The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Humanists in Education *Studies in Education during the Age of the Renaissance, 1400–1600*. By William Harrison Woodward. Cambridge University Press, 1906. *Vittorino da Feltre and other Humanist Educators*. By the same. Cambridge University Press, 1905.

A. F. Leach

The Classical Review / Volume 24 / Issue 05 / August 2010, pp 146 - 150

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0004508X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0004508X

How to cite this article:

A. F. Leach (1910). The Classical Review, 24, pp 146-150 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0004508X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

orthography. Priscian himself, I am sorry to report, 'broke Priscian's head' in laying down the law about the quantity of the antepenultimate. He classes (*inst.* IV. 31, vol. II. p. 135 19 Hertz) *aduecticius*, *commendaticius*, *Fabricius*, *pigneraticius*, *patricius*, *aedilicius*, *gentilicius*, as alike making the antepenultimate short; whereas it is long in the first, second, and fourth of his examples. Gerard John Vossius (*de arte grammatica* II. 23, ed. Foertsch, Halle, 1833, p. 200) shows from Martial (*suppositicius*) and Plautus (*emissicius*, *proiecticius*, *conducticius*) that derivatives from participles end in a dactyl, while the usage of poets proves that *Fabricius*, *tribunicus*, *patricius*, shorten the antepenultimate. He supposes that *nonicius* is an exception among derivatives from nouns. But *nonicius* does not

stand alone; *multicius* and *caesicius*?¹ follow the same law, and so no doubt does *aegroticius*, though no poet happens to use it. Vossius should have classed nouns adjective with participle. The orthography of the whole class is undoubted; yet Freund, Riddle-White, and Lewis-Short throughout give an option between *-itius* and *-icius*, and all three give *caesitius* (*sic*) as the normal quantity and spelling. Yet writers on education earnestly warn us against placing erroneous forms before our pupils' eyes. Lindley Murray is deservedly blamed for printing grammatical blunders to be corrected by learners.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

¹ *Caesicius* is long in Plautus (the only known example), but its meaning and derivation is unknown.

REVIEWS

THE HUMANISTS IN EDUCATION.

Studies in Education during the Age of the Renaissance, 1400-1600. By WILLIAM HARRISON WOODWARD. Cambridge University Press, 1906.

Vittorino da Feltre and other Humanist Educators. By the same. Cambridge University Press, 1905.

THE characteristic of all writers of the Renaissance, and of most writers on the Renaissance, which most forcibly strikes the modern reader, is the exaggeration of the novelty and the worth of the work of the Renaissance. To read their comments on the literary attainments and the intellectual achievements of the generations before the Renaissance, one would suppose that they were utter barbarians, ignorant of Latin and devoid of all interest in learning and culture. Not least in the field of education is this insolence to their predecessors exhibited by the Renaissance writers. Erasmus wrote of Colet's new endowment of St. Paul's School as if it was an unheard-of product of the working of a theretofore undiscovered mine of intellectual gold which Colet was the first to reveal to a purblind race, who had

either never suspected or had wilfully neglected the treasures beneath their feet. Colet himself spoke in unmeasured scorn of what was taught in the days before his own. Though he confessed that it passed his wit to devise and determine in particular what should be taught in his 'Newe Scole of Poules,' he was anxious to get rid of what apparently had been taught, or what he thought had been taught, in the old school. 'All barbary, all corruption, all Latin adulterate, which ignorant blind fools brought into this world, and with the same hath distained and poisoned the old Latin speech and the very Roman tongue . . . I say that filthiness and all such abusion which the later blind world brought in, which more rather may be called blotterature than literature, I utterly abolish and exclude out of this school.' Unfortunately, the authors he named as embodying the very Roman tongue, Erasmus himself, Lactantius and Prudentius, Sedulius and Juvenius, and above all Baptista Mantuanus, are such as would provoke the scorn of modern classical scholars, who would class them as emphatically blotterature rather than litera-

ture and relegate them to the same limbo with the holy Jerome and Ambrose, whom Colet speaks of in the same terms as of Virgil and Cicero. The Renaissance writers' praise of themselves and contempt of their predecessors is thus self-condemned in this classical example of it, while the modern scientist finds Colet's narrow programme, confined to two dead languages, even more contemptible and full of 'blind folly' than he found that of his predecessors.

Colet, by including in his statutes a provision that his Head, or High, master (for the provision did not extend to the Usher or Surmaster) should know Greek 'if such a one could be gotten' may have advanced a few inches. There is presumptive evidence that Greek was taught at Winchester and Eton before this, while it is certain that the first Greek teacher at Oxford, Grocyn, was a Wykehamist and New College man, and the first Professor of Greek at Cambridge, Cocks, was an Etonian and Kingsman. But it is one of the *idola fori* about the Renaissance that it was due to the introduction of Greek. The revival of Greek was an effect, not the cause, of the Renaissance. We have had abundant evidence from the 15th century downwards that a knowledge of Greek does not prevent a man from being a reactionary pedant and as 'blind' a 'fole' as the most 'Trojan' of schoolmen.

Mr. Woodward's two volumes show very conclusively that the introduction of Greek was not the cause of the Renaissance. Like others, he hails Petrarch as the morning star of the Renaissance, but Petrarch's star had set a generation before there was a single Greek teacher in Italy, while he himself had tried to learn Greek and failed. The earliest of the Renaissance educators, whom Mr. Woodward celebrates, Vergerius (though for some unexplained reason he treats of him after Vittorino da Feltre, born in 1378), was born in the year of the Black Death, and was a man of fame at 50 when in 1397 he began to learn Greek grammar with boys of 15 under Chrysoloras at Florence. Peter Paul Vergerius, for whom Purgatory would have been too good for introducing the per-

nicious practice of having two Christian names, published his work on a Liberal Education, '*De ingenuis moribus*,' in 1404. Full as it is of platitudes borrowed from Quintilian and Cicero, it never suggests that Greek is an element of a Liberal Education. Indeed, he laments that Greek was utterly lost to Italy 'except for one or two who are tardily endeavouring to rescue something from oblivion.' Vittorino da Feltre, who for his school at Mantua, started in 1414, is the chief hero of these books, was likewise born and bred and had finished his education before Greek was introduced. The first who seems to have advocated Greek as not indeed a necessary, but a desirable, part of education was Battista Guarino in 1459.

The fact is that the Renaissance itself is a misleading phrase. There was no new birth of learning wanted, because learning had never died—in schools, at all events. It may be doubted whether there was much difference in subject or method between the schools of 450 and those of 1850. The learning of Latin was the whole aim and end of education in schools. The authors read may have differed, though Virgil from first to last formed the staple of all. Otherwise Horace and Juvenal may have given way to Prudentius and Juvenius, and Cicero to Augustine, and *vice versa*. But it is by no means clear that the latter were not better stuff for the schoolboy than the former. There is more interest in a poet who believes in the God about whom he writes than in Horace's sceptical references in a mythological and antiquarian vein to the dying divinities of Greece and Rome. If it be said that the Latin of the Christian authors is inferior to that of their predecessors, we must ask what is the standard of inferiority. To all alike Latin was their native tongue. Is English as spoken today 'inferior' to that spoken by Shakespeare or Chaucer? It is certainly very different. If the professional teachers of English have their way in the schools we may soon find that Chaucer and Gower are the only wells of English undefiled, and that Byron and Tennyson will be relegated to some 'iron age' of English literature,

while Hoccleve passes muster as being of the Augustan or golden age. For people who wanted to know Latin, not to write Latin verses in imitation of Virgil, but to speak it or to read the latest work on theology or tactics or geography, the Latin of Prudentius and Augustine, or even of Duns Scotus, was as good or better than the Latin of Horace or Cicero.

The true virtue of what is known as the Renaissance is much better expressed in the term, which is that usually applied by Mr. Woodward, of Humanism. It is not the introduction of Greek or the imitation of Cicero, the preference for the study of grammar dialectic, over the details of philology instead of the niceties of logic which constitutes the Renaissance. It was the substitution of humanism for divinity, of this world for the next, as the object of living, and therefore of education, that differentiated the humanists from their predecessors. For a thousand years the attention of educated mankind had been concentrated on its latter end, or on what was feared to follow it. Not life but death had been the subject of culture. Not how to prepare for life but how to prepare for death was the sole object of education. The humanists' progress consisted in the adoption of Pope's dogma, 'The noblest study of mankind is man.' In preaching and practising Cicero in place of Lactantius Petrarch substituted political for theological study. His own Ciceronian Latin, of which he and his age were so proud, is spoken of by Erasmus with almost the same contempt as he spoke of his predecessors, or as our scholars speak of Erasmus. 'He wants full acquaintance with the language, and his whole diction shows the rudeness of the preceding age,' said Erasmus. An Italian writer quoted by Hallam describes Petrarch's style still more unkindly, as 'scarcely bearing the character of Latinity.' The methods of the humanist educators show little difference from those of their predecessors. Though the Roman politician very much idealised is substituted by Vittorino da Feltre and P. P. Vergerius for the starving monks and ascetic unwashed as the ideal, the means of ap-

proaching the ideal are not greatly altered. Asceticism still sheds its baneful shade. Vergerius' *Liberal Education* lays it down that 'dancing should be kept at a distance and the society of women carefully avoided.' 'Never is it allowable to eat, drink, or sleep up to the point of complete satisfaction.'

Æneas Sylvius, afterwards Pope Pius II., brought up himself in the humanist atmosphere, advising the King of Bohemia and Hungary 'On the Education of Boys' (*De liberorum educatione*) in 1450, still speaks in the words of Wykeham in 1382 of grammar as the doorway to all knowledge. Vittorino da Feltre recommends 'old Donatus,' as did Wykeham, and puts the *Doctrinale*, the grammar in doggerel Latin verse, of Alexander de villa Dei, a Dominican friar of 1240, into the hands of Cecilia Gonzaga, daughter of the tyrant of Mantua, at the age of 6. The results of humanist education in her case, by the way, do not seem to have been very different from those of the theologians, as the poor girl became a nun, Vittorino himself aiding and abetting, and indeed instigating her against her parents' wishes. Nicholas Perotti, a pupil of Vittorino's, first tried to oust Alexander. By him, says Mr. Woodward, the main lines of grammar, as understood for centuries afterwards, were now for the first time determined. Grammar is now defined as 'ars recte loquendi recteque scribendi scriptorum et poetarum lectionibus observata,' and as being 'initium et fundamentum omnium disciplinarum.' But surely he cannot think that this was any new definition or description. It is as old as Dionysius Thrax, c. 166 B.C., and through Quintilian, Donatus, and Priscian descended to Alcuin and all the schoolmasters of the Middle Ages.

Mr. Woodward also appears to find novelty in and to be surprised at the amount that was learnt by heart in the humanist schools, which seems to him to point to memory being 'much stronger' and a far more ready instrument of education than it is to-day. 'Whole orations of Cicero or Demosthenes, books of Livy and Sallust, besides large portions of Virgil and

Homer, were recited with accuracy and taste by boys or girls of less than 14 years of age.' But this was only in accordance with the practice of all the schools of the Middle Ages, and continued until half a century ago. The present writer took part in the last 'standing-up' at Winchester in 1864. Though it was then in a state of decadence and not half the tasks were set that characterised the heroic ages before, yet one term's learning produced by heart the whole of the 2nd *Aeneid*, half a book of Horace's *Odes* and a large slice of Livy. 'Taste' was certainly not required in the repetition of it, but 'accuracy' was, and full marks testified to that. The late Earl of Selborne records how in his day one boy took up the whole *Aeneid*, and another, who left at 16 to be killed in the Crimea, the whole of the *Iliad*. In the 13th and 14th centuries, as in earlier times, the whole psalter was habitually required to be known by heart after a year's learning by the 'Poor clerks' of Lincoln and other places. All the services, except special saints' day services, had to be known by heart, and done without book. At the most, if there was a change by the humanist schoolmasters, it was only to substitute the Latin classics for the Latin psalter as the subject of repetition. But in the scarcity of books not only the service-books but law and classics had been learnt by heart at the schools and universities. The *Disciplina Scolarium*, long attributed to Boethius, though it contains a lively account of the University of Paris, prescribes Seneca and Statius, Lucan, Virgil, Horace and Ovid to be learnt by heart. Whether this intensive cultivation of the memory was a good or a bad thing, it was certainly no new thing originating with the humanists.

Nor were the pedagogic works of Vergerius and Æneas Sylvius and others, whom Mr. Woodward has collected and translated for us, new in substance. They seem to have been largely based on Friar Vincent of Beauvais' 'Education of the sons of nobles' addressed about 1250 to Queen Margaret of France, wife of Louis IX., itself largely borrowed from Hugo's *Scholastic Discipline*. The main difference consists in the object

laid down. Whereas the 13th-century friar says that 'all the studies of learners ought to be for theology that is to tend to the knowledge of God,' his 15th-century followers aim at moulding 'the nature of man as a citizen, an active member of the state.' Oddly enough both refer to Aristotle in support of their doctrine. There appear to be two novelties in the means used and two only: one, that in Vincent and his predecessors little or nothing is said about bodily exercise and training, while in the humanists this, with its corollary of spacious grounds and handsome school buildings, becomes prominent. But it may well be that environment accounted for that difference. The sons of the King of France in the first half of the 13th century were not likely to lack space for hunting and instruction in the art of war. The children of a city tyrant, the sovereign Lord Mayor of an Italian city in the 15th century cramped within its walls, might well lack the same opportunities. Vittorino's school, or rather collection of private pupils, was placed in La Giocosa, a converted 'pleasure-house' with a large enclosed meadow, bordered by the river, exactly like Meads at Winchester or the Playing-fields at Eton. This innovation was probably an unmixed good.

The other was of doubtful virtue. This was the dead set made by the humanists at dialectic in the schools. Rhetoric or the art of oratory they encouraged, but dialectic or the art of argument they discouraged. The reason apparently was that dialectic had become indissolubly connected with theology, and had little to do with the poets who formed the main study of the humanists. Like mathematics it presented too severe a study for those who found the whole end of life, literature and education in 'belles lettres' and the art of expression. Petrarch had inveighed against dialectic. Niccolo dei Niccoli of Florence c. 1430 apparently sees something peculiarly English in it. 'What is there in dialectic which has not been disturbed by the sophisms of the British? what which has not been separated from the true and ancient way of disputing and transmuted into emptiness and trifles?' No

doubt dialectic had been carried to excess and converted into a somewhat solemn trifling. But the humanist educators were one and all Churchmen and papalists, holders of Church preferments, possible papal secretaries, like Petrarch, or Popes themselves, like Æneas Silvius. This reference to Britannic sophisms savours of dread of Wicliffe, who was like Socrates, the greatest sophist of his age. Frightened orthodoxy, jealous of the superior philosophical repute of Oxford, played a part in this hostility to dialectic. It is at least greatly to be regretted that when the school age was being extended—Vittorino's pupils stayed till 21—dialectic, which had been too early inculcated on boys of 14, should have been dropped. Logic, especially since the creation of Inductive Logic, is after all a more humane and human study than grammar. Even the puerilities of dialectic were better than the puerilities of grammar as a preparation for the politician and the citizen. The art of argument has more bearing on human life than the minutiae of the use of enclitics in a twice dead language. The banishment of logic was followed by the disappearance of rhetoric and declamation. The complete substitution of written for oral work in examina-

tions and in schools is one of the fatal results of the humanist reaction against the excesses of the school-men. In our schools and universities some attempt has been made to replace the loss by Debating Societies and the like. But these are a poor substitute, and reach only a few. It may well be doubted whether the re-introduction of Greek, most that was useful in which could have been almost as well imbibed from translations, is at all a make-weight for the loss of logic. It is a thousand pities that just when logic was going to be released from the thralldom of theology it was banished altogether from the schools. Grammar under the 'humanists' has proved, and is proving, an even more soul-deadening influence and greater kill-love of learning than dialectic under the school-men.

Whether we agree with Mr. Woodward in his estimate of the novelty of, and the progress effected by the views and practices of the humanist educators, all interested in the history of education owe him thanks for his translation of some of their treatises and his clear exposition of their lives and principles.

A. F. LEACH.

34, Elm Park Gardens, S.W.

THE SCULPTURES OF THE PARTHENON.

The Sculptures of the Parthenon. By A. H. SMITH. Published by the Trustees of the British Museum. London, 1910. Folio. Pp. 70: 92 plates.

It is a piece of good fortune which has placed in the hands of Mr. Arthur Smith the editing of this sumptuous volume, seeing that it was he who compiled the volume of the catalogue of sculpture in the British Museum which included the Parthenon marbles. The two works fit into one another. In the catalogue is an exact description of all the important figures and fragments, with references to previous works. In the new publication we have carefully executed plates of large size, bringing everything, including all fragments, before the eyes of the student. But

the descriptive text is only a summary. It must be added that for a scholarly account of the Panathenaea, for inscriptions of interest for a study of the Parthenon, and other learned apparatus, we must still use Michaelis' *Parthenon*, published in 1870, a notable example of the durability of really sound and scholarly work. For the architecture of the temple we must still use Mr. Penrose's remarkable book, with the recent admirable little treatise of Mr. Lethaby. Perhaps, in spite of the works of Murray and D'Ooge, there is still room for a book which should place before scholars in convenient form the chief results of Parthenonic research, and the present state of the problems with which it is occupied.

Somewhat unfortunately the plates of