curriculum pattern for the education of the grade-school child.

Finally then what innovations did Comenius and

\(^1\)Parker, *Talks on Pedagogics*, p. 255.
Parker make in their respective program of studies? Though certain educational practices ushered into the curriculum because of their work and influence would seem to make the two men quite different one can at least compare them as "innovators." Their distinctive contributions to the curriculum should rightfully serve to show whether Parker can be considered the American-Comenius.

Comenius introduced changes in the curriculum because he saw these as necessary to realize his purpose, namely, to give general instruction to every human being. For the first time the mother-tongue was given an honorable place in the curriculum. Formal instruction was organized to teach the Vernacular throughout the six-year program of the Vernacular School. Comenius thought it irrational to teach any foreign language, be it Latin or any other, before sound knowledge of one's own language. To this subject he added the natural sciences as a means of contributing to the growth of scientific knowledge. By observing the physical world in a scientific way, the child could be led to a greater understanding of himself and of the world of nature. He could then discover many truths which might otherwise have been denied him. Another innovation made in the curriculum was the introduction of the mechanical arts. Aware that most students would terminate their
formal schooling with the Vernacular School, he initiated the teaching of the manual skills as a preparation for the world of work and life adjustment. Thus, his school paves the way for vocational training of future schools. In addition to the introduction of these new subjects—the vernacular, the natural sciences, and the mechanical arts—Comenius thought of a well-detailed course for the preschool child. Here, as a forerunner to the kindergarten movement, he suggested a mode of educating the young child that far surpassed many programs introduced later. Then for the top of the educational ladder, Comenius speaks of a Universal College devoted to the advancement of the Sciences. This idea was so new that even today after two hundred years there is still talk of establishing a Universal College or what might be called today, an International Research Center. In brief, these are some of the most distinctive contributions that permit calling Comenius an innovator. He attempted to expand the curriculum of his day by adding new subjects and by giving to the whole new dimensions, thereby making provisions for the further development of the education of youth.

Parker also saw the need for innovations in the curriculum. Like Comenius he expanded the program of studies not so much by adding "new" subjects as by
re-organizing the elementary school content into broad areas called "central subjects." Although he was not the originator of this so-called doctrine of concentration and correlation, he was the first American teacher to adapt it successfully and on such a large scale. He revitalized the whole elementary school program by making the three R's, the natural sciences, history and particularly geography much more meaningful to the child. Operating under more favorable democratic conditions than had Comenius, Parker was in a better position to denounce a traditional formalism in the curriculum planning. The school was to be considered a "laboratory learning center" where all the children would study the world about them in a very informal way. To this end he established a teacher training center at Cook County which is surely a milestone in the development of the teaching profession. Here students received formal instruction in the liberal arts, in the science of education and in the art of teaching. The new spirit found in this training center stemmed from "the study of children and their needs."¹ Such a setup for both academic and professional training of teachers could not but help

raise teaching to the rank of a profession. At Cook County Normal School, this is precisely what Parker did. These are a few of the innovations that Parker introduced as a curriculum maker. Like Comenius he broadened in some way the course of study for the grade-school child and then added a completely new dimension to education by establishing a center for the professional training of teachers.

This detailed study of the rationale behind Comenius' and Parker's pattern of the curriculum was highlighted by three important phases of curriculum making, namely, its nature, its organization, and the innovations introduced by the two educators. Both Comenius and Parker understood the curriculum to mean those subjects or those school activities that greatly foster meaningful learning. The quality of the subjects or activities rather than the quantity was to be the main stress. Because these two educators considered the needs of the child as having priority over subject-matter and the needs of society, they presented a child-centered curriculum. Differences are noticeable in the organization of their curriculum, significant differences in the vertical rather than in the horizontal arrangement of curriculum pattern. But there is sufficient evidence in the horizontal arrangement at the elementary level to warrant calling the two curriculum patterns
similar. Finally, Comenius and Parker can be called "innovators" in curriculum making. Both contributed to the improvement of curriculum and to the establishment of centers for higher education: Comenius in the University and Parker in the Normal School. These remarks on curriculum study add further evidence to validate the claim that Parker can be called the American-Comenius.

METHODS OF INSTRUCTION: COMENIUS AND PARKER

Following the curriculum, a second point in the practical application of one's theory of education is that of methodology. The choice of particular methods of instruction will presuppose some knowledge of how a teacher can best lead, or guide, or direct the learner toward the discovery of truth. There is then no doubt as to the teacher's role in the educative process. But before turning to her functions in the school, it might be well to inquire into the nature of the work she is called upon to do. Briefly stated, her task consists in determining "what is to be taught at a given time, the means by which it is to be taught, and the order in which it is to be taught."¹

Answers to these questions will lead one to see how, in addition to the curriculum, the choice of method of instruction is vital to the concretization and implementation of any theorist's objectives of education.

Like the curriculum, the methods of instruction have beginnings, variations and continuities. It would be safe to say that methods of instruction are affected to a large extent by the premium that society places on certain areas of knowledge and by the educators who at the time are capable of devising a method that will meet the demands of their respective societies. As a result new techniques of teaching do appear while old techniques are either modified, altered or even at times permitted to continue as such. To make this more specific let us check some of the highlights in the historical development of teaching. We will thereby see how new concerns and interests in society will affect the methods of teaching.

At one time in history when oratory was most popular, all educational effort was directed to the making of the eloquent man. Methods of instruction were chiefly geared

1The information on the historical development of method was gathered from Brubacher, A History of the Problems of Education (1966), pp. 167-210 and Gage (ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching, pp. 5-29.
to guiding the learner in the memorization of those literary forms and the imitation of those models of oratory that would help make him a good speaker. With a shift of emphasis from oratory to philosophy the style of instruction was somewhat modified. Here an attempt was made to incite the learner through exhortation and dialogue to a search for the ultimate norm of the good, the true, and the beautiful. Hence came the dialectical method with its stress on leading the student to reason correctly. Centuries later with the focus of attention on man's need for faith, the study of theology became a major concern for scholars. In order to understand more adequately the theological problems of the day, the schoolmen devised a method of instruction which up to this day bears their name—the Scholastic Method. The distinctive elements in this method were the lecture, the repetition, and the disputation. Butts described these forms as follows:

The lecture consisted primarily of reading aloud from the textbook by the master and then his commenting upon the material line by line. The repetition was basically a review and perhaps recitation of the material of the lectures and textbooks, and the disputation was a formal elaboration by students who argued, defended, and attacked certain theses according to established rules for organization.¹

¹Butts, p. 193.
Systematically arranged to promote thought, this method of teaching was primarily directed toward assisting the students reconcile faith and reason. With the revival of classical learning during the Renaissance other changes and stresses occurred in the ways of teaching. The humanists stressed skill in the speaking and writing Latin and in the appreciation of style. Oral reading and recitation became the prevailing methods of imparting knowledge and developing skills. This method of teaching sought to form the cultured gentleman. But again the structure and the ideals of society changed. New demands were made. Political leaders and educators became concerned about education with the rise of nations, the Reformation, the scientific discoveries. How could education best contribute to the development of youth? The ideals and the claims of the new structured societies were quite different from those of the past. One such claim that in this writer's opinion forced a change in educational matters was that stressing the need for a real, practical, and universal education. This necessarily called for a re-examination of the existing system of education, with its aims, its curriculum and its methods of teaching. This state of affairs became particularly evident in the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. Perhaps one could attribute this change to
the many scientific discoveries and inventions. At any rate the educational theorists were impressed by the sciences and turned to them in the hope of discovering better means of educating youth. Compayre aptly presented the distinctive character of this new system of teaching when he stated:

No more setting out with abstract principles, imposed by authority; but facts intuitively apprehended, gathered by observation and verified by experiment; the order of nature faithfully followed; a cautious progression from the simplest and most elementary ideas to the most difficult and most complex truths; the knowledge of things instead of an analysis of words. 1

As a result methods of teaching were directed to observation and direct experience with real, concrete objects under the guiding principle, "Follow Nature." Hence, the commonly known "natural method" of teaching was born.

This historical survey of changes in the concept of methodology serves to support the statement advanced earlier that methods of teaching will be somewhat affected by the many and varied demands of society and by educational theorists who more than less are capable of implementing their aims of education and satisfying the needs of their society via a practical formulation of instruction. Although each educational theorist has contributed to the improvement of teaching the question of the right method

is forever being asked. Efforts will constantly be made in this direction as long as the structures and the ideals of society change and educational theorists come to grips with these needs and interests of their respective societies.

Without being presumptuous in any way, one could conclude that Comenius and Parker were two educators who, though somewhat influenced by societal structures and ideals, proposed their own particular views on a concept for the instruction of youth. At any rate their chief concern was to instruct the learner in that knowledge and those skills deemed essential by their cultures. A possible way of analyzing their concept of method might be by considering first their meaning of method, secondly the principles they chose as guidelines, and finally their application of these principles. The information garnered could serve to further substantiate that Parker's educational views on method somewhat parallel those of Comenius.

Before presenting Comenius' meaning of "method," consideration must be given to the general meaning of the word, "method." Method may be looked upon as a form of experience, a way of treating subject matter, a procedure for stimulating the learner's intellectual curiosity or even a form of determining the most effective things that will not only change the learner's behavior but also lead him to
understand what he is doing. In all these cases one does not speak of method as just any way, any form, or any procedure to impart knowledge, to develop skills and to form character. Rather when one hears the term "method" one automatically thinks of a well-ordered way, a well-structured form or a well-organized procedure which stems from a teacher's awareness of "the gradual differentiation of certain elements of experiences" and which under her guidance are ordered "to give the course or sequence of experience a direction that is desirable."\(^1\) Or one might refer to method as "the formal structure of the sequence of acts commonly denoted by instruction"\(^2\) which consists in ordering the what and the how of teaching. And again one might consider method as

a body of general educational principles which will serve as a guide to /the teacher's/ professional activities.\(^3\)

Regardless of the words used to describe method the essence seems to be ways, devices, techniques that through successful experience have been arrived at for the purpose of guiding the learner step by step in acquiring the knowledge

\(^2\) Gage, p. 3.
and skills demanded of his culture.

Comenius who is regarded by Laurie as the true founder of modern method\(^1\) was an educational theorist who sensed that the then prevailing methods of teaching were no longer adequate to meeting the demands of his society. Aware of the contributions that the sciences had made to man and his world, he believed that science could serve as "an immovable rock" upon which universal principles of instruction could be anchored. He was particularly disturbed by the uncertainty and the superficiality of the existing methods of teaching and resolved to give methodology a new direction. He explained the situation as follows:

Hitherto the method of instruction has been so uncertain that scarcely any one would dare to say: 'In so many years I will bring this youth to such and such a point; I will educate him in such and such a way.' We must therefore see if it be possible to place the art of intellectual discipline on such a firm basis that sure and certain progress may be made.

Since this basis can be properly laid only by assimilating the processes of art as much as possible to those of nature, we will follow the method of nature.\(^2\)

Hence, began Comenius' task of setting up a method of instruction or "a manner of teaching"\(^3\) that would guarantee

\(^1\)S. S. Laurie, *John Amos Comenius* (1892), p. 222.


\(^3\)Ibid., p. 104.
to all men a knowledge of all things "quickly, pleasantly,"
and thoroughly."¹ He assumed that if the educator followed
the method of arriving at truth used by scientists, that is,
the observation of natural phenomena, then he would be able
to devise methods of instruction more in harmony with the
natural development of the child who himself is bound by
certain natural laws of development. To this end Comenius
ventured "to watch the operations of nature carefully"² in
the hope of applying these to his method of teaching. From
these observations emerged a new method of teaching formu­
lated upon "the principles of natural development."³

There are several basic principles foundational to
Comenius' concept of method of instruction. Consideration
will here be given to two such principles, namely, the
principle of order and the principle of interest because a
close examination of The Great Didactic reveals that these
two principles stand out in Comenius' methodology more than
any other. Hence it seems legitimate to say that these two
principles could have served as primary guides in Comenius'
development of his concept of method.

¹Ibid., p. 3.
²Ibid., p. 100.
³Broudy and Palmer, p. 96.
To achieve his aim of education, namely, to teach all men all things, the seventeenth-century realist adopted the principle of order as education's first law. He gave the following explanation for his choice.

We find on investigation that the principle which really holds together the fabric of this world of ours, down to its smallest detail, is none other than order; that is to say, the proper division of what comes before and what comes after, of the superior and the subordinate, of the large and the small, of the similar and dissimilar, according to place, time, number, size, and weight, so that each may fulfill its function well. Order, therefore, has been called the soul of affairs. For everything that is well ordered preserves its position and its strength as long as it maintains its order.

As a result, the underlying principle in determining the proper method of teaching is the establishment of this sense of order. When this order, that is, "the skilful arrangement of time, of the subjects taught and of the method," has been thoroughly secured, Comenius conceives that it will be no harder to teach schoolboys in any number desired, than with the help of the printing-press to cover a thousand sheets daily with the neatest writing.

However exaggerated this remark might appear, it does serve

---

1 Rusk, p. 97.
3 Ibid., p. 96.
4 Idem.
to reveal that Comenius placed great hope in a method founded upon the principle of order. Just as order is an essential element in the developmental process of natural phenomena so should order be the guiding principle in setting up a method of instruction.

To reinforce this notion Comenius presents a rather interesting analysis of some of the workings of nature. Perhaps as Rusk would say, this is done not so much to support as in support of some preconceived principle. Although modern educational researchers would somehow question the value and the power of Comenius' use of analogies from natural processes as the proper way of establishing guiding principles for teaching, the attempt that he made should be recognized for it did serve to systematize the art of teaching. As Monroe once remarked with respect to Comenius' position on this particular issue: "The processes of the growth of external things had a close resemblance to the growth of mind." A few concrete examples of Comenius' study could be of some benefit here.

In observing how the birds wait for an appropriate time for mating, how the gardener chooses the right season

---

1 Rusk, p. 97.
2 Laurie, John Amos Comenius (1885), p. 214.
to take care of his plants, one could possibly conclude that the teacher should do likewise in instructing the learner. It is of paramount importance to note that "Nature observes a suitable time." From this observation Comenius offered the following suggestion on the application of this principle of order in teaching.

(1) The education of men should be commenced in the springtime of life, that is to say, in boyhood.
(2) The morning hours are the most suitable for study.
(3) All the subjects that are to be learned should be arranged so as to suit the age of the students, that nothing which is beyond their comprehension be given them to learn.

A second example taken from the same chapter sixteen of The Great Didactic further substantiates that a method of teaching should be guided by the principle of order. Here again, after observing how the bird creates and then cares for one of his, how the builder builds and how the gardener gardens, Comenius concludes that a certain order is needed if the task to be done is to be accomplished effectively. "Nature prepared the material, before she begins to give it form." Likewise the same

---

1 Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part II, p. 112.
2 Ibid., p. 114.
3 Idem.
can be said of teaching. If one wishes to teach more effectively, one has to prepare and then follow some kind of sequence. On this matter Comenius suggested the following:

(1) That books and the materials necessary for teaching be held in readiness.
(2) That the understanding be first instructed in things and then taught to express them in language.
(3) That no language be learned from a grammar, but from suitable authors.
(4) That the knowledge of things precede the knowledge of their combinations.
(5) And that examples come before rules.¹

A final observation again based upon the workings of nature led Comenius to formulate the following statement: "Nature makes no leaps, but proceeds step by step."² One has only to observe the little chick as it goes through the different developmental processes of life, or the builder as he builds, or the gardener as he gardens. In all cases, a certain order is observed. Similarly in the art of teaching, some order has to be followed. And based upon this, Comenius gave the following prescriptions:

(1) That all studies should be carefully graduated throughout the various classes, in such a way that those that come first may prepare the way for and throw light on those that come after.
(2) That the time should be carefully divided, so that each year, each month, each day, and each hour may have

¹Ibid., p. 116.
²Ibid., p. 123.
its appointed task.

(3) That the division of the time and of the subjects of study should be rigidly adhered to, that nothing may be omitted or perverted.

These examples then prove beyond a doubt that Comenius considered the principle of order as "the soul of affairs." In his view, a method of teaching guided by the principle of order will be blessed with better direction, more certainty and surer outcomes.

To the principle of order, one must add the principle of interest. The principle of interest is selected in preference to such others as the principle of induction, the principle of correlation because it pertains more strictly to education in that it stresses the interest of the learner and the interest of the subject matter, two basic elements of the teaching process. Furthermore, this principle of interest like the principle of order serves to individuate, to characterize Comenius' system of instruction.

The word "interest" commonly evokes a preference for a certain course of action accompanied by some feeling of excitement. More formally, the term "interest" may be used "as synonymous with a concern, a value, a dominant direction of thought and action, an occupation that is

\[ \text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 124. \]
I persistently important."¹ When the word "interest" is applied to matters educational, it is commonly looked upon as that element, that factor necessary to directing the teacher or the educational theorist, as the case may be in the detection of those "points of genuine and intimate contact between the subject matter of instruction and the vital experience of pupils."² It is this latter meaning that Comenius attached to the word "interest" for he was highly concerned in setting up a method of teaching that would establish a favorable and pleasant relation between the learner and the subject matter. It was also his conviction that if all men are to be educated quickly, surely, and pleasantly then a method of instruction directed by the thought, action and interest of the individual learner should prove highly recommendable. It is a known fact that learning cannot be forced. But it is equally known that learning can be promoted if in the method of instruction there is some effort expended to relating learning to the interests of the learner. The following statements culled from The Great Didactic rightfully serve to show how the principle of interest was considered es-

²Ibid., p. 472.
sentential in Comenius' development of a concept of methodology.

But first, it must be added that one would be disillusioned if he expected to find a well-defined doctrine of interest in Comenius' methodology. However, even if this principle of interest is not as prominent in Comenius' educational theory as it later came in the romantic naturalism of Rousseau and Pestalozzi, in Herbart's doctrine of interest and even later in Dewey's theory of self-activity, it still remains an important guideline in his mapping out a method of teaching. Perhaps one would be safer to say that Comenius settled for showing the merits of the principle of interest rather than for structuring a doctrine of interest. At any rate what the school reformer had foremost in mind was to convince his audience by the use of analogical materials that "a genuine and intimate contact" between the learner and his subject matter is necessary in methodology. However crude and fanciful his examples may have been, they certainly served him well.

For instance, Comenius suggests that one way to facilitate teaching as well as learning is to provide subjects or areas of study that appeal to and interest the young. One has only to consider the gardener, claims Comenius. If he wishes his plant to grow, he must
provide breath with moisture and with warmth, take pleasure in its vigorous growth." Here Comenius is alluding to the need of establishing some kind of a bond, or a concern or an interest between the gardener and the object of his work—in this case, the plants. However simple this analogy might be, it can have great value when transferred to the art of teaching. If care be taken to set up a method of instruction that is "palatable", then the desire to know and to learn should be highly kindled in the learner. No matter how heavy and how serious the object of learning might be, if it is "placed before the learner in a familiar and attractive manner" an interest will be created between the learner and the subject matter and learning will take place more readily and more pleasantly. On this matter Comenius further remarked:

The subjects of instruction themselves prove attractive to the young, if they are suited to the age of the pupil and are clearly explained; especially if the explanation be relieved by a humorous or at any rate by a less serious tone. For thus the pleasant is combined with the useful.

Moreover one way to enhance learning is to keep alive this interest in the learner. A method of teaching that uses

1 Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part II, p. 129.
2 Ibid., p. 132.
3 Ibid., p. 131.
"interest" as a guideline cannot help but maintain a favorable relation between the learner and the content to be learned.

In reference to the need for a foundation or for roots in teaching and learning, Comenius again suggests applying the principle of interest. With no hesitation whatsoever he cannot conceive that a learner would persist in intellectual pursuits "without inclination, without attention, and without intelligence." Although all three factors of inclination, attention and intelligence are important, Comenius does accentuate the need to consider the learner's inclination. He sees it as necessary to laying down the foundations or the roots of learning. Inevitably he returns to nature and from his observation of the workings of natural phenomena he then draws the following guideline: "Nature does not operate on anything, unless it possess a foundation or roots." If nature herself needs a solid foundation to operate, all the more does the learner whose task of learning is much more complex. Hence arises the need to study the learner's inclination, his concerns or in other words, his interests in order to

1 Ibid., p. 146.
2 Ibid., p. 145.
develop in him a taste for knowledge fundamental in the pursuit of intellectual endeavors. On this matter Comenius prescribed the following course of action:

Every study should be commenced in such a manner as to awaken a real liking for it on the part of the scholars, and this should be done by proving to them how excellent, useful, pleasant, and otherwise desirable it is. The desire to learn should be thoroughly awakened in the pupils, and that the general conception of the subject should be thoroughly got into their heads. Until this has been carefully done a more detailed exposition of the art or language should not be attempted.  

If a real liking and a strong desire for knowledge are prerequisites for the learner's enjoying his intellectual pursuits and if by considering the interests of the learner there is a great possibility of developing a taste for knowledge, then, according to Comenius, these two reasons suffice to consider the "interests" of the learner in the process of outlining a method of teaching. Comenius who was a keen observer and a very understanding schoolmaster could not conceive of a method of teaching operating, as Piaget remarked, "in a vacuum or mere breaking-in through action." What he discerned as fundamental in a method of teaching was the thought, the action, the

---

1 Ibid., p. 146.
2 Comenius, Selections, p. 19.
response or in one word, the activity of the learner. He surely struck the right key when he recommended:

Do not undertake any teaching without first arousing the interest of the pupil.\(^1\)

A method of instruction that considers in a reasonable way the interests of the learner is bound to promote learning with greater meaning, effectiveness and thoroughness. It is to this end that Comenius used the principle of interest as a directive in promoting better teaching and more effective and productive learning.

As a consequence, this different approach to teaching tended to stress the needs and interests of the learner rather than of the teacher. As the learner became the central figure in education, more and more stress was given to encouraging him to be active in both the teaching and the learning processes. One high point in his method according to Comenius was "individual thinking." He deplored the fact that the learner had not been favored with opportunities for personal thinking during the educative process. The prevalent method of teaching had encouraged him more than less to using "the eyes of others, and to

\[^1\text{Idem.}\]

\[^2\text{Comenius, \textit{The Great Didactic}, Part II, p. 148.}\]
procedure could in no way foster original thinkers. With this type of training, Comenius stated that most men possess no information but the quotations, sentences, and opinions that they have collected by rummaging about in various authors, and thus piece their knowledge together like a patchwork quilt.¹

But now by focusing upon the interests of the learner in devising a method of teaching, the teacher would become more aware of the needs of the learner. He would then be in a better position to bring the learner to realize that the acquisition of knowledge is a personal, an individual affair. Besides if one wishes to learn and to gain from his knowledge, he must be willing to think for himself. One sure way to excite in the learner a taste for this knowledge would be to arouse his curiosity and his attention by presenting to him appealing subjects.

Although the use of this principle of interest did not originate with Comenius, he was perhaps the first schoolmaster to concretize it, to use it in a functional way in the schools. In so doing, he directed teaching towards the needs, the interests of the learner. However simple this tactic might be, it served to give his methodology a particular character: the teaching of individuals

¹Ibid., p. 148.
rather than the teaching of subject matter.

As one can see from the above discussion Comenius conceived of a method of teaching as those procedures that are well-ordered in accordance with principles arrived at from an observation of the workings of natural phenomena. Through his study of the laws of nature the seventeenth-century realist seemed to have chosen the principles of order and of interest as main guidelines or directives in promoting better methods for the acquisition of the knowledge and skills prescribed by his culture. As a result, methodology was given new life. More and more teaching became directed toward the needs and interests of the learner. Here one finds the formal beginning of child-centered schools.

Following from this new impetus given methodology by Comenius in the seventeenth century it would seem natural to expect progress along those lines up to and through the second half of the nineteenth century. But as mentioned earlier new trends in educational practices often have difficulty making headway in the schools. It is certainly quite disheartening to see how few of Comenius' sound educational recommendations had become accepted school practice by the time Parker appeared on the scene. This statement in no way implies that during the two hundred years that
separate Comenius from Parker little had been done by educators to improve teaching. What is being emphasized is that traditional methods of teaching were still strongly prevalent. Memorization, imitation, drill for drill's sake, and textbook learning were still the rule. On the whole methods of teaching aimed at quantity rather than quality of knowledge. Little if no attention was given to the needs and interests of the learner. As a result teaching still tended to regiment the learners, to press them into a mould. This aspect of education Parker totally rejected. In no way did this American teacher ever speak in behalf of "mechanical methods." Continually watching for the "new revelations out of the wonderland of childhood,"\(^1\) he sought all his life for that method of instruction which would lead the child "by the shortest line of resistance towards freedom, the goal of human progress."\(^2\)

Like his European predecessor, Comenius, the American schoolmaster "was concerned . . . with methods of teaching."\(^3\) It was his contention "that all the teaching in our schools, if Nature be followed, will bring decided

\(^1\)Mayo, Journal of Education, XVIII (August, 1883), 84.
\(^2\)Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 376.
\(^3\)Curti, p. 380.
and permanent pleasure."¹ In his concept of methodology he abandoned the gospel of old-fashioned teaching and subscribed to a procedure or technique that enhanced the free, proper, and natural development of each child's native endowments. Methods of teaching "that strictly conformed to the laws of development"² were the surest and most effective means to sound teaching. Such teaching procedures would serve to lay the foundations of a happy life for the child. This, as have often been stated was the primary aim of all Parker's educational endeavors. Parker thought that unless the child's right to be himself be recognized, he could hardly be happy and develop his mind, body and soul harmoniously.

This is the central point. Every act, thought, plan, method, and question should lead to the harmonious growth of the whole being.³

Foremost in Parker's thoughts and actions was that methods of teaching be absolutely fixed by the developmental laws of the child. "The art of teaching," declared Parker, "discriminates the individual, distinguishes him from all others, and applies the means needed for personal devel-

¹ Parker, Talks on Teaching, p. 158.
² Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 377.
³ Parker, Talks on Teaching, p. 18.
It is the "being" to be educated that determines the methods to be used.

Following the aforementioned comments it is not surprising to hear Parker remark that the particular virtue of method was "to suggest, guide." He could not conceive of a method of instruction confined to "certain fixed details." Rather he viewed "method" in the hands of the artist-teacher as the way he or she reaches an ideal. Therefore, method is entirely personal, ever changing, ever improving.

In this definition of method, Parker singles out the need for that personal approach to instruction. This element he considered fundamental to methodology. A method should serve as a guide, as a compass to the teacher but never as a fixed pattern.

Elsewhere Parker explained "method" as the adaptation of means of growth to mind to be developed, and natural method is the exact adaptation of means of growth to mind to be developed.

---

1 Parker, *Talks on Pedagogics*, p. 394.
2 Ibid., p. 393.
3 Parker, *Talks on Teaching*, p. 17.
4 Address of Colonel Parker, *the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Quincy Movement*, p. 3.
5 Parker, *Talks on Teaching*, p. 19.
Again he reiterated the same idea in his discussion on moral training when he declared that

The true method of teaching is the exact adaptation of the subject taught, or means of growth, to the learning mind.

From these few definitions one can easily perceive that flexibility is the essential element in such a method. Defining method as "the adaptation of means of growth to the learner's mind" suggests that Parker subscribed to a method of teaching where change, choice, personal freedom and improvement were the rule. Teaching now became injected with a new spirit. Perhaps it was the combination of his idealistic and pragmatic views on life that led him to see the power in such an approach to teaching when entrusted to teachers who would know how to "adapt" the proper conditions to the mind of the learner. Because the American school-teacher placed so much faith in flexibility in method of teaching does not indicate that there should be no governing principles. On the contrary, throughout his Talks on Teaching he points out that the study of principles is indispensable in promoting effective teaching.

In the beginning, then, the study of methods aside from principles is of little use; therefore that investigation should lead to a knowledge of principles is

---

1 Ibid., p. 168.
all-important.¹

In one instance he went so far as to say that without sound principles the teacher would be "an easy prey to the countless devices and methods which infect the educational market."² To avoid this pitfall then, he constantly urged teachers "to work from principle and have the courage to be crude."³ Teachers if they are real teachers had to be willing to explore, to investigate on their own. And so Method should never be prescribed; each teacher should have the freedom of choices, to work independently, aided by tactful suggestions and directions.⁴

But, knowledge of well-grounded principles is essential to the teacher so that she may use these as "guides" impersonally determining in an intelligent and prudent manner what "adaptations of means of growth" would be most feasible. In short, methods are a means to an end and must be devised in terms of that end.

¹Ibid., p. 19.
²Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 391.
Since in methods of teaching Parker was primarily concerned with "the adaptation of the subjects to the mind of the learner," one could expect him to base his concept of method upon certain principles which he arrived at by a careful analysis of the laws of mental action taken in connection with the subjects to be taught. Unlike Comenius who derived his principles of teaching primarily from the scientific observation of the workings of nature, Parker based his on the actual life-experiences of the child. "Observation, investigation, imagination, and original inference"\(^1\) were the means that Parker suggested in studying the child in his activities. From one's conclusion a method of teaching could be formulated and adopted.

As with Comenius, there are several principles embodied in Parker's concept of methodology. For this study, two such principles will be highlighted—the principle of correlation and the principle of spontaneity. These two principles have been chosen in preference to such others as the principles of democracy, of attention, of creativity, of individuality, because it is this writer's belief that these two adequately incorporate all the basic

\(^1\)Parker, *Talks on Pedagogics*, p. 378.
elements of the Parkerian method. Also, these two principles seem to be in keeping with Parker's definition of "method" where he shows himself concerned chiefly with those "adaptations" that will contribute to the development of the whole being. This demands that everything shall be brought in which will concentrate and expand ideas and develop right habits.\(^1\)

Hence, the principle of correlation and the principle of spontaneity could rightfully be considered as those guidelines that stand out in Parker's new concept of instruction. A study of the role that these two principles play in the teaching of reading, for instance, should enhance understanding of the Parkerian view of method.

Teaching is obviously more than transmitting, or giving, or telling; it is leading or directing the child toward the realization of his full potential. To make possible this tremendous task in the most economical and effective way, Parker declared that

\[
\text{It is the part of teaching to present educative conditions for effective acts of consciousness needed for the highest self-effort.}^2
\]

Teaching according to Parker's theory calls for a method


\(^{2}\)Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 262.
that can best promote "self-effort" in the learner. Learning being a personal matter can be greatly enhanced if the method of instruction is primarily directed to intensifying thought and action. A method of teaching operating under such circumstances is bound "to lead the unfolding powers of childhood into channels of activity."¹

Reading Parker's chief works with this idea in mind--stimulating in the child his capacity for thought and action--will lead one to conclude that the method of teaching here proposed or at least suggested is founded upon the principle of correlation defined as "the correlation of thought with all the modes of expression,"² and the principle of spontaneity, described as the spontaneous activities of the child to different energies.³ Perhaps influenced by the Herbartian thought, Parker clearly saw the advisability of a method of teaching that would correlate or group several of the elementary school subjects as a unit for the purpose of heightening the child's natural and spontaneous reactions. This Parker

¹Lane, The Elementary School Teacher and Course of Study, (June, 1902), 702.
³Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 5.
claimed is the natural way the child learns. The child does not see the need to isolate the subjects. He spontaneously and unconsciously reacts to all the subjects because they act upon him and educate him. This is explicitly brought out in the following quote:

Watch a crowd of children upon the beach gathering pebbles and curious stones. They are interested in the color and form of the pebbles, and may be made exceedingly interested in the origin of the different forms, if some kind, observant friend is there to continue the questions which the stones themselves ask.

Hence a method of instruction that respects these natural and spontaneous activities of the child should be proposed. It would have the advantage of economizing the learner's educative energy on one hand, and of enhancing and developing the power of original thinking, inference and consequent generalization on the other. For what Parker found wanting in the existing methods of instruction was "that power to understand new phases of thought, to discover and to adapt new conditions to new needs."

And so foremost in Parker's thought was a method of instruction particularly designed to intensifying the unity of the learner's thought and expression in the hope of

providing better and greater "educative conditions" for awakening this "true consciousness", so fundamental in the development of one's native endowments.

As was mentioned earlier Parker's method of teaching was based upon the principles of correlation and of spontaneity. This can perhaps better be seen through a detailed analysis of the use of these two principles in the teaching of reading. The choice of reading as a subject is arbitrary for whatever principle the American schoolmaster did advance for teaching in general, he also maintained for the teaching of any particular subject.

Fundamental to Parker's concept of method is that real teaching is "thought development."¹ He conceived "method" as an ever changing process whose chief concern is to enhance and to intensify mental action. Getting the learner to think and providing him with opportunities to express his thoughts seemed to form the core of his concept of "method." In his attempt to work out some procedure for the teaching of reading he offered the following opinion:

Each and every step in the development of reading-power must be taken under the immediate impulse of intrinsic thought.²

¹Parker, Talks on Teaching, p. 86.
²Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 205.
Consequently such a method of teaching had of necessity to give priority to the development and the reproduction of thought rather than to the study of forms. Formerly, Parker remarked, stress had been on the study of forms. Educators had worked out their method of teaching by adopting in some way the old theory which stated that forms must be first learned by themselves for use thereafter in the development of thought-power. ¹

Whatever merits this procedure might have had in the art of teaching, it did not square with Parker's new views. He sought first a "thought method," one that would "continue in the best possible way the spontaneous activities of the child in the directions which nature had so effectively begun."² On this matter Parker remarked that several educators among whom he named Comenius had already attempted to develop a method that would primarily enhance the unification of thought and expression, thus making learning more profitable, more useful and more meaningful. He commented on the pioneering of Comenius in this "thought method." He stated that his method of teaching in general

¹ Idem.
² Ibid., p. 203.
had consisted in arousing the appropriate activities in order to make the associations more effective. 1

In the teaching of reading, this meant "to associate the appropriate activities and the word by means of pictures." 2 However crude and simple Comenius' attempt had been, Parker welcomed it for it served to open new horizons on methodology. From these early beginnings of teaching reading by associating the proper activity and the word by means of pictures evolved the teaching of reading by the object method, the word method, the sentence method. In each one of these different phases of the so-called "thought method" there appeared one common factor: to minimize the difficulty in learning to read by providing better acts of association for the "effect of the word and the appropriate activities." 3 From these various experiments Parker drew the general principle that "whatever assists in acts of association ... may be used in teaching reading." 4 In turn he listed the following secondary guidelines for the teaching of reading:

1 Ibid., p. 197.
2 Ibid., p. 198.
3 Ibid., p. 194.
(1) Every printed word must be learned by one of more acts of association.
(2) The less the number of acts required to function a word, the greater the economy.
(3) The greatest economy in learning a word would be, therefore, one act of association.¹

Perhaps it was this last statement that led Parker to go a step further, namely, to discover those "conditions that [would] bring about those acts of consciousness by which a word may be most economically learned."² He realized that the fewer acts of associations used in learning to read, the better the method. Also he had the feeling that difficulties in associating word with appropriate activity could be minimized, if not overcome, "under the white heat of thought."³ With this in mind he formulated his "thought method" for the teaching of reading on the assumption "that children can learn to read as they learn to talk,"⁴ because each child has "the desire to make known to others cumulation and climax of thought."⁵

From his many teaching experiences Parker knew that

---

¹Ibid., p. 195.
²Idem.
³Ibid., p. 199.
⁴Parker, The Course of Study, I (July, 1900), 13.
⁵Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 240.
surround him. Everything in the world of nature interested him, aroused his curiosity, and stimulated his thinking. In certain instances the child can be so absorbed by the workings of nature that it would take very few acts of association to help him learn to read a word presented under such moments of intense consciousness. On this matter Parker made the following remarks which substantiate the views advanced earlier:

The use of pictures and objects, as I (Parker) have already said, is a tendency in the right direction; but we find in the study of the central subjects, in the study of geography, physics, mineralogy, and botany, an inexhaustible source of pleasure and of interest. We see also that in the study of these subjects there is an organic growth and development of thought, that the thought itself has an organic body, and that that body is continually growing if the right conditions are used.¹

What Parker is explicitly stating is that teaching of reading or any other subject would be highly effective if in the method of instruction due consideration and attention were given to correlating thought and expression instead of isolating them. If the teacher begins with the study of central subjects, she has at hand ample pleasing and interesting materials to arouse the child's curiosity, to keep his mind active and open to all that is operating around him. Having first set his mind to thinking,

she can then present the word to be taught. As Parker aptly states:

The child learns to read when the printed words best help him in thinking. . . . Instead, then, of the child's being plunged into a labyrinth of empty words, his mind is aroused and quickened by vital, interesting thought in science, geography, and history, and out of these in a perfectly natural way come the learning to read and the reading.\(^1\)

Even if one is to follow the "natural method," Parker did suggest a course of action that has proven quite successful.

. . . present the object (a favorite one of the child's), and say the word, not with the lips, but with the chalk. The child's consciousness is filled with interest for the object, leaving just room enough for the new form to find a resting-place.\(^2\)

It is assumed that the object to which Parker is alluding is one taken from the child's environment and to which the child has spontaneously reacted or at least in which he has manifested some kind of interest. Otherwise Parker's "thought method" would be no different from that of other educators who had formulated certain practices for the teaching of reading.

In addition to the use of objects, "drawings upon the blackboard made under the eye of the pupil, pictures,

\(^1\)Parker, *The Course of Study*, I (July, 1900), 13.
\(^2\)Parker, *Talks on Teaching*, p. 28.
conversations, and stories," \(^1\) could be used as means to help the child correlate thought and expression in a freer, more natural manner. By starting the child to read under such natural and pleasant circumstances, the teacher can easily lead the child into several fields of knowledge, extending both meanings and sensitivity all along the way. This "thought method" would then present those "educative conditions" so essential in promoting the right to live in a rich environment, to exercise to the full all their (children's) powers of expression and to leave every avenue to their souls open and in use.\(^2\)

Hence from this exposé one can acquire a better understanding of Parker's concept of method and its application in the teaching of reading. Perhaps there is no better statement to adequately summarize Parker's concept of method than the one he himself made when he quoted Delsarte whose statement on expressive power had read:

\[
\text{Strength at the center, freedom at the surface is the true condition of being.}\quad ^3
\]

This concise but meaningful statement would seem to contain the Parkerian concept of method as it has been discussed below.

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 32.


\(^3\)Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 265.
here. It may be interpreted as follows: "Strength at the center" could refer to that power Parker intended to develop in each child through correlating or unifying the thought and action of the learner in a natural way; "freedom at the surface" could be interpreted as those "spontaneous activities" Parker so highly advocated as the surest means of developing thought expression; "the true condition of being" could mean that the child could best be himself if the proper combination of the two principles, namely, the principle of correlation and the principle of spontaneity, is established for the natural development of the child's whole being. Thus, one finds in this concise statement Parker's idea of methodology.

At this point an attempt could be made to compare the Comenian and Parkerian concept of method. With Comenius and Parker method meant a way, a procedure not only for imparting knowledge and acquiring skills but also for realizing the learner's potential through the application of the laws of Nature. Interested in quality and in meaningful learning the two educators presented a method that stressed the training of the senses, the use of real and concrete materials and the active participation of the learner in every learning situation. Despite the fact that both educators were architects of a "thought method" of
instruction founded upon natural, logical and psychological principles of learning, there are certain distinctive features worth mentioning in the Comenian and the Parkerian concept of method.

First, the manner in which the two educators arrived at certain basic principles essential to giving a sense of direction at times varied. From the present study it becomes evident that Comenius drew his pedagogical principles primarily by observing the workings of natural phenomena while Parker discovered his instructional guidelines from an observation of the life-experience of children. Despite this relatively minor difference in method, both worked out a new and rather similar approach to instruction based on the natural laws of the developmental phases of the child's growth instead of on abstract principles imposed by some authority and not arrived at through experimental studies.

Secondly, as both educators worked from principles, it would be legitimate to find a variety of them embodied within their concept of method. For convenience's sake a choice was necessary. However it seems that the choice of the principles of order and interest best represented the direction Comenius took in mapping out his concept of instruction while the principles of correlation and spon-
taneity seemed to serve as the leading guidelines that moved Parker in formulating his method of teaching. But, in no way are these four principles fundamental to these two educators' approach to the "thought method," totally mutually exclusive one of the other. Obviously no one can deny that the principle of order stands prominent in Comenius' thought. One has but to read a few passages in *The Great Didactic* to sense this order, this well-organized and well-structured system of teaching. Every step, every move, is framed by certain fixed principles. In reading Parker's *Talks on Teaching*, however, one gets a quite different view of a method of teaching. If he mentions the principle of order and he does as was seen earlier in the description of the teaching of reading, he but suggests it as a *protective* measure rather than as a *prescriptive* one. And this "protective" attitude toward the use of principles in general seems to square with Parker's principle of correlation, which in this writer's opinion, is the fundamental principle in his method of teaching.

Grouping several of the elementary school subjects into units to reinforce the child's power of thought, and correlating thought and action to give the child greater freedom for thought expression calls for some order, but an order that is so flexible, that it can be changed and
adapted easily to the immediate needs of the child without disrupting the development of thought in any way. According to this method the principle of correlation takes precedence over the principle of order. With respect to the principles of interest and of spontaneity as guides in the development of a method of instruction, there exists a close affinity between them. Both educators showed themselves very resourceful in developing an enthusiastic self-activity program in teaching and in learning. They both suggested the use of real, concrete materials. Unless the child is personally active and interprets whatever he learns in terms of his own experience there will be little value to what he is exposed. Comenius sought to encourage self-activity by stressing the interests of the child whereas Parker resorted to the spontaneous activities of the child. In both cases the focus is upon the child—his needs, his interests, his activities.

Finally though both were promoters of the "thought method" there is one other point of difference in procedure. As mentioned earlier Comenius and Parker were concerned with the making of teaching and learning not only pleasant and practical but also meaningful and economical. An aspect of method both stressed was the use of the law of association which fundamentally consisted in associating
appropriate activities with the forms to be learned. In the Comenian concept one notices an effort to present the forms to be learned as a means to promote thought whereas in the Parkerian concept the stimulation of thought was used as a means to present new forms. Although in each case the educators appealed to the learner's consciousness, it would seem that Parker's procedure is more advisable because if the thought process is already in operation, it follows that the learner will exercise less effort in learning the new forms.

These few remarks on methodological concept warrant advancing that Comenius and Parker shared similar views on the general aspect of method but differed somewhat in the execution of their plans in particular situations. Working from principles that are more than less related, each devised a method somewhat distinct from the other, thus supporting the contention that method is personal, ever changing, ever improving and in keeping with societal needs and demands.

THE FUNCTION OF THE TEACHER: COMENIUS AND PARKER

In addition to Comenius' and Parker's views on those vital means for concretizing and implementing a theory of education, namely, the curriculum and method-
ology, another important element in the educative process should be considered, namely, the teacher.

As the teacher is the chief agent of effective instruction, it would seem legitimate to close this chapter on educational practices by making a few remarks on the selection, the formation and the performance of teachers. However well-defined the concept of the child and the objectives of education, however well-organized the curriculum and the method of teaching, the strength of any educational theory is still determined to a large extent by the competency of the teacher. On this particular matter, Bishop Spalding, in speaking of Parker's stress on teacher-training remarked:

The teacher is the school... He (Parker) believed that the most important social function is performed by the educator; and he held, consequently, that the best work one can do for society is to raise to highest efficiency the men and women whose vocation is to inspire, instruct, counsel, and guide their fellows, not in the things which concern their temporal affairs chiefly, but in whatever pertains to wisdom, conduct, and character.¹

If it is the teacher then who is largely responsible for the effectiveness of an educational system, there will come the all-important matter of selecting the right kind of person

for this profession and providing him with the proper academic and professional training. Only under the stimulation and guidance of such a teacher will a system of education become more realistic and thereby prove itself more adequate and more valuable to children who are to become tomorrow's leaders.

Since Comenius and Parker committed themselves to the education of youth, a juxtaposing of their ideas relative to the role of the teacher in the classroom should prove most rewarding in achieving a still clearer understanding of their educational policies. To this end, their notion of the teacher will be studied from two aspects. First will be brought out Comenius' and Parker's views on the personality, the educational formation and the selection of the teacher. Secondly will be discussed their opinions on the teacher as classroom instructor and coordinator. It is hoped that the information secured from a study of this phase of the educative process will further permit Parker's being called the American-Comenius.

Before launching off to Comenius' and Parker's view of the teacher one must take into consideration how the image of the teacher has changed through the ages. Each society conceived of him in somewhat different terms depending upon the concept of education prevalent at that
time. If one consults Plato one notices that for the Ancient Greeks the teacher was looked upon as "a lover of wisdom," "a seeker of truth." The newer concept of Greek education stressed that the best educated person is the one who has developed his intellectual capacities to the highest point.\(^1\)

To the members of this society learning was a splendid challenge for the mind. The teacher-master delighted in speculations on the nature of justice, truth, virtue and so forth. With respect to specific character traits Plato did recommend that teachers be "sound in body and mind."\(^2\)

He also added that if a choice among teachers were to be made, he would prefer teachers who are

\begin{itemize}
  \item the surest and the bravest, and, if possible, \ldots
  \item the fairest; and, having noble and generous tempers, they should also have the natural gifts as keenness and ready powers of acquisition \ldots
  \item a good memory, and be an unwearied solid man who is a lover of labor in any line.\(^3\)
\end{itemize}

The image of the teacher-master in Plato's society presented a person of good character, intoxicated with ideas, ever questing for truth—in a word, "a lover of wisdom."

\(^1\)Butts, p. 70.


\(^3\)Ibid., pp. 295-296.
The typical Roman teacher in Quintilian's society apparently found greater satisfaction and fulfillment in dealing with practical matters rather than speculative issues. For the Roman to know the nature of virtue was all very well, but to be virtuous was more important. When circumstances forced Roman parents to delegate the education of their children to teachers, they demanded that each teacher,

adopt a parental attitude to his pupils and regard himself as the representative of those who have committed their children to his charge.¹

In this Roman society the teacher was looked upon approximately, as a father, ever ready to give the students the moral and the intellectual training needed for this fulfillment. A man of eloquence and of good character, the teacher was engaged in forming the future Roman citizen "not merely for declamation but for the whole of life."² To this end, the Roman teacher was to be knowledgeable in all things and "friendly, clear, patient, generous, and

---


ready to give praise"\(^1\) in all his teachings. A kind, father-type person, untiringly devoted to those committed to his charge, seems to describe the Roman teacher in Quintilian's society.

The concept of the typical teacher for the medieval society seems to be that worked out by Thomas Aquinas in his essay, *The Teacher*. Here one sees the teacher neither as Plato's "lover of wisdom" nor as Quintilian's benevolent father-type, but rather as an "instrumental agent" indispensable to the learner who is seeking the sound intellectual virtues of science and wisdom. Since one of the major tasks of teachers during this one thousand year period was to reconcile the logic of Aristotle with the Gospels, the teacher's primary duty and responsibility was to acquire not only good control over his own knowledge but also the ability to communicate to his student something of his own insight and cast of mind.\(^2\)

Though the teacher could not learn for the learner, he "must have the knowledge which he causes in another explicitly and perfectly,"\(^3\) thus serving as "the instrumental

---

\(^1\) Power, *Main Currents in the History of Education*, p. 149.


agent." He must furnish "suitable illustrations and concrete images which aid the activity of reason." His primary function was to assist the learner to see the truth with his own mind through knowledge and to express it via verbal skills. Thus the term, "instrumental agent," given to the teacher by Thomas befits the notion of the teacher in medieval society.

Other societies also held particular ideas of the teacher. In some instances they differed whereas in others they were relatively similar. If one considers the teacher in the Comenian and the Parkerian societies, one would depict him as "a God-child-centered person" deeply concerned with the establishment of the proper conditions for the total development of each individual. Should a distinction be made between the Comenian and the Parkerian teacher, it would be one of stress rather than of difference. In the Comenian society the teacher would have to be more God-centered than child-centered whereas the teacher in the Parkerian world would have to be more child-centered than God-centered. Though this difference in stress might seem irrelevant, it still serves to present two slightly divergent images of the teacher--the God-child-centered teacher.

1 Ibid., p. XIII.
and the child-God-centered teacher. Furthermore, this distinc-
tion substantiates a statement made earlier, namely, that each society tends to conceive its own concept of the teacher.

In attempting to determine Comenius' views on the selection and preparation of teachers one is somewhat dis­turbed to find that this practising schoolmaster offered so little on such an important phase of teaching. However, upon a closer examination, this educator's recommendations on school practices do show that his main interest was not in the pre-service teacher but in the in-service teacher.¹ This distinction perhaps serves to explain Comenius' apparent neglect of this important topic. Judging from his series of prescriptions for and exhortations on the impro­vement of classroom management and instruction one can obtain sufficient evidence on the kind of teacher Comenius would select, and the kind of academic preparation he would exact of him.

Without being presumptuous in any way, one could describe Comenius' teacher as a person of fine character.

moral and intellectually fitted to serve as "example in word and deed"\(^1\) to all those entrusted to his charge. God-fearing and religious, the teacher would also be keen and enthusiastic, zealous and industrious, sympathetic and understanding.\(^2\) As the servant of his students, his mission would be "to cultivate and not to transform and therefore he should never attempt to force a scholar to study any subject if he sees that it is uncongenial to his natural disposition."\(^3\) This leads one to believe that the Comenian teacher would have some knowledge of the student's abilities as well as of the laws of learning and their application. If schools are to be "workshops of humanity" where all teaching is "clear, ardent and pleasant,"\(^4\) or again, if schools are to be a source of profit and delight to everyone, then thought Comenius we /should/ produce the learned and cultivated teachers.\(^5\) The teacher should receive "solid foundations of knowledge /and/ a judicious

\(^1\) Comenius, Selections, p. 152.
\(^2\) Ibid., pp. 63-65.
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 78.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 164.
\(^5\) Comenius, The Analytical Didactic, p. 82.
Moreover, as the teacher is called upon to instill this attitude toward the acquisition of knowledge, virtue and piety, in the hearts and minds of his students, it is natural that Comenius should insist that he be inspired by religious motives in fulfilling his duties and responsibilities. Learning is greatly enhanced by "examples, precepts, and imitations." It would seem then that the term, "God-child-centered teacher," would well depict the type of teacher Comenius would advocate for teaching in his school.

By the time Parker appeared on the educational scene, the general attitude toward the teaching profession had somewhat changed. Up until the early part of the nineteenth century little had been accomplished with respect to the professional training of the teacher. In fact, it was held by most educators that if the teacher was well-versed in knowledge, he was, ipso facto, capable of teaching. Comenius himself had endorsed this idea. But he had gone a step further when he claimed that a correct method of instructing the student in addition to personal scholarship on the part of the teacher would guarantee effective

1 Von Haumer, Barnard's American Journal of Education, V (June, 1858), 291.
2 Comenius, Selections, p. 149.
teaching. Like his predecessors the seventeenth-century schoolmaster had made no mention of a "practising school" where pre-service teachers could, under the supervision of master-teachers, receive professional training. The Normal School Movement for the training of teachers first appeared in America in the 1820's. Under the leadership of such outstanding educators as Horace Mann and Edward A. Sheldon, who studied in the European teacher-training centers, the normal schools served as an important means for improving the status and the quality of teachers. Also the founding of teachers' associations and institutes, the appearance of periodicals and textbooks for teachers, contributed in creating a better attitude toward the teaching profession. These aids, Comenius had not enjoyed.

Amidst this feverish activity in the education and professional training of teachers came Parker. Unlike Comenius, his primary interest was to work with pre-service teachers and this at the Cook County Normal School but still without totally neglecting the in-service teachers. As with other schoolmasters, Parker also formulated his own standards for the selection and the preparation of teachers.

1Butts, p. 492.
Since he prized character as the ideal of education, this emancipator of teachers would make it a point of choosing candidates of fine character, willing and desirous of learning about the science of education and zealous in applying its principles. Since the teacher is called upon "to become a builder of human souls," he must have a keen interest in children and be willing to take all measures possible to unfold the powers of childhood into channels of activity. For this reason Parker welcomed the "artist teacher who is proud of his work and industrious to perfect it for the sake of the child." He expected the teacher to be "an eager student of the significant trends of his age." Among some of the personality traits that Parker sought in the teacher were self-control, courage, freshness, cheerfulness, open-mindedness, love of children, enthusiasm, and creative ability. Of all the teacher qualities Curti remarks that

1 Parker, The Course of Study, I (July, 1900), 10.
4 Dewey, Elementary School Teacher and Course of Study, II (June, 1902), 736.
5 Heffron, p. 63.
Parker most treasured "spontaneous enthusiasm." From his exhortations to teachers, one gets a fair idea of what the American schoolmaster demanded in the line of academic and professional training.

My dear teachers, fill yourselves full of the subject you would teach, know its nature, its length, breadth, and depth, and then, with the knowledge of the learning child, lead him to discover, step by step, what you have discovered. I promise you that in such work you will find for yourselves a mental growth on your own part that can scarcely be found anywhere else, and an unequalled joy in leading little ones to fulfill the grand destiny for which God intended them.

Ida Heffron comments that when Parker interviewed prospective teachers he held each candidate in total respect. She writes:

\[\text{Parker,}\] never asked 'What can you do? How much do you know?' but, 'What are you?' Those whom he found with spiritual insight, he considered better equipped to meet the demands of the unfolding child, than others with greater knowledge and experience in teaching, but lacking this essential. Ideally, however, he desired that they have both spiritual insight and knowledge gained through experience and professional training.

This last remark summarizes well Parker's views on the selection of teachers and on the preparation he intended for them. There is no denying that the child remains the

\[\text{1Curti, p. 382.}\]
\[\text{2Parker, \textit{Talks on Teaching}, p. 116.}\]
\[\text{3Heffron, p. 102.}\]
focal point in all his educational endeavors. The term, child-God-centered teacher characterizes well what the Parkerian society sought in a member of that profession.

On the selection and the preparation of teachers, Comenius and Parker then held rather similar views. Both educators looked for teachers of excellent moral character possessing academic and professional competence. Of the many personality traits deemed essential to the teacher, the love and the understanding of children can be singled out. Both schoolmasters were willing to sacrifice a teacher with sound scholarship and little dedication to children for one who possessed less knowledge but who loved and understood children. Should any difference be pointed out in the preparation of teachers, it is this one: Comenius concentrated primarily on in-service teachers while Parker devoted himself to pre-service teachers.

Following these reflections on the selection and the preparation of teachers one can now proceed to a study of the function of the teacher, first as instructor, then as coordinator. In determining the role of the instructor in the classroom consideration should be given to three points in instructional activities, namely, the introduction of a learning activity, its development and finally its evaluation.
In presenting a new lesson, Comenius and Parker felt that the primary duty and responsibility of the teacher was to get the learner consciously aware of what he was to learn. This awareness could best be achieved through the use of real objects, that is, concrete materials of real interest to the learner. Should real objects be unavailable, representations, such as pictures, drawings, and other apparatus should be freely employed at the early stage. The use of first-hand materials will make an impression upon the mind, stimulate it, and get it ready for new experiences. The learner will then see the purpose of what is exposed before him and regard it as something worthy of admiration. This admiration will generate emotions proper to learning: love, desire and diligence. The learner will grasp what lies before him and hence will be prompted to question, to express his thoughts freely, and to make relations which otherwise would be denied him. This is the kind of meaningful learning both Comenius and Parker sought.

1 On this point both Comenius and Parker hold similar views. Evidence of this can be found in Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part II, p. 127 and in Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, p. 19.


3 On this point both Comenius and Parker hold similar views. Evidence of this can be found in Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part II, p. 116 and in Parker, Talks on Teaching, p. 158.
to introduce in their schools. It could be done if teachers provided the learner with those live-experiences that meet his needs, his interests, and his abilities. Such an informal approach to learning where materials are so skilfully and attractively arranged can not but stimulate the learner to do his own thinking, to be consciously aware of what is presented to him and to be actively engaged in the activity. Once this initial step in the instructional program is made, the effort of the learner will be directed toward the use of other more sophisticated tools.

Here again, the instructor should see that the conditions proper to learning be maintained. Among some classroom activities worthy of mention one finds the use of textbooks, field trips and dramatization. It is only normal, however, to find differences of opinion on the use of distinct materials of instruction. Advancements in education have revealed that other procedures could be more effectively used in the teaching process. Yet the point of importance is that both Comenius and Parker dared break with traditional methods and experimented with new ideas in teaching.

Fundamentally Comenius and Parker sought concrete means to enliven and enrich the learning activity. In the use of the textbooks, both felt that suitable materials
should be placed in the hands of the learner. The textbooks were to be planned according to the interest and the comprehension level of the learner. With Comenius, though, one would say that, in general, the instructor would be given little play for personal initiative and spontaneity.

In the Moravian schoolmaster's textbooks little allowance is made for the teacher and the students to offer their own interpretation and to follow an order that would be more fitted to their needs, interests, and abilities. For instance, in the *Orbis Pictus*, the pictures were followed by a descriptive caption that the student was called upon to master. Today one would find instead questions that would permit the students to make their own contribution to the study of the picture. And with respect to the number of textbooks to be used, Comenius was quite explicit. Consider the following comment:

Specially prepared books should be supplied to each class, and these should contain the whole subject-matter of the literary, moral, and religious instruction prescribed for the class. Within these limits no other books should be needed.

These statements would force one to conclude that the Comenian instructor was not "left free to employ his trained

---

faculties according to the dictates of a trained judgment.\(^1\) This was one point against which Parker rebelled.\(^2\) He could not conceive of teachers being confined to the use of one textbook and forced to follow that textbook exactly. He had faith in the ingenuity of his teachers and it was his contention that they should be given the opportunity to use their own spontaneity and initiative.\(^3\) Should pictures be used, Parker offered many suggestions. One of them read:

Write questions on the board to aid the pupils—such as, 'What things do you see in the picture?' 'Where are they?' 'What are they doing?' 'What have they been doing?' 'What do you think they will do?'\(^4\)

To use pictures in this fashion would allow the teacher to become more personal and informal in his teaching. Textbooks he maintained should be consulted sparingly. Parker encouraged both the teacher and the students to consider sources other than the one recommended so that they could see for themselves "that even the best authorities are not always reliable."\(^5\)

Furthermore the American schoolmaster

4. Ibid., p. 81.
5. Ibid., p. 146.
did not always deem it necessary to use textbooks. For instance, he questioned the value of a column of isolated words as one would find in a speller.

Now I would like to ask, if the pupil writes, and writes correctly, day after day all the words he learns in History, Geography, Arithmetic, and the Natural Sciences, how many more words does he need to learn? What is the use of the Spelling-book?¹

Parker offered similar views on the use of textbooks for the teaching of arithmetic, grammar and other subjects. Textbooks, he considered as tools, instruments, and guides to be used discreetly and economically. At no time would he tolerate a teacher being a slave to a textbook. When juxtaposing the main ideas of these two schoolmasters on the use of textbooks, then, one could perhaps conclude that where Comenius relied "too much on the class-book and too little on the class-master,"² Parker relied too much on the class-master and too little on the class-book.

Comenius and Parker also considered field trips as another teaching aid capable of helping the learner acquire certain knowledge and skills. A field trip properly designed and organized could serve to make learning

¹Ibid., pp. 89-90.
more meaningful, more profitable. By actual observation and sensuous perception the student could arrive at a better understanding of the object before him. In the study of science, for example, the two educators highly recommended the Book of Nature. Were the Comenian instructor to give a lesson in geography, he would see that the students be taken to the fields and along the rivers, and trained to observe plants, animals, running water, and the turning of windmills. . . . They should have outdoor lessons in geography and be taught to find their way through the streets, to the market place, and to the homes of their friends and relatives.¹

The Parkerian instructor would do likewise. He would take the children out into the fields and valleys; return to the school-room; let them describe orally what they have seen; then mould and draw it; and, finally, have them describe the objects they have seen by writing.²

No doubt, the field trip would be a worthwhile experience. Commenting briefly then on Comenius' and Parker's views on the use of this practice, one can say that in keeping with their fundamental principle—everything should, as far as is possible, be placed before the senses—the field trip would be most fitting. Yet, it would be an oversimplification to say that the two educators used this activity

¹Monroe, Comenius and the Beginnings of Educational Reform, p. 116.
²Parker, Talks on Teaching, p. 125.
in exactly the same way. Granted that each educator presented worthwhile suggestions on the use of this learning activity, one might add that Parker more than Comenius stressed field trips as the initial step in a greater variety of learning adventures.

Dramatization is another school practice that Comenius and Parker considered as enriching in the development of a learning activity. In general, dramatic activities contribute to making learning more enjoyable, to helping the learner grow emotionally, to developing proper conversational habits, to acquiring ease, poise, and natural manners when speaking in front of an audience and finally to providing opportunity for different modes of creative expression. As a method of teaching, dramatization can be of great value. Comenius and Parker saw great possibilities in the use of this practice. Though both used it each differed somewhat in his implementation of it in the educative process. The seventeenth-century school-master, pioneering this technique, thought of preparing a folio of his own plays. The plays covered the essential elements of the different subjects taught and were to be performed by all the boys at the end of the semester. Comenius looked upon these as a concrete means "to transmit
grammatical and mathematical insights."¹ Perhaps one reason why his boys reacted somewhat unsatisfactorily to them was that they were written in a rather "stilted manner"² by their own teacher and covered materials less than more appealing to them. Although Comenius' attempt at using plays in teaching seemed unsuccessful, one can nonetheless credit him for breaking ground for others who would later reap benefits from their use. When Parker chose to make dramatization an integral part of his educational practices, he proceeded differently from Comenius. He did not write a series of plays that could be used freely at the end of the school year as some sort of culminating activity. Rather, he forcefully encouraged his student-teachers to write their own plays. This in no way indicates that he was opposed to the use of "ready-made" plays, but only that he believed

that it was not enough for a child to act a memorized part in a play, he must make a vital impersonation of character naturally expressed through speech and action.³

He felt that there were no better opportunities in the school program for developing this "impersonation of character naturally expressed through speech and action."

¹ Nash, Kazanias and Perkinson, p. 181.
² Comenius, The Great Didactic, Part I, p. 79.
³ Heffron, p. 94.
acter naturally" than by having the children write their own plays and then dramatize them. Under the direction of a well-prepared teacher, any age-group could write a play on a topic selected from their reading, history, or any other lesson which lent itself well to dramatization. After deciding upon the topic, the students would plan the play, organize and write and finally perform it before their own classmates and even before the whole student body. This approach which is more developed than Comenius' could serve to foster creative expression in speech and action and at the same time develop in each student a greater appreciation of literature, of history or of any other discipline. Obviously, dramatization employed in this fashion has its shortcomings. Evidently these "school-made" plays would lack the order, the structure, the depth and the refinement of Comenius'. But Parker was willing to sacrifice these qualities for the sake of serving the child--his needs, his interests, his abilities. He would highly recommend "the writing of original plays acted by the children."¹

Following the introduction and the development of an instructional activity would naturally come its ap-

¹Idem.
praisal, the evaluation of it. Here again Comenius and Parker advanced interesting views. As there are various procedures for evaluating a learning activity, it is probably wise to concentrate on the most commonly known practice, namely, the examination.

From time immemorial the examination has been an integral part of the classroom routine. In most instances the examination was a systematic test given at certain intervals to find out what knowledge and skill the student had mastered in a subject taught. Before attempting to determine any one schoolmaster's position on the use of this evaluative technique it might be well to determine the precise purpose of his practice. Perhaps this could best be discovered by noting whether the examination is given to find out what the student knows or whether it is meant to judge how well the instructor has performed his task. Granted that the answer to this question will provide valuable insights upon this learning activity itself, it seems that an instructor who will give priority to one of these two aspects in his examination, namely, the students' mental progress or the teachers' method of teaching, will necessarily have a different attitude toward its use and as a consequence will employ it differently.
There is no denying that Comenius and Parker were highly concerned with both the mental progress of the student and the effectiveness of the teacher's method of teaching. The two educators felt the need to use examinations as a means of checking upon the effectiveness of the learning activity. And yet, further analysis reveals that the two schoolmasters presented somewhat different viewpoints on this matter.

In his series of suggestions to in-service teachers, Comenius did not forget to include the use of the examination as a sure means of finding out the progress of the students as well as of determining their ability to cope with their work easily, pleasantly and thoroughly.¹ In one of his remarks he was quite definite on the manner and the time tests should be administered:

A teacher should give frequent tests (sometimes at set intervals, sometimes unexpectedly, especially to the least trustworthy pupils, in order to make sure that they are not missing any part of the instruction.)²

These tests were not necessarily pencil-and-paper tests. Comenius speaks of the copy-book technique as a means of

discovering if the students could write "well, quickly, and accurately."¹ Under his supervision the copy-book served as the surest proof to parents that their children are not wasting their time at school, and will enable them to judge how much progress they are making.²

Another type of examination that Comenius highly advocated was that of having the student play the role of the teacher and repeat to the class the teacher's lesson. He explained it as follows:

In each lesson, after the teacher has briefly gone through the work that has been prepared, and has explained the meanings of the words, one of the pupils should be allowed to rise from his place and repeat what has just been said in the same order (just as if he were the teacher of the rest), to give his explanations in the same words, and to employ the same examples, and if he make a mistake he should be corrected.³

There can be certain merits to this testing technique. The student who is called upon to explain to the others what he has been taught must of necessity acquire deeper insights into the subject matter if he is to impart it to others. Furthermore, in some way, he is encouraged "to bring into his mental consciousness not only what he has learned, . . . . .

²Idem.
³Ibid., p. 157.
but also to be able to pass sound judgment on the objective facts to which his information refers.\(^1\) Though Comenius did state that the student had to repeat the explanation in the same order and in the same words as the teacher, this did not necessarily imply that the repetition had to be done without understanding and meaning, that is, simply through rote. Comenius could not conceive of education as "stuffing the students' heads with a mass of words, sentences, and ideas dragged together out of various authors, but rather as opening their understanding to the outer world."\(^2\) In other words Comenius expected the student to apply the information gathered in the learning activity to concrete and practical life experiences. He looked upon the examination as a "bracing influence"\(^3\) that should be given to the student until he has mastered the lesson. However, the schoolmaster was also interested in the teacher's method. And in his fashion he saw that teachers were also examined. At the end of the school year he suggested that inspectors be given the responsibility of testing not only the "progress

\(^1\)Ibid., pp. 142-143.
\(^2\)Ibid., p. 147.
\(^3\)Ibid., p. 293.
of the pupils, and the thoroughness and comprehensiveness of their training," but also of certifying "that the subjects appointed had been properly learned." For if the subjects had been properly learned as revealed in the performance of the students, this would indicate that the method of teaching was proper. To check the work of the teacher against the progress of the student was not perhaps the best approach to judge the effectiveness of a teacher's method of teaching. At any rate Comenius seemed to have used it wisely and prudently.

In summary then one can say that Comenius employed examinations primarily to evaluate the student's mental progress and secondly to check the teacher's performance.

Parker was also quite interested in the administration of examinations. However, his attitude toward testing differed somewhat from Comenius'. He looked upon the examination as first a means of evaluating the teacher's performance and then as a means of discovering what the student has learned. On this point he wrote that examinations were

\[1\text{Idem.}\]
Like Comenius he gave an illustration of what he considered as the right mode of testing.

Suppose, then, that... the pupils have been under the guidance of a skilful teacher, who has given out, one after another, the most interesting subjects to be found in history, and had her pupils read all they could find in various books about them, and after taking these acquired treasures of knowledge, and arranging the events in logical order, had finally had the children write out in good English the whole story. The test of such work would simply be to request the pupils to tell orally, or on paper, all they knew about Columbus, Walter Raleigh, Bunker Hill, or any other interesting subject they have studied.2

This type of examination is far from requiring the student to memorize disconnected and meaningless facts. Rather he is forced to apply within a frame of reference the knowledge he has been exposed to and then choose from it what he thinks is most pertinent to the development of his own topic.

If meaningless words have been memorized, if there is a lack of research, investigation, and original thought, the results will be painfully apparent. Whatever the teacher has done, or failed to do, can be readily comprehended by an expert in examination. . . . The test of spelling, punctuation, and the power to use correct language, can be tested in no better way than by the writing of such compositions as these.3

1 Parker, Talks on Teaching, pp. 148-149.
2 Ibid., p. 149.
3 Idem.
These statements lead one to conclude that Parker's use of the examination called for more freedom, more flexibility, more individualization. Instead of having the students repeat in the same order and with the same expressions what had been taught them, as was the case with Comenius, Parker frees the student from this burden by allowing him to use different modes of expression which, in turn, will foster the development of spontaneity, initiative, and creative ability.

Another interesting point on this question of examinations is the following: Parker did not believe that the "examination should . . . be made the test of fitness for promotion."\(^1\) It was his contention that

the teacher is the best judge of the fitness of her pupils to do the work of the next grade.\(^2\)

He saw the use of "uniform" examinations as "creatures of torture" for both the teachers and the students.

The demand fixed by examiners is for cram, and not for an art.\(^3\)

Under these circumstances the teacher becomes pressurized by the amount of material to be covered within a certain time, and this uncomfortable feeling curtails his freedom

\(^1\) Idem.
\(^2\) Idem.
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 152.
and spontaneity to choose activities which otherwise might have benefited the students. Parker worked with and for the pre-service teachers and he provided them with this kind of professional training. It is not surprising to find him campaigning for greater trust in the teacher, for more freedom and a greater sense of responsibility in the performance of his task. He could not see any value in having inspectors administer examinations for the promotion of students. It was his contention that a teacher who had observed a student for a whole year was in a better position to judge of his promotion to a higher grade.¹ In reporting on Parker's theory on promotion, Heffron makes the following statement which could serve to throw more light upon Parker's views on this matter:

Colonel Parker thought that nothing should be allowed to stand between an individual and success, but personal effort. The children were taught that they could, and did, promote themselves. In irregular promotions, after grade teachers had reported certain children as, in their judgment, showing ability for a higher grade of work, it was his custom to step into the room and ask such pupils in class whether they thought they were able to do more work than they were doing—then he introduced them into the next grade room to try to work there. Colonel Parker would never have the pupil work for reward or 'credit,' not even for the seeming honor of belonging to a higher group. Rather, his thought was to have them interested in their school activities, that the interest and power aroused by these factors would be the im-

¹Ibid., p. 150.
Hence, on this issue Parker's thought and action differed somewhat from Comenius'. Though this procedure might have its shortcomings, Parker must have resorted to it as a means to correct the abuses in the use of examinations as a determinant of promotion. If inspectors visited his schools, and they did, their purpose was first to test the instructional methods of the teachers, but then also the mental progress of the students as the two purposes are not necessarily mutually exclusive. As a teacher of teachers who encouraged pre-service teachers to use their spontaneity and initiative in teaching, he felt that fixed examinations for promotion purposes stifled a possible effectiveness in teaching. He believed that a teacher worthy of his profession should be capable of handling this problem. And for this reason he left the judging of the individual's progress to the discretion of the teacher. The slight difference between Comenius' and Parker's views on promotion may then be summarized as follows: where Comenius depended mostly upon "uniform and periodical" examinations for the promotion of the students Parker depended mostly upon

1Heffron, pp. 54-55.
2Parker, Talks on Teaching, p. 151.
informal, and individualized" examinations prepared by the teacher. Teachers under the Parkerian influences would enjoy more freedom, more flexibility, and more opportunities for democratic procedures in administering examinations than would teachers under the Comenian direction.

Then one can conclude that Comenius and Parker offered somewhat similar and practical suggestions for the initial step in the learning activity, namely, the use of relevant experiences. Then, on the question of the second stage in the instructional program, namely, in the use of such learning devices as the textbook, field trips, and dramatization certain differences were singled out. But, by and large, on this point the two schoolmasters still encouraged self-activity in learning. Finally by way of culminating activity in the instructional program Comenius and Parker both advocated the use of the examination though the emphasis for each was a bit different.

But this section on the function of the teacher would be incomplete without some attention given to the teacher as classroom coordinator. According to Comenius and Parker the school was looked upon as a laboratory for developing the complete man. Effort was made to make learning and teaching free, ardent and pleasant. To this end the two schoolmasters strove to make the school and
its surroundings pleasant and attractive. The classroom itself should be provided with suitable furnishings, proper lighting, heating and ventilation. Instructional supplies and other learning apparatus should be readily accessible. In addition to separate classrooms for each grade, there should be an assembly hall for morning gatherings, dramatic performances, and other group activities.\footnote{Comenius, \textit{The Great Didactic}, Part I, p. 82.} In all areas provision should be made for cleanliness and orderliness. Near the school or within close proximity there should be a garden where the students could freely and easily observe plant life.\footnote{On this point both Comenius and Parker hold similar views. Evidence of this can be found in Comenius, \textit{The Great Didactic}, Part II, p. 131 and in Heffron, pp. 80-82.} In short, the teacher as classroom coordinator in a Comenian and a Parkerian school would seek to lessen the traditional formality and rigidity of the school atmosphere by improving physical environment, making the situation less artificial and conventional.

To the improvement of physical environment one might add the notion of school discipline as another means of providing for a better intellectual climate in the classroom. On this matter Comenius and Parker held enlightened views. They used the term, discipline, in its ordinary
sense, namely, as the means a teacher should adopt to enforce instruction upon the students in the classroom. It was their belief that discipline of some kind is desirable if knowledge and skills are to be of any value to the students. Just as there are procedures proper for developing instructional practices, so must there be ways for establishing discipline in the classroom more in keeping with the needs of the students.

The classroom coordinator adhering to Comenian and Parkerian thought would look upon discipline as a means of perfecting the freedom and enhancing the intelligence of the students. He would consider it his primary duty to know the students, the subjects he is to teach, and the relation that exists between these two. Should the students manifest unfavorable attitudes toward any of the subjects---be it dislike, indifference, aversion, or sheer laziness---his first reaction would be to find the cause of this unfortunate circumstance and not punish the students with blows because they could not learn or refused to learn. In keeping with this Comenius wisely recommended that discipline should . . . be free from personal elements, such as anger or dislike, and should be exercised with such frankness and sincerity of purpose, that even the pupils may feel that the action taken is for their good, and that those set over them are but exercising paternal authority. They will thus regard it in the same light.
Parker has something similar to offer. Though expressed in different terms, Parker's idea of enforcing instruction upon the students contains, and even further emphasizes this respect for the intellectual development of the students.

The highest motive of school government is to give the child the power and necessary reason to control himself. Attention may be impelled by a desire springing from within, from the attractiveness of the object; or compelled from without by the will of the teacher, who expresses her will by means of rewards and punishments. The first great question, then, for the teacher to decide is, To what extent can the attractiveness of the object be made to control attention? That is, in what measure can the interest of the child and the love of work be excited and quickened? And again for the good of students who were not attracted to their studies, he exhorted teachers to self-control and courage. As a teacher who had himself gained valuable insights into the doings of children, he knew from experience the extent to which children study and read the teacher. The following remarks prove that the American schoolmaster truly understood the ways of children and knew how to cope with them.

If there is one weak point indicated by your presence in movement, attitude, or expression, they will make

---

2Parker, Talks on Teaching, pp. 155-156.
3Ibid., p. 162.
the charge there. If you can be teased, irritated, or made angry, they will find, for want of better things, the greatest pleasure in sticking pins (figurative) into the weak places of your moral anatomy. If you threaten, they take great delight in listening to your threats. If you scold, they will invent ways of perpetuating the process. But if they see in you a quiet, unalterable determination to control them, softened and strengthened by a great love for children, in most cases their surrender will be complete and permanent; provided you have already at hand some nutritious and tasteful food in the way of good teaching and training.  

All the suggestions for classroom discipline made in the above quoted materials reveal the love, sympathy and understanding Comenius and Parker had for students and teachers. In no way would they have enforced instruction through forms of severe punishments. If someone is to shoulder the blame for the students' poor performance in learning, the two educators never hesitated to blame the teacher. It was their belief that if school subjects were properly taught, that is, presented in a style attractive, interesting and conforming to the students' natural way of thinking, then there would be no reason for a true teacher to exercise harsh discipline. Blows and shrieks would never make an impression on the understanding of the students, nor would they ever serve to develop in these same students a love for knowledge. Should remedies need to be applied, this should be done gently, sparingly, and lovingly. One has just to recall

\[1\text{Idem.}\]
Comenius' striking comparison on this matter:

... a musician does not strike his lyre a blow with his fist or with a stick, nor does he throw it against the wall, because it produces a discordant sound; but, setting to work on scientific principles, he tunes it and gets it into order.

The same applies in disciplining the minds of the students. If great care and tender love be taken to adapt the school work to the interest and ability of the students, then there would be no need for strict discipline and for worthless copy work. The students under the guidance of well-disciplined teachers would be trained to love their school work and pursue it earnestly, diligently, and pleasantly.

School discipline, then, in the hands of a Comenian and Parkerian classroom coordinator becomes an effective method of enhancing the development of true freedom in the child and of developing his intelligence in a happy manner. If a distinction must be made between these two educators on this classroom practice, one could say that Parker carried still further Comenius' human concept of discipline by advocating this spirit of loving and giving that could transform the school into a "sublimated home."  

---

2Heffron, p. 51.
And when I (Parker) took the Normal School here I proposed to carry out the plan that the great secret of human growth was to arouse the spiritual and higher in the human being, to drop all external incentives to selfishness, leave out ambition and emulation and all unnatural competition, and feed the child with mental and moral nourishment. Make it love the work and love to help others for the sake of the work.¹

The first seed had been planted by Comenius whose aim in discipline had been to train the students "that they may love and reverence their masters, and not merely allow themselves to be led in the right direction, but actually tend towards it of their own accord."² Parker continued what Comenius had so daringly begun.

By way of conclusion on the function of the teacher, one could advance that Comenius and Parker sought to improve the academic and the professional conditions of the teacher, the former by exhorting teachers to be conscious of their heavenly calling and by prescribing "ready-made" teaching practices and the latter by granting teachers that freedom, that flexibility, to use their spontaneity, their initiative, their creative ability, in the art of teaching.

¹Giffin, p. 134.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

This study has presented a comparison of Comenius' and of Parker's views on educational matters. The evidence gleaned from each one's career as a school reformer and from an analysis of each one's theory of and practices in education would seem to warrant calling Parker, the Comenius of America. There are in reality numerous points of similarity in the thought of the two men. But, there are also striking differences that oblige one to make certain reservations in affixing such a label. However, if one considers the kind of contribution to American education made by Parker, then one would seem justified in paralleling him to Comenius.

In presenting the educational climate of the seventeenth and the nineteenth centuries, it was found that both eras were "spirited periods" where reactions occurred not only in the religious and political worlds but also in the scientific and the educational as well. And yet, amidst certain similarities, the educational climate within which Comenius labored did differ somewhat from that of Parker.
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The imperialist aggressions and religious dissensions of seventeenth-century Europe were by far more oppressive than the political and educational upheavals of nineteenth-century America. Also, the former age's expansion of scientific knowledge which produced a new faith in possibilities for self-improvement and for reconstructing society called for a new kind of education. Comenius reacted by pleading for a more realistic system of education along natural and democratic lines. For a changing and progressing society the Moravian reformer sought to introduce a free, universal education, a broader curriculum, a method of teaching based upon the natural laws of learning. Reason, observation, and experimentation became key instruments in the quest for knowledge. But, Parker came at a time when the need for universal education was still more keenly felt. The pressures arising from the growth of cities and industries, from the expansion of scientific knowledge, and from the extension of suffrage to all citizens aroused an educational consciousness not so pronounced during Comenius' time. Also efforts had already been made in America to establish a public school system that would guarantee a free, universal, compulsory and state-supported education for all its citizens. In addition, normal schools for training teachers, certain professional publications and
educational organizations, were already in existence when Parker made his debut as a schoolteacher. And then one could add that Parker was capable of studying the educational contributions of Comenius himself, of famous European thinkers like Pestalozzi, Herbart and Froebel and even of fellow American educators who had preceded him. In a way the nineteenth-century climate lent itself more than did the seventeenth to educational reforms. But what is perhaps most relevant to the present thesis is that these two periods manifested a great spirit of progress and that both Comenius and Parker were capable of seizing the opportunity of reconstructing a system of education along more natural and democratic lines.

Though reformers must live in a time ripe for change and progress, they must also of necessity possess certain personality traits. By taking a telescopic view of the outstanding features in their educational career, one notes numerous points of similarity in Comenius and Parker. As men of vision, thought and action, they manifested a strong faith in their Creator, in themselves, and in the power of education. They understood the conditions of their respective societies and accepted them as such. As schoolmasters they were open to various influences but integrated into their own educational
framework only those school practices which they thought commendable. The courage and the strength both possessed in promoting their particular educational views against strong opposition and in the midst of all kinds of difficulties distinguishes them from other prophets of education. In their relations with others, they were quite different: Comenius, though forceful, was more conciliatory and humble while Parker was more aggressive, dominating and at times even sarcastic. A combination of these personal characteristics—dynamic personality, keen intellectual insight, strong emotions—contributes to their bringing a new life to, a new outlook on and a new spirit to the educational world.

As architects of modern education Comenius and Parker were crusaders for child-centered schools. Comenius organized a complete system of education beginning with the early training of the child and terminating with the university. His plan possessed such universality that it could be used as a guide in designing school programs in other nations. Parker's theory of education was not as broad in scope. Though many of his suggestions could have been adopted in school systems advocating democratic procedures, his aim was more to treat specifically of American children taught by American teachers. It is
perhaps for this reason that Comenius became known as Teacher of Nations, while Parker was labeled Teacher of Teachers. At any rate the two schoolmasters gradually gained popularity as educators through the many and varied teaching and administrative positions they held. The Moravian evangelist was teacher in Poland, adviser in England, textbook writer in Sweden, and superintendent of schools in Hungary. Likewise Parker was teacher and principal in elementary schools, leader of the Quincy Movement, superintendent of Boston schools, and finally director of Cook County Normal School and the Chicago Institute of Pedagogy. Though both dynamic leaders accepted similar administrative positions, Parker was more fortunate than Comenius in the implementation of his theory and practice. Comenius' great dream—that of establishing a pansophic academy or what might be termed today an international research center—never materialized during his lifetime nor has it even to this day. Parker's hope of founding a center for the training of teachers—obviously a lesser undertaking—was realized during his lifetime. Whether or not these two reformers achieved success is of little consequence. But what does matter is that both Comenius and Parker labored with unflagging zeal to break the formalism of traditional education.
To disseminate their educational views Comenius and Parker wrote. Although each revealed in his works depth of feeling and sincerity, a sharp contrast can be found in the quantity and the quality of their writings. Comenius wrote voluminously and eruditely not only on educational issues but also on religious and political topics as well. Parker's writings are limited to the field of education and less scholarly in approach. In fact, one would say that Parker was more successful in spreading his philosophy of education as a lecturer rather than as a writer. Whereas Parker was a greater "doer," Comenius was a greater "thinker."

In their theory of education two points are worthy of mention: the concept of the child and the aims of education. On the first point Comenius and Parker held that the child, a composite of body and soul, was created by God and in His image. However, they differed somewhat in their views of the means of harmoniously developing the whole child. God and Nature occupied a different place in each one's theory and practice of education. Comenius placed God in the foreground of his educational schema and emphasized the supernatural and religious training of the child; Parker placed God in the background of his educational theory and stressed the natural and secular training of the child. With respect to the child studied
from a cultural aspect, both entertained great expectations in his capacity for bettering himself and hence his society. It is precisely this—an unbounded faith and trust in the infinite God-given gifts placed in the child—that led Comenius and Parker to study him as a child and then to design a theory of education focused upon his needs, his interests and his abilities. Concerning the child's destiny, Comenius and Parker believed his ultimate end to be the union of his soul with God, his Creator. A minor distinction can be noted here. Comenius saw life as a preparation for eternity whereas Parker saw it as a beginning of eternity. This very subtle difference meant that in educational practices Comenius placed greater emphasis upon the individual's adherence to divine law to assure later eternal happiness whereas Parker laid stronger stress on individual initiative, individual expansion, individual freedom, all growing to perfection in this progressive movement toward eternity. By and large Comenius and Parker struggled for the good of the child. As lovers of children both cherished one great dream—to see each child arrive at the highest possible degree of the good, the true and the beautiful.

Without categorically affirming that Comenius and Parker possessed common educational objectives, one can nonetheless note certain similarities in the ends each
proposed in educating the young. On the question of the ultimate objective of education both believed that education should aim at uniting the soul of the created being with its Creator and thereby assist it in achieving its own perfection and happiness. A slight difference may be expressed thus: Comenius prepared the child to be a good, religious-minded citizen in this world thereby readying him for the next; Parker had the child actually experience living as a good, secular citizen of this world thereby introducing him into the next.

As for the immediate aims of education both shared similar views. In and out of season Comenius and Parker emphasized useful knowledge with this slight difference that Comenius incorporated the need for religious, dogmatic teaching, whereas Parker felt less than more the need for this. With respect to the practice and perfection of skills both schoolmasters supported a program of teaching based upon understanding and meaning. On the formation of habits both agreed upon the principle of self-activity and the principle of self-responsibility as the most economical and effective means of developing good habits of living as well as good habits for acquiring knowledge and skills. Although both considered the school as the ideal place for the student's learning the art of right living, Parker
would seem to have been more realistic, more creative, but this is perhaps because he was freer than had been Comenius to use classroom situations to implement this principle of self-activity. As was pointed out earlier, the educational climate of the nineteenth century favored self-activity more and Parker was wise enough to capitalize on this opportunity. By so doing he improved upon what the seventeenth-century schoolmaster had dared to instigate. And the same can be said of the principle of self-responsibility. As a pioneer in democratic practices, Comenius presented a rather complete outline of those conditions essential for the normal growth and the total development of each individual. With this work already done, Parker carried things a step further by advocating activities or functions for the immediate practice of self-responsibility in the regular classroom, thereby correlating home, school, and community. Comenius' immediate aims of education were perhaps rather idealistic, definitely more sectarian, and certainly more definite than Parker's. Yet, both educators used somewhat similar objectives as those guides which directed their efforts towards establishing conditions proper to the practical education of youth.

This study of each educator's theory naturally led to an analysis of its implementation in practice.
Comenius and Parker present interesting views on such practical aspects of the educational system as curriculum, methods of teaching, and role of teacher.

To Comenius and Parker the word curriculum meant those subjects essential to the educated person or those school activities that greatly foster meaningful learning. Quality rather than quantity was their main stress here. Because both considered the needs of the child as having priority over subject-matter and societal needs, they presented a child-centered curriculum. Significant differences are noticeable in the vertical rather than in the horizontal arrangement of their curriculum patterns. Comenius worked out a primarily extensive course of study; Parker primarily an intensive one. But there is sufficient evidence of parallels in the horizontal arrangement at the elementary level to warrant calling the two curriculum patterns quite similar.

As a second element in educational practice Comenius and Parker formulated particular views on methods of instructing youth. With both educators method meant a procedure not only for imparting knowledge and acquiring skills but also for realizing the learner's potential through the application of the laws of Nature. In their approach to teaching they stressed the training of the
senses, the use of real and concrete materials and the active participation of the learner in every learning situation. Among some of the distinctive features in each one's concept of method, the following three can be cited. First, Comenius drew his pedagogical principles primarily by observing the workings of natural phenomena whereas Parker formulated his instructional guidelines from his observation of life-experiences of children. Secondly, the principles of order and interest best underlie Comenian concept of instruction whereas the principles of correlation and spontaneity best underlie Parker's. Finally, in the Comenian concept of method one notices that an effort was made to present the forms to be learned as a means of promoting thought whereas in the Parkerian concept the stimulation of thought was used as a means to present new forms. These few remarks on methodological concept show that though Comenius and Parker shared similar views on the general aspect of method they differed somewhat in particulars, specifically in the execution of their plans. Each devised a method somewhat distinct from the other. This, however, can only support the contention that method must be personal, ever changing and ever improving if it is to keep up with individual needs in a particular society.
The teacher as the chief agent of effective instruction was the last topic discussed in this study of educational practice. In general Comenius and Parker shared similar views on the selection, the formation and the performance of teachers. Concerning the selection and preparation of teachers, both looked for teachers of excellent moral character possessing academic and professional competence. Of the many personality traits deemed essential, the love and the understanding of children were singled out. Secondly, although Comenius concentrated primarily on in-service and Parker on pre-service teachers, the two educators highly encouraged an informal approach to learning. Both endorsed the teacher's use of life-experiences to stimulate the learner to do his own thinking and to be actively engaged in the learning process. In the use of such tools as textbooks, field trips and dramatization, each educator held his own views. When juxtaposing the main ideas of these two schoolmasters on the use of textbooks, one finds that Comenius relied more on the textbook and less on the teacher whereas Parker relied more on the teacher and less on the textbook. On the use of field trips, it would be an oversimplification to say that both wanted the teacher to employ this activity in exactly the same fashion. Al-
though each stressed field trips, Parker more than Comenius made use of this activity in a greater variety of learning adventures. In the use of dramatization as an enriching school practice, each educator differed somewhat in his implementation of it in the educative process. According to Comenius, the teacher prepared the plays that the boys were to perform at the end of the semester whereas according to Parker the teacher was to encourage the students to plan, organize and write their own plays. This latter approach served to foster creative expression in speech and action and by the same token develop in each student a greater appreciation of literature. Also, Comenius and Parker offered interesting views on the teacher's use of the commonly known practice, the examination. Both stressed the use of examinations to evaluate learning but with a different purpose in mind: Comenius prescribed that "uniform and periodical" examinations be administered to find out what the students had learned; Parker suggested that the teacher administer "informal and individualized" examinations to find out how well he had performed his task. The result here is that Parkerian teachers enjoyed more freedom, more flexibility and more opportunities for original procedures than did Comenian teachers.

In considering the teacher as classroom coordi-
notor, both Comenius and Parker held similar views. The two schoolmasters decreed that the teacher should strive to make the school and its surroundings pleasant and attractive. They advocated lessening the traditional formality and rigidity of the school atmosphere by making the situation less artificial and conventional. School discipline in the hands of a Comenian and a Parkerian teacher became an effective method of enhancing the development of true freedom in the student and of developing his intelligence in a happy manner. Should a distinction be made, one could say that Parker carried still further Comenius' humane concept of classroom discipline by further advocating this spirit of loving and giving that transformed the schools into centers of pleasant learning.

In the light then of these many points of similarity not overlooking naturally the certain relatively minor differences in the educational theory and practice of these two educators, one can conclude that evidence does warrant calling Francis W. Parker, the American Comenius. The differences between the two men are in reality not so much in kind as in degree and due primarily to the age in which each lived. Being given the two centuries that separate the two educational reformers,
it would be naive for anyone to expect that Parker be a perfect replica of Comenius. It is then only with this total realization of the changes naturally wrought in education during two hundred years that one could rightly understand the label: Francis W. Parker, the American Comenius.
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