Luther and the Foundations of Literacy, Secular Schooling and Educational Administration

Carmen Luke
James Cook University of North Queensland

Antecedants and consequences of typography and 16th century Protestant educational reform are outlined to show how curricular innovation led to a bureaucratic discourse of social control. It is argued that compulsory schooling for mass literacy gave rise to the institutionalization of childhood, and to state controlled techniques of normalization and surveillance. Implications for the histories of curriculum and administration are noted.

L'avènement de l'imprimerie et la réforme protestante du XVIe siècle ont eu pour effet la bureaucratisation de l'enfance. Le mouvement d'alphabétisation des masses a fait surgir des techniques de normalisation et de surveillance qui ont été remises aux mains de l'Etat. Ce mouvement de scolarisation obligatoire pour tous, en faisant de l'enfance une institution, ne pouvait qu'entraîner le contrôle social des programmes et de l'administration scolaires.

Introduction

Missing from contemporary curriculum and scholarship in educational administration has been a consideration of early modern historical foundations. This paper focuses on one such commonly overlooked historical juncture, the advent of typography and the development of early modern schooling. Luther's contributions to the foundations of early modern educational principles and to the fields of educational administration and curriculum will be examined. No Reformation scholar has overlooked as "key contributions" Luther's rejection of clerical privileges in favor of a priesthood of all believers and his vernacular translation of the Bible, considered a landmark in the standardization and development of modern German. His translation of the New Testament (1522) and the Old Testament (1534) into a German dialect spoken and understood by the majority of Germans was meant to give an unlettered laity access to the holy word independent of clerical mediation. In fact, the precondition that would enable the general public to read the Bible was the implementation of universal and public schooling for the promotion of mass literacy. And Luther, aided by Philip Melanchthon, laid a foundation for modern schooling through the curricular content and instructional methods they advocated. Their combined efforts to provide access for all children to schooling and to print literacy resulted in the

establishment of state administered Latin, vernacular and girls' schools throughout the reformed German territories. Yet the discourse of curricular and administrative history has omitted this era in its historical reconstruction and has sold itself short by delimiting its own history through a "constant harking back to the early nineteenth century" (Goodson, 1983, p. 407).

Curriculum studies has its own history that is at least as significant to the history of teaching and learning as the respective histories of educational philosophy, psychology and sociology (cf. Goodson, 1983). Luther's contribution to curricular and educational history is significant: He provided the intellectual impetus for an educational reform movement that encouraged and sanctioned the reconceptualization of pedagogical practices by educators such as Melanchthon, Bucer, Bugenhagen and Sturm. Their combined works marked a pivotal point in educational history, one that heralded the end of medieval scholasticism, and forwarded both a system of public schooling and a rudimentary version of an early modern secular administrative discourse. I will argue, then, that Luther's role in promoting a system of public schooling and in systematizing and standardizing the German vernacular was a central contribution to the formation of both the modern European state and modern schooling.

In what follows, I first outline the historical background of educational reform in the early decades of the Protestant Reformation, and then turn to a review of Luther and Melanchthon's curricula for sixteenth century Latin, vernacular, and girls' schools as documented in exemplary school ordinances. Implementing this early standardized curriculum gave rise to a formalized discourse on schooling. Hence, the early Lutheran stress on the mass transmission of literacy generated a prototypical *bureaucratic discourse* on teaching and learning in the context of state administered institutions of learning.

The early Protestant curriculum, institutional practices and administrative discourse aimed to ensure the uniform transmission of Lutheran doctrine, social morality and discipline (Luke, 1989b). This was made possible, in part, by the development of print technology which assured the mass production and distribution of the written word (Eisenstein, 1980). School ordinances and textbooks could be distributed in schools within a given territory or electorate, thereby ensuring, at least in principle, uniform standards and methods of teaching and learning. Examination and certification, and regular school visits (cf. Gawthrop, 1987; Strauss, 1978) were intended to provide order within and among schools, and among teachers and learners. These attempts at order marked the beginning of educational bureaucratization administered by the state. Secular and centralized administration of public schooling, so Luther and his contemporaries had hoped, would help reunite a religiously, politically, and socially disunified nation. Future generations, he believed, would acquire literacy and the ideology of the new faith through enforced public schooling. As Luther envisioned the reformed social order, the governance of a new German state, independent of the religious and political domination of papal Italy, would require a moral and intellectual rebuilding of the populace. And what better way to embark on a program of social and spiritual renewal but to lay the foundation in children and youth.

Antecedents of Educational Reform

The 1525 peasant rebellion changed Luther's attitude towards the German people, and his perceptions of the influence and consequences of his own word. Peasant objections to taxation, to their diminishing fishing and hunting rights,to compulsory labor for the local church and lordships, to regulations prohibiting the cutting of timber, and to the restrictions of grazing rights on local commons were longstanding. While Luther's preachings and many publications between 1517 and 1525 cannot be read as sole cause for the ensuing peasant revolt, they did contribute to the peasants' sense that their demands were just. Godly law, according to Luther to be found in unambiguous terms in the Bible, underscored the peasants' demands to break with territorial interpretations of ecclesiastical law. Peasants called for a just community of a Christian sister/brotherhood under godly law as laid out in the scriptures. Natural law, Luther had preached, was godly law to which each individual had equal right of access by reading the Bible. With scripture as the sole and final arbiter of individual and communal secular and spiritual life, the legitimacy of a political and social order dictated by church law and interpreted by ruling lords was effectively broken.

The religious and social chaos of the previous years had led to deterioration and, in some cases, total disintegration of church and school. What was desperately needed, in the estimation of the reformers, was a thorough assessment and documentation of existing conditions from which a scheme for the reorganization of church, school and community could be derived. In 1527 Luther, with the support of the Elector of Saxony, launched the first civil church-school survey. Luther's colleague and friend, Melanchthon, wrote the *Instructions to the Visitors* (1528) which was to guide examiners in their visits to every parish of the territory. By the 1560s all "reformed" pro-Lutheran territories throughout Germany had adopted the *Instructions* and implemented territorial visit.

The church-school survey revealed what appeared to Luther as a serious and widespread lack of commitment by parents to send their children to school. Formerly, the study of the learned disciplines had assured boys a future in the priesthood or the professions, "but these livings were swept away on the revolution which was now taking place " (Eby & Arrowood, 1934, p. 84). As a result, local schools and universities "were deserted," since "parents refused to have their sons study for a vocation so uncertain" (p. 84). Parents' negative attitudes towards formal education were further reinforced by the reformers' rejection of traditional scholarship, that is, monastic learning which, in Luther's (1526/1967) words, was "really a lazy, secure, and good life" (p. 149). As early as 1520 he had called for university reform in his *Address to the Christian Nobility*, an instant "best-seller" (Febvre & Martin, 1967, p. 29). Condemning the universities, Luther (1520/1967) wrote, "What are the universities, as at present ordered, but, as the book of Maccabees says, "schools of 'Greek fashion' and 'heathenish manners'" . . . where . . . Aristotle rules even further than Christ?" (p. 338). In addition, parental resistance to a classical education for their sons may have been supported by the wide dissemination and availability of the vernacular Bible

which Luther had claimed all along to hold the key to personal enlightenment, redemption, and salvation.

Yet by the late 1520s, Luther very clearly saw the need for an educated civil service trained in the classical languages, in church and civil law and history. Facility only with German was considered insufficient for good church and state government. In his popular *Sermon on Keeping Children in School* (1530/1967), he explained:

> Every community, and especially a great city, must have in it many kinds of people besides merchants. It must have people who can do more than simply add, subtract and read German. German books are made primarily for the common man to read at home . . . . There may, of course, be an occasional idolater, . . . who will take his son out of school and say, "if my son can read and do arithmetic, that is enough; we now have books in German, etc." Such a person sets a bad example for all the other good citizens. (p. 215)

Ten years earlier, in the *Address to the Christian Nobility* (1520/1967), Luther had judged the study of the classical disciplines and languages to be useful only to men "of higher understanding:"

> Aristotle's books of Logic, Rhetoric, and Poetry, should be retained . . . in a condensed form. Besides this, there are the languages — Latin, Greek, and Hebrew — the mathematics, history; which I recommend to men of higher understanding. (p. 339)

In 1530, however, in the aftermath of the peasant uprising and shortly after participating in one of the school visits, Luther's views on schooling, secular and spiritual governance had changed perceptibly to include "the middle class of common people" (p. 251). Citing his own background and schooling as an example for the necessity of sending children to school, he wrote (1530/1967):

> Without any doubt, I should not have come to this if I had not gone to school and become a writer. Therefore go ahead and send your son to study . . . your son and my son, that is, the children of the common people, will necessarily rule the world, both in the spiritual and worldly estates . . . . The born princes and lords cannot do it alone . . . . Thus both kinds of government on earth must remain with the middle class of common people. (p. 251)

Upon a return from a school visit in November 1528, Luther "was profoundly moved by the dense ignorance and indifference, gross immorality and spiritual destitution which prevailed everywhere" (Eby & Arrowood, 1934, p. 87). Henceforth, he would favor Latin over vernacular schools. Luther recognized that a broader, partially classical education was essential for the training of future church and state leaders. Vernacular schooling was seen as sufficient for the children of the common folk but considered inadequate preparation for the future ruling class.

Melanchthon took over the redesigning of the Latin school curriculum and Luther took charge of rewriting the curriculum of existing vernacular schools. That winter Luther set himself to work writing the *Short Catechism* and the *Longer Catechism*. Both works were to replace the Bible in religious school

instruction in the hope that a summarized and short version of Christian doctrine would preclude individual misinterpretation. In the preface to the *Short Catechism*, he explained:

> The miserable and deplorable situation that I myself encountered during my recent journeys as a visitor has forced and compelled me to cast this catechism, that is, the Christian doctrine, in such a small, concise and simple form. (in Thulin, 1966, p.104)

Both works went to press in early 1529. As the data from the church-school surveys showed, parents could not be entrusted to raise children in an appropriate Christian manner, let alone be expected to send their children to school voluntarily. The next imperative step was to expand and enforce universal and compulsory education. Compulsory schooling had already been implemented legally in Magdeburg, a city not far from Wittenberg, in 1524 (Parker, 1912, p.50), and in Eisleben, Luther's birthplace, in 1525. In 1528, compulsory schooling came under civil law in the Electorate of Saxony, in which Wittenberg was located (Parker, 1912, p. 52).

The causes and results of the 1525 Peasant Revolt had made Luther distrustful of vernacular schooling. Yet, some 30 years later, vernacular schools were recognized as essential and legitimate schools for the less intellectually able, poor or the rural, reflecting a renewed attempt to bring territorial subjects under centralized state control by imbuing all subjects with a standard set of religious and social/moral values. Underlying the emphasis on uniformity and repetition both in lesson scheduling and curricular content was a tacit recognition of the need for greater social discipline and civic order. In an era wracked by political strife over religious controversy, the surest way to preclude heterodoxy was to ensure conformity. The rising Anabaptist and other sectarian movements confirmed the fears of civil authorities and Reformation leaders alike that organized, religiously motivated dissent was a real possibility. Hence, a lawful and centrally controlled indoctrination program, as Strauss (1978) puts it, designed to reach both poor and rural subjects was seen as one way to prevent the formation of sectarian splinter groups.

The emphasis on both civic and religious order is understandable in light of the kind of disarray documented by visitation examiners (cf. Strauss, 1978). In order to enforce uniformity of thought and behavior, clear and simple instructions, both for children and teachers were seen as the key to preventing misinterpretation. The necessity for order, uniformity and regularity is a recurring, explicit and overarching rule in all the school ordinances — the German word *Ordnung* (ordinance) means order and orderliness.

The Latin School Curriculum

Because they highlight the reformers' perception of the need for uniformity, coherence, and order within and among regionally scattered schools, the curricula for various types of schools and different age/grade levels warrant some scrutiny. It seemed to the reformers that mass implementation of these curricula required

an administrative labor force and bureaucratic rule system to ensure that school masters adhered to educational content and pedagogical practices. We turn first, then, to a brief examination of curricula for Latin, vernacular, and girls' schools before examining the institutionalization of teachers and students.

Based on the model of a small Latin preparatory school Melanchthon had set up in his own home, the main purpose of elementary schooling for boys was "the inculcation of true religion and sound learning" (Woodward, 1965, p. 219). Melanchthon's Latin school model was implemented as a state system throughout Saxony in 1528. Other territories instituted variations on his basic curricular and instructional outline throughout the century.

The curriculum for the first class, "Classis Elementarium," was designed for boys with no prior reading or writing skills, and aimed at teaching the alphabet and the rudiments of Latin by use of the vernacular. Memorization and recitation of lists of Latin words and sentences was meant to expand the vocabulary as quickly as possible. One hour daily was reserved for music and singing (Woodward, 1965, p. 222). "Religion was taught in Latin and learned by heart. Singing in Latin by the entire group formed a most important part of the daily program" (Eby & Arrowood, 1934, p. 102). Sundays were reserved for the exclusive study of the gospel; the schoolmaster gave scriptural expositions to the entire school and students were to recite assigned portions of the Bible as well as the Lord's Prayer, the Apostle's Creed, and Ten Commandments (Woodward, 1965, p. 222). Provision for study on Sundays most likely refers to residential Latin Schools where students were full-time boarders.

An elementary Latin grammar, written by Melanchthon in 1524 and printed in more than 50 editions which were still in use in all public schools in Saxony until the eighteenth century (Painter, 1908, p. 167), was used to teach "short sentences, prayers, psalms, etc., in Latin and in German" (Woodward, 1965, p. 219). From *Aesop's Fables*, which Luther highly valued (MacKinnon, 1962, p. 102), dialogues were selected for memorization. These formed the basics of beginners' Latin conversation. Memorization of sentence structure and vocabulary preceded formal grammar study which, in Melanchthon's view, allowed students to become functional speakers of Latin first, and accomplished grammarians not until the second class. The textbook of the *Fables* consisted of a Latin and German version on each page which, for its day, was a revolutionary and innovative second language teaching strategy. Both Melanchthon and Luther believed in the use of literary works, instead of grammar texts, for second language teaching. By reading literature for language study, conversational fluency was made orally explicit and could be learned more readily than by study of grammar texts. As Luther saw it, "letters are dead words: the utterances of the mouth are living words, which in writing can never stand forth so distinct and so excellent" (in Eby, 1931, p. 165). Language instruction and learning thus were to proceed from conversational fluency to the study of grammar. Latin, the "sacred tongue," "amiable" Greek, and "majestic" Hebrew, according to Luther, "are much better learned by use and wont, than from these rules . . . . Is it not extremely

absurd, for one who would learn the sacred tongue . . . to pick the language out of grammar alone?'' (in Eby, 1931, p. 165).

In the second class, to which a boy was not transferred until the ''master perceived that he was ripe for a more rigorous type of instruction'' (Woodward, 1965, p. 220), the use of German was minimized, the study of Latin syntax was introduced, and readings included Terence and Virgil (Woodward, 1965, p. 220). Upon entering the third class, the student was expected to study the rudiments of logic and the principles of rhetoric, both considered indispensable skills for future university studies and eventual work in the clerical or secular professions. Conversational and written expertise in Latin was required and readings included Livy, Horace, Ovid and Cicero. Boys were grouped according to ability and those most advanced in their studies were taught Greek which Melanchthon, professor of Greek and theology at Wittenberg University, held in high esteem; some were encouraged to study Hebrew. Small group and individual instruction seems to have been the norm for study of the languages, except ''twice a week there shall be two lessons (e.g., upon a play of Plautus, or a book of Cicero's *Letters*) given to the entire class'' (in Woodward, 1965, p. 221). The classics, then, figured prominently in the Lutheran conception of what was to count as an ''educated man,'' a future member of a civil service elite. Vernacular religious training, by contrast, was seen as both essential and sufficient for the ''literate Christian,'' the ordinary peasant, burgher, artisan, merchant, or housewife.

The Vernacular School Curriculum

Under the direction of Duke Christopher of Württemberg, the school ordinance of 1559 established a system based on Melanchthon's three-tiered model of the Latin schools, but included as well vernacular schools, schools for the poor, and schools for girls. The Württemberg school system benefitted from 30 years of experience and data gathered by other territories in the establishment of compulsory and universal schooling. ''Particular'' or elementary schools were set up throughout districts from which ''able'' students would progress to one of two ''pedagogia'' in either urban Stuttgart or Tübingen. Pedagogia were similar in kind to the modern high school, organized into five classes in preparation for university entrance (Eby, 1931, p. 213). ''Lower'' and ''higher'' cloister schools were residence schools designed primarily for the training of pastors, teachers and parish administrators. Elementary schools were retained in larger towns; rural hamlets and villages provided basic catechetical instruction through the parish. Under the article ''Of the Instruction,'' the ordinance prescribes in concise, unambiguous terms what should be taught, how to teach, and how to classify and group learners. In the first class ''. . . those are placed who are first beginning to learn the alphabet; the second, those who are just beginning to put syllables together; the third, those who are beginning to read and write'' (in Eby, 1931, p. 224). Within each class, students are to be grouped according to ability, ''. . . so that those of equal aptness to learn in each group may be put together, in order that the children may be stimulated to industry and the work of the schoolmaster

may be lessened'' (pp. 224-225). Schoolmasters are advised not to hurry the children or promote them until competence is achieved. The teaching of the alphabet should follow a systematic approach, but occasionally the letters ''should be broken up and with the letters mixed up the children should be asked to name some of the letters indiscriminately'' (p. 225).

While ability grouping may very well have stimulated children to industry, it certainly had the intent of lessening the work of the schoolmaster. This early form of academic streaming, not unlike today's practices, undoubtedly facilitated more ''efficient'' instruction, testing and classification. And since school achievement — and classification according to ability — was to be certified through formal examinations, this procedural move towards more efficient administration of the teaching/learning process laid the foundations for the classification or, in Foucault's (1972) terms, the ''discursive construction'' of the (certifiable) literate subject.

Once identification of letters is mastered, pronunciation of syllables follows: Clarity of diction is stressed and ''they shall be taught not to mumble the last syllables'' (in Eby, 1931, p. 22). Once children are able to read ''tolerably well,'' writing instruction begins and children must have their own ''special booklets.'' These the schoolmaster should examine regularly ''having regard to defects in the form of letters, the joining and adjustment thereof.'' Teachers are advised that ''each child be kindly spoken to in a low tone and shown in a friendly way how each defect should be corrected'' (pp. 225-226). Such a moderate approach is to ensure that ''the children before all things should be brought to the fear of God'' (p. 226). ''Scandalous, shameful, sectarian books'' are prohibited; authorized texts are the ''Catechism, the Book of Psalms, the Proverbs of Solomon, Jesus Sirach, the New Testament, and the like'' (p. 226). The Catechism, as Luther had envisioned it, was to be used as the basic text for language and moral instruction. One day a week, ''one particular hour of the same day'' was to be set aside for catechetical instruction. ''Thus uniformity may be preserved, be drilled into the children, ... that they become more familiar with it, so that they will memorize it, practice it, and rightly understand and comprehend it'' (p.226). Uniform comprehension was to be achieved by drilling content into children, by memorization, recitation, ''simple instruction,'' and explanation ''in a way that they can understand.'' As well, competition was seen as another useful instructional method and motivational device whereby all the children in the school ''shall compete in asking and answering questions about the Catechism'' (p. 220).

Music and singing instruction on certain days of the week at the same hour each day was to accustom children to singing in church and at school. Luther considered music and gymnastics an important part of the curriculum and he apparently took a personal interest in the implementation of these programs in the schools around Wittenberg. In the 1528 ordinance, written by Luther's friend and colleague Johann Bugenhagen for the town of Brunswick, the teaching of vernacular and Latin songs is stressed:

> it is their [the choristers'] particular duty to teach all children, large and small, learned and ignorant, to sing (as Philip Melanchthon has stated in the aforementioned book) common songs in German and Latin . . . . In this way all children and youth shall learn to sing in the school. (in Eby, 1931, p. 201)

In both Latin and vernacular schools, precise and detailed specification of all aspects of teaching and learning reflected new conceptions of discipline and pedagogy. Luther's incessant appeals between the 1520s and 1540s for more extensive popular schooling for all children, and for the formal (Latin) education of a new class of future state officials, were finally realized during mid-century. As the ordinance and visitation documents indicate, public school systems were operational throughout reformed German territories (cf. Gawthrop, 1987; Strauss, 1978).

The 1559 Württemberg ordinance exemplifies the beginning of modern school organization, the irrevocable trend towards a "totalized administration" of knowledge and of children (cf. Foucault, 1979). Regularity and repetition to promote conformity of thought and behavior constituted the new pedagogical method and aim; all school procedures were recorded, all documents processed by state appointed officials. Further, the increasingly "efficient" administration of school and pupil progress was catalogued and permanently fixed in the state archive, constituting a personal yet public record of the individual characterized by ratings of skills achievement, personal demeanour, and academic placement in relation to peers.

An archive of the "personal" enabled the administrative grouping of individuals according to intellectual, behavioral, and social criteria. Yet students were grouped not only on paper, but also physically and spatially in classrooms and schools in the same rank order as their index cards in the administrator's bureau. The power of "dividing practices" — the classification and hierarchical structuring enabled by the examination — was based on and derived from the objectification of knowledge (Foucault, 1977). The transmission, acquisition, and reproduction of school knowledge reified in the (confessional) examination, comprised a procedural discourse within which the subject was constituted as an object of knowledge. The student was transformed into a discursive object of study, scrutiny, and knowledge, and the student was reconstituted as an embodiment of certifiable knowledge. Mandatory examination as part of compulsory schooling, Foucault (1977) comments, "is the technique by which power . . . holds them [school children] in a mechanism of objectification" (p. 187). The school's discursive practices took children from a previously undifferentiated social mass and constructed them as objectified subjects by way of

> efficient and diverse applications of these combined procedures of power and knowledge . . . modes of classification, control and containment . . . to dominated groups or to groups formed and given an identity through the dividing practices. (Rabinow, 1986, p.8)

Schooling practices, then, aimed at reform of the individual and society, generated administrative processes of grouping and individualizing human subjects and gave rise to more formalized inquisitorial processes of probing, questioning,

observing, examining. Such practices, however, were confined not solely to the disciplinary and social control of subjects but extended to a surveillance network to include the institutions in which subjects were incarcerated for reform.

Personal surveillance by school inspectors was regular and highly regulated, as the 1559 Württemberg ordinance states that the Inspector shall "either alone, or, if necessary, with the bailiff and regular inspectors visit the school at least once a month, and see how, and to what extent, these school-regulations of ours are carried out" (Learned, 1914, p. 17). This system of monthly school inspections points to the urgency and seriousness with which the reformers saw their task of ensuring uniform, consistent and continued adherence to school regulations. School inspectors and their visitation documents were not beyond supervision either: "The highest body within the church administration annually reviewed the inspectors' reports and took action whenever needed" (Gawthrop, 1987, p. 33).

Visiting officials were to be present not only at students' examinations and promotions, but were required to examine the teachers periodically as well. As Learned (1914) comments, "It is apparent that the schoolmaster is no longer master within his own domain, but has become a public servant in a minutely regulated institution" (p. 17).

All of Bugenhagen's ordinances, in use throughout northern Germany, specified requisite teacher qualifications including the exact credentials necessary, preliminary examinations to be passed, practica to undergo, final examinations and disputations to pass before official appointment to a rector or sub-rectorship. The examination, then, situated not only students but teachers as well in a network of writing which located and fixed them "in a system of intense registration and . . . documentary accumulation" (Foucault, 1977, p. 189). At the level of the student, "the examination enabled the teacher, while transmitting his knowledge, to transform his pupils into a whole field of knowledge" (p. 187). At the level of the teacher, the examination enabled the teacher, while transmitting his knowledge, to transform his pupils into a whole filed of knowledge" (p. 187). At the level of the teacher, the examination enabled school administrators to transform teachers and teaching into a field of knowledge. The precise and rigid organization of time, space and bodies in the schools, coupled with the confessional procedures of the examination and punitive procedures of classroom control, combined to constitute the site of early modern pedagogy where the calculated — pre-scientific — deployment of institutionalized disciplinary power and knowledge intersected. As Foucault comments:

> the examination in the school was a constant exchange of knowledge; it guaranteed the movement of knowledge from the teacher to the pupil, but it extracted from the pupil a knowledge destined and reserved for the teacher. The school became the place for the elaboration of pedagogy. And just as the procedure of the hospital examination made possible the epistemological "thaw" of medicine, the age of the "examining" school marked the beginning of a pedagogy that functions as a science. (p. 187)

Classroom control was a problem for educators then as it is now. Instructional guidelines were balanced by equally explicit guidelines for administering penalties for student infractions. The Latin school ordinance (1525) of Brunswick, for instance, prohibited corporal punishment for students over 17 years; instead, punishment was commuted to fines. The Kursachen ordinance of 1580 prescribed this punishment scale: a first verbal warning and reprimand followed by taking meals on the ground, the withholding of food and drink, whipping, confinement in the school dungeon and, as a final resort, the expulsion of the student from the school (Learned, 1914, p. 20). The maintenance of order and control among large groups of children and youth required a hierarchy of punitive procedures which paralleled the regulatory logic of an "orderly pedagogy" embodied in all the ordinances.

In all, a multi-tiered system of discipline and surveillance — of the student, the teacher, the school — repositioned children in a new institutional matrix and redefined them through a new discourse. As Foucault (1977) has observed of the disciplinary function of the examination — in the school, the prisons, and the military:

> The procedures of examination were accompanied at the same time by a system of intense registration and of documentary accumulation. A **power of writing** was constituted as an essential part in the mechanism of discipline [emphasis added]. (p. 189)

The compulsory (textual) registration of children in schools at once both institutionally separated them from society, and yet repositioned them as a formal and "public" part of society: Within this emergent discourse of curriculum, administration, instruction and evaluation, their status was redefined from the private domain of the family to the public domain of the state.

On the Education of Girls

In 1520 Luther wrote:

> Above all, in schools of all kinds the chief and most common lesson should be the Scriptures, and for young boys the Gospel; and would to God each town had also a girls' school, in which girls might be taught the Gospel for an hour daily, either in German or Latin. (1520/1967, p. 232)

Prior to the 1520s, education for girls in local or parish schools was not common, although the education of daughters of the nobility or upper class in convent schools had been in vogue for centuries. Four years later, in 1524, Luther again called upon parents to send their sons and daughters to schools which, as he points out, would not interfere with the duties expected from children at home:

> Boys shall attend upon such schools as I have in view an hour or two a day and none less; spend their time at home, or learning some trade . . . . So, too, your little girls may easily find time to go to school an hour a day and yet do all their household duties. (In Parker, 1912, p. 50)

The 1526 school reform document for the Electorate of Hesse made provisions for the education of girls who "were to be given some proficiency in reading, writing and needlework. Religious instruction was to consist of Psalms and selected scriptural passages" (in Strauss, 1978, p.20). This same document contains Luther's most direct explanation of what he considered the essential purpose of public education:

> It is sufficient reason for establishing the best possible schools for boys and girls that the State, for its own advantage, needs well educated men and women for the better government of land and people, and the proper upbringing of children in the home. (in MacKinnon, 1962, pp. 220-221)

Education was not seen as an end in itself, but as a means for individuals to be of effective, if differentiated, service to state and church. Men were to govern in the home, community and society; women were to administer the household. Efficient household management was seen as an important secular and spiritual function for women. Luther's denouncement of monasteries and nunneries and his stress on the social and spiritual importance of marriage and the family repositioned women from the private enclave of the cloister cell to the private enclave of the household.

Fellow reformer Johan Bugenhagen contributed much to the advancement of girls' education. A close friend and colleague of Luther and Melanchthon, he held the chair of theology at Wittenberg University, and was appointed pastor of the town church. His aim for educational reform was to combine both Latin and vernacular schools under one state system. He wrote school ordinances for the city of Hamburg (1529), Lübeck (1531), Bremen (1534), Pomerania (1535), Schleswig-Holstein (1542), Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel (1534), and for cities in Denmark and Norway during the late 1540s and 1550s (Eby, 1931, p. 192). The aims and methods of his interpretation of Lutheran pedagogy, then, had widespread influence across northern Germany and parts of Scandinavia. Prefacing a reprint of Bugenhagen's 1529 ordinance, Eby (1931) judges that "his services to popular education were greater in practical results than those of either Luther or Melanchthon" (p. 192). From "Concerning the Girls' Schools" in the 1529 Brunswick ordinance, we can derive some specific ideas held by the author about how and what girls should be taught, and we can assume these educational practices to have been in general use given the wide distribution of Bugenhagen's ordinances.

In order that girls not be required to "go a great distance from their parents," it was suggested that "four schools for girls be held in four well selected parts of the city;" girls were required to attend school daily, but "only one or at most two hours per day" (p. 204). In reference to payment of school fees to be paid to the school mistress "every quarter," it was pointed out that although "teaching involves trouble and labor," nonetheless, the teaching of girls required only "a short time." That is, girls could learn all that was deemed necessary "in a year or at most two years:"

> for the girls need only to read, . . . to hear some exposition of the Ten Commandments, the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, . . . what baptism is, . . . to learn to recite some passage from the New Testament . . . and some sacred history or story suitable to girls, in order to exercise their memories . . . and in addition to learn Christian songs. (p. 205)

Girls' formal education, then, was predominantly religious training. Subsequent to attending school for an hour or two, girls were to spend the rest of the day at home repeating their lessons, "and also to help their parents to keep house, and to observe, etc." (p. 205).

Rudimentary literacy was considered essential for the Christian girl and future housewife who could best manage household and children if her thoughts and actions were grounded in an understanding of the words of God:

> From such girls who have laid hold of God's word there will come useful, skillful, happy, friendly, obedient, God-fearing, not superstitious, and self-willed housewives, who can control their servants, and train their children in obedience and respect them to reverence God. (p. 205)

The ideal Christian woman, whether rich or poor, rural or urban, was envisioned as the mistress of the house — happy yet obedient, self-willed yet God-fearing.

Poor or rich, parents should strive to have their daughters acquire a basic Christian education in the schools. Poverty must not deter parents from sending their daughters to school for "if any burgher is very poor," there is a "general treasury for the poor" from which to draw school fees. In the 1529 Hamburg ordinance, Bugenhagen made a similar provision for a general treasury to fund rural schools for girls: "in every district a girls' school must be held" (in Eby, 1931, p. 212). Girls' schools under Bugenhagen's system were separate geographically from boys' schools. In contrast, the Wüttemberg ordinance of 1559 suggests that boys and girls were taught in the same school, if not in the same classroom, as the following directions to schoolmasters indicate: boys and "little girls" are to be "separately placed and taught:" the schoolmaster must "by no means allow them to run back and forth among each other, or to have disorderly relations with each other or to slip together" (p. 224).

In theory and in practice, boys' and girls' education were to be separate and divergent. Yet provision was made for a very basic education for girls which, although it emphasized traditional subject matter considered suitable for girls, aimed to teach girls rudimentary reading and writing skills. The mass promotion of literacy, irrespective of its essentially religious purposes, did give girls, particularly those in rural areas or from less affluent families, an opportunity to acquire the skills of reading and writing.

Undoubtedly, for many girls the opportunity to attend schools was constrained by social or economic circumstances. Generations of girls continued to be raised at home, unaffected by literacy or formal schooling. Given the greater availability of and importance placed on boys' education, we can assume that in most communities more male than female household members could at least read. In reality, one literate person among two or three families would be sufficient to

conduct Bible readings and discussions. And since the kind of vocations and professions that required a proficient literacy were exclusive male domains, the need to acquire a formal education or even basic literacy was perceived to be less important for girls. Nonetheless, Luther did provide the impetus for contemporary and later educational reformers to include girls in the formal educational discourse and to create a place for them — however constrained and constraining — in the public school system.

School Administration

The teaching of literacy at the classroom level, once consolidated and institutionalized as part of the state apparatus, generated an administrative discourse specific to "education." This institutional discourse necessitated concepts, language, procedures, and forms of documentation to express, in Foucault's (1977, 1981) words, a "technology of power." What emerged were newly defined hierarchies of power over placement and advancement for the student and teacher in schools: Instruments, methods, techniques, and objectives for examinations and certification; curricula and instruction to match students classified by age and ability; penalty systems for student and teacher infractions; systems for the administration of school and district finances, enrollments and so forth. In effect, a "bureaucratic" literacy (cf. Goody & Watt, 1968) emerged to administer the mass transmission of a "common" literacy. The rise of a public school system in sixteenth century Protestant Germany, then, generated an official, state sanctioned discourse on pedagogy, curriculum, and the administration of both (Luke, 1989a).

This official "educational" discourse, borne of an initial "grass roots" literacy movement (Cressy, 1980, pp. 184-185), organized and rationalized the institutional distribution of literacy. The formalization of this discourse was reflected in the efforts made, as outlined in the ordinances, to record and classify most aspects of students' and teachers' institutional performance, and to centralize this information as part of the state archive. On the school and community level — in those states that adopted the Lutheran system of state education — children, youths, and teachers were institutionalized and became identifiable, "visible" objects of knowledge via the written trace left by their own writings, and by the notations made about them by their supervisors and the surveillance experts of the visitations. The regulation and ordering of the processes of learning and teaching required a system of registration of all that went on in schools; detailed record-keeping and the wide distribution of school ordinances were meant "to regulate everything" (in Eby, 1931, p. 215).

The Württemberg ordinance, for instance, explained to teachers that "as we find heretofore in our schools a certain amount of diversity as regards teaching, authors and methods of teaching ... which is considered more of a hindrance than a help," the new ordinance "is simply arranged and may have a childish appearance" (p. 215) which no schoolmaster was likely to misinterpret. Teachers were called upon to "regulate everything," for the "good and advantage of the youth."

Regulations in the preparatory pedagogia and cloister schools were more complex. Here the "maintenance of right order" was of a more bureaucratic and administrative kind where examinations and certification held a key role for both students and teachers. Pedagogy and cloister schools were open only to boys, and the Württemberg ordinance called upon parents to be "on the look out for boys ... from twelve to about fourteen years of age who have good minds and are desirous and capable of higher studies" (p. 220). The institutional regulations at cloister schools and pedagogia indicate how thorough and detailed the registration of students and teachers, learning and teaching had become, and the kind of bureaucratic surveillance this imposed upon communities.

Admission to a pedagogium was dependent upon the results of both written and oral examinations. Prior to acceptance to examinations, students were to present certificates from pastor and schoolmaster "regarding his scholastic attainments, talents, and correct conduct . . . his age . . . demeanour, . . . the temporal means of his parents, and what sort of brothers and sisters he has, and whether these are educated or not, and, if so, to what extent in a Christian way" (p. 222). As well, parents or guardians were required to submit their written consent and, thereby, "obligate themselves" to support a boy's course of study. The school, then, served "not simply [to] train docile children," but also to supervise their parents, to gain information as to their way of life, their resources, their piety, their morals . . . to constitute minute social observatories that penetrate even to the adults and exercise regular supervision over them (Foucault, 1977, p. 211).

A detailed report of each student's ability and family background was to be prepared by counsellors and kept on file in Stuttgart, the territorial capital. Explaining the purpose of centralized documentation, the ordinance states "a regular record and catalogue should be in hand, so that at any time they [administrators] may see from it what sort of boys are in each cloister, and how many vacancies there are" (in Eby, 1931, p. 223).

It was hoped that the distribution of printed, identical ordinances and school texts to every school in a territory would standardize instructional practices and curricula. The data collected by periodic visits — in addition to centralized documentation of examination results, students' personal portfolios, and school enrolment records — enabled closer and more far reaching scrutiny of school affairs independent of personal monitoring. Under a system of state administered schooling, the accumulation of personal files of children, their families, and schoolmasters provided a newly devised form of registration of one segment of the populace. However inconsistent or inaccurate by contemporary standards, these early attempts at enumerating individuals within a secular network of writing signified the first subtle shift towards constructing more elaborate grids of classification upon which the social body would be mapped. The advent of demographic delineations of the populace is commonly associated with the eighteenth century "avalanche of printed numbers" (Hacking, 1982) but, in fact, quantification

had its beginnings in the sixteenth and seventeenth century church-school examination registers (Johansson, 1987).

Printing thus enabled the mass promotion of literacy through public education; the standardization of public schooling depended upon concerted efforts to enforce instructional, curricular, and administrative uniformity. The Württemberg ordinances and the attendant institutional processing of print and people, which the centralized administration of public schooling required, illustrate how the growth of an institution specializing, *inter alia*, in the transmission, production and reproduction of knowledge leads to the necessary correlative expansion of and refinement in methods of efficient administration.

Teaching and learning in public schools, then, by mid-century had become a clearly defined system of graduated curricula and instruction related to age/grade levels. Student and teacher recruitment, examinations, certification, school finances, the administration of different types of schools, and teacher training had all come under state jurisdiction, usually located in the capitals of territories, electorates, or principalities. State and church affairs were not disjoined, but state legislation was superimposed on municipal and ecclesiastical affairs.

Public compulsory schooling had seemed to Luther and Melanchthon a pragmatic idea and necessary precondition to reunite a religiously, politically and socially disunified nation that recognized the need to liberate itself from the cultural, intellectual and religious domination of papal Italy. A key issue for German national autonomy was the shift of religious-political power from Rome to domestic authority over local church and secular affairs at the national, regional and community level (cf. Holborn, 1961). The push for communities to select their own pastor who would, in turn, participate in the hiring of teachers, illustrates this trend towards local secular authority over religious and civil issues. The accumulation of data was meant to improve the efficiency of school administration and to provide order and discipline within and among schools and communities. This accumulated knowledge, in turn, would be reapplied to the system from which the data were derived to further improve its growth, efficiency, or "quality," all of which was an investment of sorts in the production of knowledge, beliefs, and skills embodied in children and youths. The "network of writing" (cf. Foucault, 1977) or record-keeping by standardized and multiple printed copies of documents underlay the possibility of systematizing the administration of schools and schooling across locales (cf. Innis, 1951).

Printed text, as distinct from manuscript text, enabled literacy, in the context discussed here, to develop two forms. First it promoted print literacy encoded primarily in religious text. At the "object level" of print literacy, then, the transmission of graphemic, syntactic and semantic elements of the (increasingly standardized) German language were inseparable from the ideological messages embedded in popular literacy. Phonemic elements differed regionally since high and low German texts were published throughout the century. Importantly, the most widely acknowledged consequence of print technology and the subsequent

spread of popular literacy (i.e., rudimentary reading skills and to a lesser extent writing skills) was the spread of "popular religion" (Graff, 1987).

The second consequence of the institutional promotion of literacy was the kind of administrative literacy that the rather complex organization of an unprecedented accumulation of documents engendered. At this second, or "meta" level of literacy, the school apparatus required interpretive, notational, and classificatory schemes with which to organize diverse information about a large number of people in and associated with a district's schools. The success or failure of a school could be judged according to school records and visitation documents that gave extensive and minute accounts of schools, church, individuals, and families (cf. Strauss, 1978). And so educational administrators and senior evaluators in charge of visitations became the instruments for the political supervision of collective forms of behavior, attitudes, and performance through the reinterpretation and rewriting of accumulated data in visitation reports and ministerial registers which, in turn, would provide the basis for further revisions of the ordinances.

Finally, "the school," as Foucault (1977, p. 186) notes, "became a sort of apparatus of uninterrupted examination that duplicated along its entire length the operation of teaching." Foucault here describes the eighteenth century French school, but his observations apply aptly to the sixteenth century German school which was established and functioned with the same zeal for "regulating everything" as La Salle had prescribed for the French Christian schools. The examination, perhaps more than the visitation documents of recorded observations, constituted and made visible the literate individual both as individuated subject and as object of knowledge. The construction of the individual subject by the textual and procedural discourse of the school parallels the ontological constitution of the subject fundamental in Luther's individualist theology. "For a long time," prior to the establishment of compulsory schooling, "ordinary individuality — the everyday individuality of everybody — remained below the threshold of description" (p. 191). The disciplinary apparatus of the school, and in particular the examination, "reversed this relation, lowered the threshold of describable individuality and made of this description a means of control and a method of domination" (p. 191). By transform[ing] the economy of visibility into the exercise of power" (p. 187), by "introduc[ing] individuality into the field of documentation" (p. 189), and by "mak[ing] each individual into a 'case'" (p. 191), the examination became a disciplinary technology which constituted individuals as elements of power and knowledge (p. 194). In pursuit of building, from the ground up, a moral, educated and disciplined citizenry, Luther's mass literacy campaign mobilized all possible forces of social registration which, in turn, laid the foundation for the modern bureaucratic state apparatus.

Conclusion

Public schooling based on the Lutheran model took root because printing helped popularize the religiously grounded rationale for view that it was the duty of individuals to become proficient in reading, and because literacy, for the most

part, had been accepted as the key to true faith and possible salvation. Public schooling can be considered as both consequence and concomitant of a mass promoted ideology that stressed the importance of individual duties and rights of access to the printed word (Graff, 1987). Knowledge and its transmission were no longer to be the private domain of clerics, but under state control, were to become "public property," accessible to all. The official power to select and transmit public knowledge, then, could be attained, in principle, by anyone since all children were legally compelled to attend public schools.

A half century after Luther helped to stir the German people to a social, political, and a kind of intellectual reawakening, education had itself become part of a social and political environment which, as Cressy (1980) notes, provided a fairly well defined and established context which would define the values, uses and criteria for literacy. In this sense, education as a state institution and as a political and social structure did take over the role of defining and evaluating literacy, and of establishing certain criteria for specific literacy skills required of educational practitioners (cf. deCastell & Luke, 1986; Graff, 1981). This historical development contrasts with the earlier push to promote literacy according to the criteria and aims set forth by Luther and contemporary educational reformers who had more narrowly defined literacy: first, to acquire the skills of reading to decipher and comprehend the scriptures and second, to acquire the Lutheran version of a "classical" education along the lines set out by Melanchthon to facilitate service to and leadership in the church and state. All these concerns about child and adolescents did, nonetheless, directly and indirectly bring the young under "professional" scrutiny, which itself was enabled by the (print) discourses of the ordinances.

Public schooling was not in effect throughout the German Empire. But in those states that did implement universal schooling, children's lives were affected. For many, learning had been removed from the home, the streets or the community and had been replaced by an organized and regimented institutional setting where rewards, punishments, and the ideas and skills to be learned were provided by an authority other than the more familiar and personal authority of family and community members. Public schooling undoubtedly affected parents who were now legally compelled to send their children to school and could not count on the economic benefits of free help received from children's labor in the household or workplace. For most children, a part of each day was spent in schools. For others, public schooling provided access to more and advanced schooling.

As the state assumed greater authority and responsibility over the social order, the need to systematize and enforce public schooling, to encourage advanced study, and to institutionalize the young seemed a reasonable and necessary step towards preparing future generations to perpetuate and uphold an ideology hard won in the face of internal and external political and religious adversity. The establishment of public and compulsory schooling reflects the support and furthering of two very radical and fundamental historical changes, the significance of which we can only appreciate in historical retrospect. One was the transition from oral

to print culture, and the other was the shift of authority over education from the church to the state.

As curricular historian Goodson (1983) has put it, curriculum theorists today either ignore curricular history altogether, or tend to fall into a nostalgic reliance on "the early nineteenth century for analogies with which to support contemporary theory" (p. 407). This contemporary orientation is a disservice to students of educational history and to the field of history itself. By way of conclusion, I wish to consider the concrete implications of this kind of historical omission for educational theorists and researchers.

The unspoken consensus in the scholarly community today is that the fields of administrative and curriculum studies have not been granted true disciplinary legitimacy. Administrative and curricular studies are often branded as an adjunct to the more traditional foundations of educational philosophy, sociology, and psychology. And yet there is some validity to the adage that a "discipline" does not mature until it becomes fully conscious of its own history. Certainly, educational psychologists — after a century of pursuing "state of the art" knowledge — are coming, however reluctantly, to this realization. The recent reorientation, for instance, from behaviorist to cognitive models has led to a rediscovery of the previously discarded work of nineteenth century foundational figures like Wundt and Ebbinghaus. Curriculum and administration researchers, by contrast, have not ventured past the well-trodden paths of the early and mid-twentieth century, the period commonly dated as the genesis of curriculum studies, when Charters, Bobbitt and, later, Tyler formulated the tenets of a "scientific" approach to curriculum development, alongside which the scientific management model of "efficient" educational administration emerged. Yet concerns about administrative and curricular reform have a more far-reaching and complex history than academic educational specialists are willing to acknowledge.

Not until more diverse historical studies are undertaken which attempt to unravel the many obscure and familiar power relations among cultural, political, economic, ideological and social processes, and curricular content and the administration of schooling, can we even begin to make any claims about the historical character of curriculum and educational administration. That is, in the absence of serious commitments to the critical and interdisciplinary study of the history of schooling, we cannot assume unconditionally that the "evolution of western schooling" is either the result of a continuous historical transformation or of a series of discontinuous innovative reforms or, alternatively, a series of adjustments in social control mechanisms. More historical inquiry is needed from differing disciplinary, interdisciplinary and methodological perspectives — demographic, social historical *and* discursive — before we can justifiably address questions about periodization, about school administration and curricula for whom, to what ends, and by what means.

The glaring omission of history courses in most educational administration and curriculum studies programs, and the almost complete absence of published works on educational administrative history over the past thirty to forty years,

attests to the ahistorical technicist sensibility of modern administrative and curricular studies. More to the point, this disregard for both administrative and curricular history will engender and legitimate disinterest among scholars, leading to the continuation of the training — not educating — of further generations of administrative bureaucrats and curriculum technicians.

I would like to thank Dr. Christopher R. Friedrichs, Department of History, University of British Columbia for his helpful suggestions in the preparation of this article.

References

Chaytor, H.J. (1966). *From script to print.* London: Sidgwick and Jackson.

Cressy, D. (1980). *Literacy and the social order: Reading and writing in Tudor and Stuart England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DeCastell, S. & Luke, A. (1986). Literacy in North American schools: Social and historical conditions and consequences. In S. DeCastell, A. Luke & K. Egan (Eds.). *Literacy, society and schooling.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eby, F. (1931). *Early Protestant educators.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Eby, F. & Arrowood, C. (1934). *The development of modern education.* New York: Prentice-Hall.

Febvre, L. & Martin, H.J. (1976). *The coming of the book.* Norfolk: Lower and Brydone.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge.* New York: Harper and Row.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipine and punish.* New York: Vintage.

Foucault, M. (1981). Questions of method: An interview. *Ideology and Consciousness,* 8, 3-14.

Gawthrop, R. (1987). Literacy drives in preindustrial Germany. In R. Arnove & H.J. Graff (Eds.), *National literacy campaigns: Historical and comparative perspectives.* New York: Plenum.

Goodson, I. (1983). Subjects for study: Aspects of a social history of curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 15*(4), 391-408.

Goody, J. & Watt, I. (1968). Literacy in traditional societies. In J. Goody (Ed.), *Literacy in traditional societies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Graff, H.J. (Ed.). (1981). *Literacy and social development in the West.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Graff, H.J. (1987). *The legacies of literacy.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hacking, I. (1982). Biopower and the avalanche of printed numbers. *Humanities in Society, 5*(3 & 4), 279-295.

Holborn, H. (1961). *The history of modern Germany.* New York: Alfred Knopf.

Innis, H.A. (1951) *The bias of communication.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Johansson, E. (1987). Literacy campaigns in Sweden. In R. Arnove & H. Graff (Eds.). *National literacy campaigns: Historical and comparative perspectives.* New York: Plenum.

Learned, W. (1914). *The Oberlehrer: A study of the social and professional evolution of the German schoolmaster.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Luke, C. (1989). *Pedagogy, printing and Protestantism: The discourse on childhood.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Luke, C. (1989b). Social control and the standardization of the word: Luther and Melanchthon's curriculum. *Discourse,* 9 (2), 64-81.

Luther, M. (1520/1910). Address to the Christian nobility of the German nation respecting the reformation of the Christian estate (C. Buchheim, Trans.). In C. Eliot (Ed.), *Harvard Classics,* Vol. 36. New York: Collier and Son.

Luther, M. (1526/1967). An answer to several questions on monastic vows. In R. Schultz (Trans. 7th ed.), *Luther's works,* Vol. 46. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Luther, M. (1530/1967). A sermon on keeping children in school. In R. Schultz (Ed.) & C. Jacobs (Trans.), *Luther's works,* Vol. 46. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Luther, M. (1532/1967). When women try to run everything. From 'Table Talk Collected by Conrad Cordatus'. In T. Tappert (Trans. & Ed.), *Luther's works*, Vol. 54. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
MacKinnon, J. (1962). *Luther and the Reformation*, Vol. 4. New York: Russell and Russell.
Painter, F. (1908). *A history of education*. New York: Appleton and Co.
Strauss, G. (1978). *Luther's house of learning*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Stupperich, R. (1966). *Melanchthon*. London: Lutterworth Press.
Thulin, O. (1966). *Life of Luther*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
Woodward, W.H. (1965). *Studies in education during the age of the Renaissance, 1400-1600*. New York: Russell and Russell.