

the moral dimensions of pedagogy

teaching behavior in popular primary schools in nineteenth-century america

barbara j. finkelstein

In relatively low-cost accessible popular schools throughout the nineteenth century, thousands of teachers were engaged in an effort to teach thousands of students to read, to write, to cipher and to acquire a rudimentary knowledge of their country.¹ The way these primary school teachers taught suggests that they believed that the main function of education was instilling restraint. Their role, as they saw it, was to channel youthful energies into a highly controlled series of intellectual exercises, and to encourage students to suspend their own impulses in order to acquire literacy. Indeed, teachers seemed to assume that literacy was a *sine qua non* for right conduct, and that the ultimate value of instruction was to restrain and redirect the unseemly propensities, if not the evil nature, of their charges. It never seemed to occur to most primary school teachers that the inner life of children amounted to anything but a subversion of wisdom. They proceeded to ignore, if not to suppress it.

In recollections of students and of teachers, and in analyses and criticisms of foreign visitors and of interested Americans, there is overwhelming evidence to suggest that the generality of American teachers—in settings as diverse as the one-room subscription schools and district schools of the countryside, the monitorial schools of the cities, as well as the bureaucratized urban public schools of the latter half of the nineteenth century—shared the conviction that childhood was a precarious and undesirable state and that the primary school teacher needed to provide occasions for intellectual exercise which they designed simultaneously to encourage students to acquire the rudiments of knowledge as well as to suspend any subjective evaluations or impressions of the material.²

This analysis is derived from descriptive literature comprising recollections, observations and criticisms of classroom procedures written by a multitude of individuals using a variety of methods. The inherently subjective character of each source and the limited number of schools described in each source requires cautious use. The collected data can convey some sense of variety in classroom procedures, but cannot document the frequency of each type of behavior in American schools. Because those who describe schools are a select group, and because the sources themselves are selectively published and preserved, there are bound to be distortions. Nonetheless, a range and variety of instructional behaviors can be discerned, and the behaviors are startling in their consistency and persistence.³

In relatively homogeneous rural communities, where family, church and school together provided a highly structured and controlled educational environment and where threats to stability, order and continuity were not obvious, teachers nonetheless seemed to regard the restraining character of literacy as fundamental. Unlike their urban counterparts, they almost never consciously elaborated the relationship between character and intellect, but their stated goals suggest that they tied literacy and morality inextricably together. A Brush County, North Carolina, schoolmaster emphasized the moral intention of his teaching when, he intoned: “. . . an endless throng of heedless children in mad pursuit of illusive childish joys danced by my station. If left unwarned they would surely choose the downward way. . . .” A Pennsylvania teacher of the 1850’s also tied his role as a teacher to the characteristics which he believed literacy would nurture. The whole future of these boys and girls, he declared, “. . . might be rightly shaped or malformed” in his classroom. His intention was to instill “. . . a *right* appreciation of the world, its people and its destiny”⁴ (emphasis mine).

In urban schools, where teachers commonly instructed children from a variety of ethnic and social backgrounds, and where economic, social and demographic factors were transforming the supervisory function of the family, teachers consciously tied intellectual and moral aspects of education inextricably together as they described their own importance. The Baltimore School Commissioners described the role of a successful teacher as essentially restraining: “In the space of 7 out of 14 waking hours, the child is, as it were, stolen from himself . . . the intellectual faculties, are exercised by themselves and for themselves, and the passions are at rest. . . . In a well regulated school, passions ought to have no play, the lower propensities no expression.”⁵

The Boston grammar schoolmasters who had controlled popular schooling in Boston in the 1830’s and 1840’s also tied intellectual discipline and moral restraint inextricably together: “The object of elementary instruction of our schools . . . is, not alone to impart a certain amount of knowledge to the pupils, but to give . . . training . . . to dis-

cipline and strengthen their minds, and prepare them, as far as possible, for that independent action, which will be required of them in the discharge of the duties of life.”⁶ Twenty years later, the Boston School Committee defined the teacher’s obligation in a manner which also suggests the necessity of intellectual discipline to assure moral restraint—the kind of restraint which they apparently felt was missing from family discipline in the lower classes:

Taking children at random from a great city, undisciplined, uninstructed, often with inveterate forwardness and obstinacy and with the inherited stupidity of centuries of ignorant ancestors; forming them from animals into intellectual beings, and . . . from intellectual beings into spiritual beings; giving to many their first appreciation of what is wise, what is true, what is lovely and what is pure.⁷

The tendency to place intellect in the service of moral restraint is also demonstrated by the behavior of teachers as intellectual guides. Even in their most narrow capacity as instructors, teachers indirectly, and for the most part unconsciously, emphasized “rule-mindedness” and the suppression of subjectivity as essential qualities in intellectual development. They consistently tried to impose intellectual order by compelling students to memorize facts. North and south, east and west, in rural schools as well as urban schools, throughout the nineteenth century, we find that teachers assigned lessons, asked questions, and created standards of achievement designed to compel students to assimilate knowledge and practice skills in a particular fashion. It was a fashion dictated by the textbooks usually—and often with dogmatic determination. But occasionally the teachers themselves interpreted material for the students. Indeed, their behavior as instructors suggests that teachers were uninterested in the ways that students reacted to the material. Indeed, in all of the descriptive literature, I was able to find only three examples of teaching situations in which teachers engaged students in discussions designed to elicit student ideas;⁸ only two descriptions of original composition writing and the preparation of speeches;⁹ and no descriptions of discussion which required students to interpret, or criticize textbook materials.¹⁰

The descriptive literature suggests that there were basically three patterns of instructional behavior in nineteenth-century popular schools—all of which required rule-mindedness and the suppression of subjectivity. The first pattern—that of the Intellectual Overseer—involved the teacher in little more than the rendering of assignments and the punishment of mistakes, and involved students in memorization. A Hoosier man recalled this verbal exchange in 1820, typical in the descriptive literature of the nineteenth century.

“Open thy book,” the master commanded.
It was opened.

“Now what letter is this?”

The child hesitated.

“It’s A,” said the master, “A, A, A! Look at it. Now tell me what it is.”

The child timidly answered, “A.”

“That’s right. Remember it’s A. Now what’s this next letter?”

Again the child hesitated.

“I tell thee it’s B. Look at it. It’s B, B, B! Now tell me what it is.”

The child, a little encouraged, answered, “B.”

“Yes, that’s right. Now don’t forget. This is A and this is B. Now go to thy seat, and study these two letters till thee know them by heart.”¹¹

The second pattern of instructional behavior—that of the Drillmaster—involved teachers in leading children in concert or individually through a variety of exercises which compelled students to repeat the material to be learned out loud without involving teachers in illustration, in exploration or clarification of the material. For example, exercises in chanting or singing geography where teachers pointed to places on maps and heard students repeat names, locations, etc., were described in places as diverse as Hardin County, Iowa, and Uxbridge, Massachusetts; New York City and Medicine Lodge, Kansas; York County, Pennsylvania, and Boston, Massachusetts.¹² A Kansas mother who had attended school in York County, Pennsylvania, in the 1860’s and 1870’s recalled her exercise in “Chanting Geography”:

Maine, Augusta, is on the Kennebec River,
New Hampshire, Concord, is on the Merrimac River,
Vermont, Montpelier, is on the Onion River,
Massachusetts, Boston, is on the Boston Harbor,
Rhode Island has two capitals—Providence and Newport,
Connecticut, Hartford, is on the Connecticut River. . . .

The teacher, she went on, required them to repeat each line twice and then move on. “We covered the United States, South America, Europe, Asia and Africa in just the same way. Some of the tunes changed a little, but never the plan.”¹³ This sort of teaching behavior seems to have limited the quality of private musing in the students who remembered the exercises rather than their daydreams.

A third pattern of instructional behavior—that of an Interpreter of Culture—involved teachers in the clarification of concepts and in explanations of material. This kind of teaching behavior was unusual throughout the century, but might have occurred in any instructional setting.¹⁴ A teacher who taught in a one-room Massachusetts school in the 1830’s even recognized that the proper assimilation of the content of texts required prepared minds and readied his students for the verbal difficulties of Morse’s *Geography* in this manner:

I usually commenced by showing my pupil or pupils some very small object which I had about me, or which they had about them . . . and which was about an inch in length. I usually selected . . . a common pin. After a little familiar conversation with them about the pin—of what it was made etc. . . . I told them it was an inch long; and thus endeavored to fix in their minds, as the starting point, a clear idea of an inch.¹⁵

Even when teachers interpreted and clarified ideas, they rendered appraisals of student knowledge by measuring the ability of students to reproduce, parrot-like, the lessons to be learned.

The universality of these three patterns of instructional behavior suggests that the generality of American teachers behaved as though they believed that all knowledge, from reading to arithmetic, comprised collections of fact—absolute, unchanging, true. Like their contemporaries, they did not regard knowledge as provisionally held and progressively realized, as constantly changing and as subject to creative manipulation. The task of the student was to learn the material, and not to question its validity, nor analyze its meaning. The task of the teacher—essentially disciplinary—was to make students learn. In essence, teachers regarded the content of texts as fixed law, to be accepted, like the gospel, without inspection or criticism. This kind of pedagogy emphasized “Rule Mind-fulness” as a desirable intellectual characteristic, and led teachers to praise performances which were free of subjectivity and interpretation.

The deportment of teachers as disciplinarians also suggests that they rarely distinguished differences between the development of intellect and of character. In order to compel learning, teachers universally used external compulsions, from physical coercion to psychological manipulation of one sort or another. Indeed, they seemed to be committed to the notion that learning was a matter of the will rather than of the intellect. When one compares the teachers’ identification and treatment of misbehavior with their treatment of poor academic performance, one finds that teachers only rarely made distinctions between failure and misbehavior—an attitude incidentally, which they seemed to share with parents. An observer of Pennsylvania schools in the 40’s contended that “parents were uneasy if the master was backward in applying the rod” and inferred that the children “could not be learning much.”¹⁶ A Trustee offered this kindly advice to a prospective teacher in upstate New York in the 60’s: “Cuff ’em, thrash ’em—any way to Larn ’em, but whatever you do, don’t let ’em thrash you.”¹⁷ Warren Burton described the favor in which his most severe teacher was held by parents, who in the 20’s and 30’s in New England, seemed to equate good schooling with physical force.¹⁸ The two—learning and deportment—were seen as co-existent, concomitant forces, so dependent one on the other as to be almost undifferentiated.

The tendency of teachers to look upon academic failure as evidence

of moral sloth was not lost on their students, and it is noteworthy that the students as well as the teachers seemed to accept the efficacy of this painful method of instruction. A farmer recalling his Indiana school days remembered the following procedure in a log school in Indiana in the 1840's. "The master would open the book and listen. . . . If the [student] stumbled . . . he received a thump on the cheek, a twitch on the ear or a spank on the bottom." A New England student remarked that the thimble "was a unique teaching aid" and assisted students to learn their letters. "Thrashing," recalled William Dean Howells, of Ohio schools in the 1840's, "was one of the most efficient agencies of education." A student who was raised in Andover, Massachusetts, in the 1860's, recalled a woman teacher whom she was sure "would have liked to kiss away the tears that followed the snaps [of a thimble] . . . but," she continued, "she was too much of a martinet for that so she contented herself with sniffs so loud and peculiar that we came to consider them a natural and necessary part of the proceeding." A student described his teacher's equation of learning and deportment in school in the 50's in this way: "The larger switches were graded, partly by the size of the boys and partly by the gravity of the offense, the *gravest of which was an imperfect lesson. . . .*"¹⁹

Observers were no less sensitive than students to the uses of physical coercion to punish intellectual failure. "Children were whipped," recalled Paul Hanus of rural schooling in the 1870's ". . . not only for mis-conduct . . . but for failure to learn the assigned lessons." Teachers, recalled a New England woman in the 1840's, had no mercy on backward pupils and tried to bestir their brains physically.²⁰

Descriptions are legion of teachers who combined the cruelest physical torture with the more subtle persuasion of humiliation, in order to shame as well as pain students into learning. Lazy boy's corners, dunce or wisdom stools symbolized the uses of humiliation as an incentive to learning.²¹ A normal school principal, who described schooling in Oregon in the 1860's and '70's, recalled that a failing student would be "sent [to the] front to stand and face the pupils until his memory returned." The experience of a Hardin County, Iowa, man who attended schools in the 1860's suggests that his teacher had incorporated the collective wisdom of all other experts at humiliation. Not only did his teacher require pupils whose academic performance was unsatisfactory to stand with their arms extended or with a finger on a certain nailhead in the floor for a considerable time, but he often hung a wisdom cap on their heads, or compelled them to sit on the girls' side, or forced them to squat in tortuous positions for hours on end.²²

Teachers in monitorial schools of the cities also punished academic failure.²³ But the typical master preferred humiliation to physical coercion—Dunce caps, lazy-boy corners, and fool's caps were part of the technology of urban as well as of rural schools in this early generation.²⁴ A

resentful student who had attended a Roman Catholic Charity school described an elaborate academic incentive which, it is true, seems unusually severe:

. . . two other “implements of culture” were called respectively the “fool’s-cap” and the “hangman’s-cap.” The former was a kind of skull-cap, without a visor, which made a person look, and I presume, feel like a fool indeed. The Hangman’s-cap jutted all over with indescribable angles and snaky curves. . . . A boy, having the Fool’s or Hangman’s cap on, was marched . . . to the lower end of the hall and made to get up in the recess of one of the windows.

The scholars were ordered to turn and face him. The master then gave the order, and the whole assemblage, with fingers pointed, commenced to deride and insult their school-mate in every conceivable manner, and to set up so horrible a hissing at him, that one might have thought this academic place had suddenly been turned into a serpentry of the whole Ophidian race. . . .²⁵

The assumption that the development of restraint and of intellect proceeded simultaneously is equally demonstrated in descriptions of teacher behavior in the highly structured schools in the last half of the nineteenth century. Beside the usual arsenal of punishments for academic failure, these teachers had developed still others. A man who attended school in Hartford, Connecticut, in the 1870’s, remembered that students who failed were expelled. “A Monthly Report, containing the standing of each student in the school. . . .” was made public and sent home to parents. “If . . .” he explained, “one’s average dropped below Five for three months, one was dropped into the lower class; and if one was in the lowest class, one was dropped from school. Chicago teachers removed failing students to ungraded rooms labelled for dunces and truants.²⁶ Indeed, almost every major city provided ungraded classrooms, usually in basements, or in separate schools to house the academically incompetent and indolent—and they made no distinction between them.²⁷

The behavior of the teachers as disciplinarians reflected, it would seem, a commitment to the notion that the acquisition of knowledge represented a triumph of the will as well as the intellect. Consistently, in every kind of teaching situation, we find that teachers treated academic failure not as reflection of differences in student abilities nor their own inabilities as instructors, but as evidence of the students’ personal and moral recalcitrance. This tendency was institutionalized on a grand scale in the village and city schools of the last half of the century, where the presence of culturally and economically diverse groups of students required strenuous effort. Indeed, the evidence suggests that teachers in every setting only rarely distinguished between intellectual achievement and other aspects of student behavior as they meted out rewards and punishments. In effect, they obscured distinctions between academic performance and socially acceptable behavior, suggesting that they be-

lieved that academic achievement required restraint which they supplied with vigor.

The tendency of teachers to organize intellectual exercises in a way that would restrain willful passions was dramatically illustrated in cities where teachers developed elaborate rules and regulations to prescribe the physical movements of students. Not only did the teachers define when students should sit, when they should stand, when they should hang their coats, when they should turn their heads, when they should nod etc., but how to move when they recited:

While reading, as the eye rises to the top of the right hand page, the right hand is brought to the position seen in figure 4, with the forefinger under the leaf, the hand is slid down to the lower corner, and retained there during the reading of the page. . . . This also is the position in which the book is to be held when about to be closed; in doing which the left hand, being carried up to the side, supports the book firmly and unmoved, while the right hand turns the part it supports over the left thumb. . . . The thumb will then be drawn out between the leaves and placed on the cover; when the right hand will fall by the side.²⁸

A student who attended a monitorial Lancasterian school in New York recalled that every boy had to have his "left palm enclosed in his right behind his back, in a sort of self-handcuffed state, and woe be to him who is not paying attention when the order is given, or is tardy in obeying it. . . . Hadn't hands-behind was a significant offense in this school."²⁹

Such detailed attention to the physical movement of students was equally evident in descriptions of pedagogy in urban schools in the last half of the century. When a mathematics problem was proposed by the teacher, recalled one writer who described Cincinnati schools in the 1870's, ". . . down would go all the slates and the work of ciphering would proceed . . . as the work was completed . . . the slates would pop up against the breast, one after another; and when a boy was called upon to explain, up he would jump, rattle off his explanation, and then thump down again amongst the perfect stillness of the rest. . . ."³⁰ The tendency to equate the development of intellect and of character is most dramatically illustrated perhaps, in a description written by Joseph Mayer Rice in 1897. In a New York City classroom which he described, the teacher had carried the passion for obedience and mechanical submission to regulations so far that she had confused them with the instructional task at hand:

During several daily recitation periods, each of which is from twenty to twenty five minutes in duration, the children are obliged to stand on the line, perfectly motionless, their bodies erect, their knees and feet together, the tips of their shoes touching the edge of the board in the floor. The

slightest movement on the part of the child attracts the attention of the teacher. The recitation is repeatedly interrupted with cries of "Stand straight," "Don't bend the knees," "Don't lean against the wall," and so on. I heard one teacher ask a little boy: "How can you learn anything with your knees and toes out of order."³¹

The instructional behavior of teachers remained consistent in urban and rural settings, and in the North, South, East, and West. As teachers described their instructional role, as they drilled students in the fundamentals of literacy, as they enjoined the pupils, by one means or another, to be studious and diligent, and as they organized recitations, the generality of American teachers taught with a high sense of moralism which, if it did not subvert intellect, certainly channeled it into very precise paths.

The ideas of nurture writers such as Jacob Abbott, Bronson Alcott, Francis Wayland Parker and Lydia Signourey did not make their way into most classrooms in the nineteenth century. While these emissaries of childhood innocence were advancing pedagogical theories requiring teachers to nurture and study the imaginative faculties of children (the better to control their expression) most American teachers continued to combine moral and intellectual education so that the imaginative faculties would remain dormant in the classroom.³² Older forms of moral and intellectual education persisted.³³

While the institutional behavior of teachers did not reflect a commitment to new theories of child nurture, it also remained constant in the presence of economic, social and demographic upheavals that were transforming the character of urban society. The presence of large numbers of alien students probably explains the urgency of teachers' demands for intellectual and physical uniformity in urban centers. But in all environments, teachers organized their classes in a fashion that enabled them inexorably to link restraint and literacy and to suppress imagination.

University of Maryland

footnotes

1. This discussion revolves around schools which might be considered typical; of the sort that were accessible to most people. Free schools, and low-cost subscription schools, both denominational and nondenominational in character, are all exemplary. The role of teachers in fashionable and expensive seminaries, on Indian reservations, in schools where English was not the predominant language, in schools for the deaf, dumb, blind or insane will not be considered.

2. At no point have I generalized from one or two sources. Indeed, each generalization reflects convergences in the observations of a variety of people—teachers and students recalling their experience, foreign travelers observing American schools, and interested Americans describing and analyzing schooling. For a more complete bibliography see: Barbara Finkelstein, "Governing the Young: Teacher Behavior in American Primary Schools, 1820-1880." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1970.)

3. The similarities in teacher behavior from one organizational setting to another suggest that the setting had less to do with the ways in which teachers related to students than did the teachers' assumptions about the students. The assumption made by Michael Katz, *Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools* (New York, 1970), that schools would have been more responsive to

the needs of students and other dependent groups if they had been organized on the model of the "Democratic Localists," rather than the "Incipient Bureaucrats," seems clearly to be contradicted by descriptive evidence.

4. Lawrence Daniel Washington, *Confessions of a Schoolmaster* (San Antonio: The Naylor Company, 1939), ix; Jacob William Binder, *All in a Lifetime; An Autobiography* (Elizabeth, N.J.: Printed by Colby and McGowan, Inc., 1942), 16; see also: Mary B. King, *Looking Backward; or Memories of the Past* (New York, 1870), 14.

5. Baltimore Commissioners of Public Schools, *Eighth Annual Report of the Commissioners of Public Schools to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore*, 1836 (Baltimore, 1836), 9.

6. Boston Association of Masters of the Public Schools, *Remarks on the Seventh Annual Report of the Honorable Horace Mann, Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education* (Boston, 1844), 45.

7. Quoted in Michael B. Katz, *The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-Nineteenth Century Massachusetts* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), 120.

8. Leila Patridge, *The "Quincy Methods" illustration. Pen Photographs from the Quincy Schools* (New York, 1885), *Elizabeth Peabody's Record of Mr. Alcott's School*, 3d ed. (Boston, 1874); William Andrus Alcott, *Confessions of a Schoolmaster* (Andover: Gould, Newman and Saxton, 1839).

9. Patridge; Peabody.

10. Over 1,000 different descriptions were consulted, but they are not exhaustive by any means. Hence this statement might have to be qualified in the future.

11. James Baldwin, *In My Youth* (Indianapolis, 1914), 327. For other examples, see—for New England cities and towns: William Bentley Fowle, "Boston Monitorial Schools," *American Journal of Education*, I:1 (January 1826), 34; Anon., "History of a Common School from 1801 to 1831," *American Journal of Education and Instruction* I, (November 1831), 509; Amos Bronson Alcott, *New Connecticut, An Autobiographical Poem* (Boston, 1887), 131; William Augustus Mowry, *Recollections of a New England Educator, 1838-1908* (New York, 1908), 51-53; Anon., "Common Schools of Connecticut," *American Annals of Education and Instruction*, II (May 15, 1832), 246. For the Middle States, see L. Rufus, *Matthew Jones, A Small-Town Boy* (New York, 1941), 75; Eli M. Rapp, "The Eight Cornered Schoolhouse at Sinking Spring," Historical Society of Berks County, Pennsylvania, *Transactions*, VII (1907), 217-18. For the Midwest see: Edwin Sawyer Walker, ed., *Genealogical Notes of the Carpenter Family* (Springfield, Ill.: Illinois State Journal Company, 1907), 77; James William Turner, *Half a Century in the School Room* (Carrier Mills, Ill.: Turner Publishing Company, 1920), 19. For the South see: Rebecca Latimer Felton, *Country Life in Georgia in the days of My Youth* (Atlanta, 1919), 59; John George Clinkscales, *On the Old Plantation: Reminiscences of his Childhood* (Spartanburg, S.C.: Band and White, 1916), 81; Thomas Garth, ed., *Old School Days: Being Reminiscences of a Passing Generation* (Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, n.d.), 73.

12. James Langdon Hill, *My First Years as a Boy* (Andover: Andover Press, 1927), 183; Frank T. Clappitt, *Some Incidents in My Life, a Saga of the "Unknown" Citizen* (Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, 1935), 15-16; William Augustus Mowry, *Recollections of a New England Educator, 1838-1908* (New York, 1908), 22-23; Mrs. Francis Edward Clark, *The Little Girl that Once Was I* (Boston, 1936), 23; Flo V. Knisely Menninger, *Days of My Life: Memories of a Kansas Mother and Teacher* (New York, 1939), 122; C. Louis Barzee, *Oregon in the Making: '60's to Gay '90's* (Salem: Statesman Publishing Company, 1936), 60.

13. Menninger, 143; A complete text of a Singing Geography can be found in Edward Knight and Clifton D. Hall, eds. *Readings in American Educational History* (New York, 1951), 510-16; See also: V. Clark, *A Rhyming Geography: or, a Poetic Description of the United States of America* (Hartford, 1819).

14. See Katherine Henry, *Back Home in Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, 1937), 117; Daniel Carter Beard, *Hardly a Man is Now Alive: The Autobiography of Dan Beard* (New York, 1939), 54.

15. William Andrus Alcott, 240-41.

16. Rapp, "The Eight-Cornered Schoolhouse. . . ."

17. Quoted in James Mickel Williams, *Our Rural Heritage* (New York, 1925), 155.

18. Warren Burton, *The District School as it Was. By One Who Went to it* (Boston, 1833), 40. See also: William Cooper Howells, *Recollections of Life in Ohio from 1813 to 1840* (Gainesville: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1963), 414. Baldwin, *In My Youth*, 328; John Morris Dodd, *Autobiography of a Surgeon* (New York, 1928), 63; Judge D. F. Morrow, *Then and Now in Education: Reminiscences and Historical Romance* (Macon: The J. W. Burke Company, 1926), 227.

19. Descriptions of physical punishments and instruments of torture appear to be universal in the literature of the rural schools. The following five citations are intended partially to document the fact that corporal punishment might have been employed with equal vigor in the north, south, east, or west, in the ungraded one-room school, throughout the period under discussion. Baldwin, *In My Youth*, 335; Sarah Stuart Robbins, *Old Andover Days: Memories of a Puritan Childhood* (Boston, 1908), 61-62; William Dean Howells, *Recollections of Life in*

Ohio from 1813 to 1840 (Gainesville: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1963), 41; E. E. Kenney, "Recollections of Early Schools," *University of Texas Bulletin* No. 1824 (April 25, 1918), 137.

20. Paul Henry Hanus, *Adventuring in Education* (Cambridge, Mass., 1937), 27; Garth, ed., *Old School Days*, 40.

21. Descriptions of these procedures also appear to have been universal. For particularly graphic descriptions of the combining of physical torture and humiliation, see: New England: Burton, *The District School as It Was*, 39; Walter Brooks, *A Child and a Boy* (New York, 1916), 110; William Smith Knowlton, *The Old Schoolmaster: or Forty-Five Years with the Girls and Boys* (Augusta, Maine: Burleigh and Flynt, Printers, 1905), 28; Middle States: L. B. Balliet, "A Lehigh County English School Seventy Years Ago," *The Pennsylvania-German*, IX-1 (January 1907), 526; West: Hill, *My First Years as a Boy*, 185-86.

22. Barzee, *Oregon in the Making*, 61; Clampitt, *Some Incidents in My Life*, 15-16.

23. The sources around which this discussion of Lancasterian schools turn portray schools in eastern cities—New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Baltimore, Pittsburgh. But there is guidance to suggest that monitorial schools in cities further west resembled those of the eastern metropolises. Civic leaders from places such as Cincinnati and Lexington dispatched men to study schools in Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York and Boston. Richard C. Wade, *The Urban Frontier: The Rise of Western Cities, 1790-1830* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), 105-25. Articles appear frequently in the *American Annals of Education and Instruction* and describe the progress made by western cities in establishing monitorial schools. Allusions to Lancasterian schools can also be found in other periodicals. See for examples: *American Journal of Education*, 1826-1830; *Western Academician and Journal of Education and Science*. The Joseph Lancaster Papers in the American Antiquarian Society in Worcester, Massachusetts, also contain references to Lancasterian schools in many cities. Manuals prepared by masters of Lancasterian schools in particular locations also indicate their omnipresence. See, for example, William Dale, *A Manual of the Albany Lancasterian School* (Albany, 1820); John Franklin Reigart, *The Lancasterian System of Instruction in the Schools of New York City* (New York, 1916). Several other historians allude to the presence of Lancasterian schools in particular states. See, for examples: Moses Edward Ligon, *A History of Public Education in Kentucky* (Lexington, 1942), 33; Charles Lee Coon, *North Carolina Schools and Academies, 1790-1840: A Documentary History* (Raleigh, 1915), 722-45; William Arthur Maddox, *The Free School Idea in Virginia Before the Civil War* (New York, 1915).

24. Descriptions can be found in the following sources: "My School Boy Days in New York City Forty Years Ago," *New York Teacher, and American Educational Monthly*, VI (March 1869), 89-100; John Griscom, *Memoir of John Griscom, LLD* (New York, 1859), 206-07; John Howard Redfield, *Recollections of John Howard Redfield* (New York, 1900), 201; Edward Strutt Abdy, *Journal of a Residence and Tour in the United States of North America, from April, 1833, to October, 1834* (London, 1835), I:152; Thomas Hamilton, *Men and Manners in America* (Philadelphia, 1833), 52-57; Isaac Fidler, *Observations on Professions, Literature, Manners, and Emigration, in the United States and Canada, made during a residence there in 1832* (New York, 1833), 39-40; William Bentley Fowle, "Boston Monitorial Schools," *American Journal of Education*, I:1 (March 1826), 160-66.

25. "My School-Boy Days," 95.

26. William Lyon Phelps, *Autobiography with Letters* (New York, 1939), 100; Chicago Board of Education, *Twenty-Third Annual Report for the Year Ending July 31, 1877* (Chicago, 1877), 24.

27. The similarity of treatment afforded to the academically incompetent and to the negligent and truant, suggests that schoolmen continued to be committed to the notion that academic failure was a moral issue. For descriptions of large city schools with separate rooms for dunces and truants, see the following sources: Boston School Committee, *Annual Report, 1857* (Boston, 1858), Section Five: *Report of the Committee Appointed to Visit the Public Schools of Philadelphia, New York, Brooklyn, and Boston, to the Board of Commissioners of Public Schools of Baltimore, 1867* (Baltimore, 1867), 13; William Edward Baxter, *America and the Americans* (London, 1855), 159.

28. "My School-Boy Days," 96.

29. *Ibid.*

30. "Two Representative Schools," *The New York Teacher, and American Educational Monthly*, V (July 1868), 75-78; See also: Mary Austin, *Earth Horizon* (Boston, 1932), 63.

31. Joseph Mayer Rice, *The Public School System of the United States* (New York, 1893), 98. See also: *Report of the Committee . . . to the Board of Commissioners of Baltimore*, 83.

32. We should note that the so-called "soft pedagogy" of Alcott, Abbott, etc. also had expression in the eighteenth century. See Nancy S. Hornick, *Anthony Benezet and the Rise of the Schools in Loco Parentis* (Unpublished biography in progress, University of Maryland, College Park) for an excellent analysis of Quaker pedagogical responses to social dislocation, and decline in parental authority.

33. I am grateful to my colleague Professor Gene P. Agre for helping to clarify a variety of theories of moral education.