CHARACTERISTICS OF GREAT TEACHERS

By

Neil Lamper

A THESIS

Submitted to the School for Advanced Graduate Studies
of Michigan State University of Agriculture and
Applied Science in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Teacher Education

1959

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to make two types of acknowledgments: to those dealing directly with the study, and to those who, in all probability unaware of the help they gave, aided by their continual encouragement, friendliness, and warm, human understanding.

The major measure of the thanks is to Dr. Donald H. Hughes, chairman of the entire study. The other members of the committee who served as guides throughout the long hours of the project were: Dr. George R. Myers, Dr. Walter F. Johnson, and Dr. Charles R. Hoffer. The author is greatly indebted to these men for the hours they devoted to this study and to the enthusiasm and encouragement with which they supported it.

The road to completion of a study of this type has its high and low points. When at times the spirit and flesh are both strained, a nod or smile of encouragement from someone, unknowingly, may give the added support that is needed. For this type of encouragement the author would like to recognize the following men whom he feels had a part in this study: Dr. Ernest Melby, Dr. Cole Brembeck, Dr. William Farquhar, Dr. Harold Dillon, and Dr. Lee Dean.

The study would have been impossible to complete without the understanding and sympathy of the family of the author. The author's wife assumed an ever-larger family responsibility in a housing situation not conducive to the raising of five children. The heart-felt thanks of the author are extended to his wife Pat, and to the children, Mark, Kim, Valerie, Stacey, and Shelley.

****

CHARACTERISTICS OF GREAT TEACHERS

By

Neil Lamper

AN ABSTRACT

Submitted to the School for Advanced Graduate Studies
of Michigan State University of Agriculture and
Applied Science in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Teacher Education

Year 1959

Approved Donald H. Hughes

ABSTRACT

The problem in this study was to identify the characteristics of great teachers. Twelve men of the past were used as a basis for the study. They are as follows: Buddha, Confucius, Socrates, Jesus, Quintilian, Erasmus, Comenius, Pestalozzi, Froebel, Horace Mann, Mark Hopkins, and Gandhi. The purpose of the study was to identify those aspects of these twelve men that might have had bearing on their effectiveness not only as leaders but also as teachers of men.

The process used in the study was an analysis and synthesis of what is known and has been said about the twelve men selected for study. The thesis began with an acknowledgment of purpose, the background investigation of and reasons for the study. A section was then devoted to theories of social change, leadership, learning, and various known methods of teaching. The next section of the study was devoted to a consideration of the nature of research, with an emphasis on educational research employing some of the principles of historical research. Additional paragraphs dealt with the selection of the twelve men to be studied and the survey of contemporary opinion leading to this selection.

The main body of the study is a series of twelve brief sketches. These sketches deal shortly with the facts of birth, locale, and death. Some mention is made of social forces but the primary emphasis is on how the twelve men lived, and where necessary, on what they said.

Lists were compiled of the outstanding characteristics of these men. A final section of the study organized the data into a meaningful pattern involving the characteristics of the twelve men studied and their implications for teaching method.

The findings of this study indicate that the personality of the teacher is quite significant. The twelve men studied lived in different social situations, had different purposes, and had different ways of organizing their knowledge. But there was a consistency in the way they expressed their knowledge and in their attitudes towards people. The study listed many personality traits in each section, but in its final pages, it dealt with only those five which were outstanding in the case of each of the twelve men, and which were broad enough to be considered categories, covering many smaller items of subtle interpretation. The following five essential categories of characteristics evolved in the study: enthusiasm, simplicity, dedication, purpose, and humility.

The recommendations of this study are that it is meaningful to note that twelve men whom history has recorded as influential all possessed these same five characteristics, plus the interpolated considerations that went into the descriptions of these five items as categories. The study recommends that these be considered some of the characteristics of great teachers. Additional recommendations are added that call for a wider exploration into the lives of other men of influence,

investigations in greater depth of each of the twelve men included in this study, and any attempts that can be made to understand more fully these traits so that they might be within the understanding and possible reach of any serious student of effective teaching.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE OF THE STUDY

A. Purpose

What are the characteristics of great teaching? Are they identifiable? Where can these characteristics be found? Can they be described? What practical value lies in knowing these characteristics? Is it possible to develop these characteristics in one's self or in others?

What are the characteristics of great teaching? Great teaching is distinctive. This study is concerned with the distinctive characteristics of great teaching. It attempts to state these characteristics systematically and clearly.

Are they identifiable? Whether tangible or elusive it is valuable to seek the characteristics of great teaching. To study these characteristics in itself is to make them less elusive and to describe the essential nature of great teaching.

Where can these characteristics be found? They are not abstractions. They are possessed by people. To search for them in a most likely place is to search in the lives of great teachers.

Can they be described? A characteristic can be pointed out. To make it have meaning is the challenge of description. Identification

alone does not assure understanding. Description can limit because of the inadequacies of language but can also enlarge by relating background of experience to richness of new meaning.

What practical value lies in knowing these characteristics? Knowledge of a thing encourages its use. When that knowledge is of great teaching the practical value is apparent. Improved teaching should result.

Is it possible to develop these characteristics in one's self or in others? The principle findings of this study have to do with the education of teachers. It is assumed that behavior can be modified. This definition of learning makes improvement in the quality of teacher education possible.

This study seeks to prove the following hypotheses:

1. Characteristics of great teaching are identifiable.
2. They are most identifiable in the lives and teaching of great teachers.
3. These characteristics are essentially personality characteristics.

B. Justification

The rationale for these hypotheses is that teaching can not be studied as an abstraction. The teacher is central to the act of teaching. Therefore, the principle burden of proof lies with the third hypothesis. The proof involved in the first two hypotheses contributes

to that in the third. That is, the teaching and the lives of great teachers find expression in personality characteristics.

A study of this nature can either add new knowledge or it can emphasize by its organization some dimension not particularly considered to any great extent previously. This is essentially the process of gaining insight. Not only is it possible in a study of this kind to gain insight and knowledge about great teachers but also into the nature of great teaching.

C. Background

In the fabric of the lives and teaching of a number of great teachers in history runs a common thread. The personalities of these teachers reveal that thread of greatness clearly. The student becomes aware of certain characteristics in men like Buddha, Socrates, and Jesus, and recognizes the thread of great teaching woven into the pattern of their lives and works. This study deals with those common characteristics, the thread of greatness, as found in the personalities, work, and subsequent influence of twelve selected men covering a span of time from 563 B. C. to the year 1948, which marks the death of Mohatma Gandhi.

This study is conducted with a viewpoint similar to that of Florence Hay.[1] In her study of Comenius, Hay has reflected on Comenius' influence. The present study also reflects on men and their influence,

---

[1]Florence Hay, "Apparent Reflections of Comenius's Philosophy in Contemporary Education," unpublished doctoral thesis, 1955, p. 1.

and in these reflections on the personalities, lives, teaching methods, and influences of these twelve great teachers the proof is directed not specifically toward historical influence but towards evidence of common characteristics of great teachers. Their greatness and consequently historical influence is an a priori assumption. This study does not emphasize what these men taught; that is, it does not come to grips with the philosophies of these men. The purpose of avoiding such considerations, of not wrestling with the ideas of these men, is to avoid becoming involved in value judgments for it is not the purpose of this study to pass on the merits of philosophies or systems of thought. If this is a fine distinction, and not always a clear one, it is nevertheless essential to the study and will be maintained insofar as possible. At times it is, of course, necessary to note that the teaching of some great man has appeal because it deals with important considerations--for example, life and death--but in this study no contemporary judgment is made as to whether or not these are really important matters. In this way the study is released from the responsibility of evaluating the religion of Jesus, the loyalty of Socrates, and the patriotism of Gandhi. To deal adequately with the complete ideas of twelve such great men would be presumptuous if not impossible. But by concentrating on only those elements in their lives and works common to the approach to teaching used by all of these men, a less presumptuous and more useful study is possible. Such limiting is also meaningful because in focusing on the characteristics of men of influence it is well to remember that history records also that

large numbers of men were awed and influenced by Alexander the Great, Napoleon, and Hitler. At first glance this aspect of possible great influence for good or evil may seem disturbing. With little adjustment of differences some men have used personalities and methods similar to those of the great teachers to the general detriment of society. A closer look, however, is more encouraging for it reveals that personality factors and teaching methods may be studied by anyone, and used for purposes good or evil. With the idea in mind that one's own teaching may benefit by the study of effectiveness in others and with the recognition of the influence of purpose as well as method in lives and teaching, the disturbing element noted is brought into more proper perspective. By figuratively sitting at the feet of the great one shares in great ideas and the awareness of good purposes. Perhaps one's approach to teaching may take on some of the characteristics of greatness because of this association.

Related to this is the concern with the influence of the time, the place, and fortuitous circumstances involving these great teachers. Serious questions are posed by these conditions in analyzing the greatness and influence of these twelve selected men. The problem of whether times make the man or the man makes the times becomes apparent and there is no ready answer to this significant question. This study, although not designed to answer this question, can hardly escape recognition of the problem. A reasonable approach to handling this matter in this type of study is contained in the following:

> For those who see history as a record of man's creative efforts to choose between alternatives in an endless chain of historical situations and not only as a series of reactions to various abstract causes, geographic, climatic, racial, or economic, which more or less determine his destiny, human society is an historical process wherein each generation sifts to the top particular individual types, warriors, prophets, priests, merchants, bankers, or bureaucrats, whose talents are needed in any given period; these individuals, in turn, and within limits, make the decisions which shape the course of history.[1]

It is seldom necessary to judge matters, even this sort, in terms of one extreme or another, for most often a situation is compounded of many things and is consequently inherently complex. The a priori assumption is that the men in this study were great and they are observed in a naturally limited sphere as teachers, and at any given time.

Any given teacher today may hold endless community and committee responsibilities, plus being aware of designs for units of teaching. Any teacher may be in possession of a degree and teach a range of subjects to over a hundred different pupils a day. But whether or not that teacher is as effective as possible is most likely determined when he works with one class of twenty or thirty pupils at a time; that is, with a limited group of learners in the learning situation. Today, Jesus is placed in historical perspective as the founder of a world rekuguibm Buddha of another, and Confucius of a moral system, while Gandhi is credited with the independence of a major nation of the world. Yet each man in his time considered his important work to be the teaching of a handful of disciples that followed in his footsteps. It would

---

[1]E. D. Baltzell, "Who's Who in America" and "The Social Register": Elite and Upper Class Indexes in Metropolitan America," Class, Status, and Power, R. Bendix, S. M. Lipset, (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1953), p. 174.

be foolish to deny that the quality of those disciples and the social structure contemporary to their times is not important, but the emphasis in this study is on what passed between the teacher and the students, the master and his disciples. This study seeks to isolate some of those factors, and its purpose will be served if it offers at least some clues to what makes for great teaching, perhaps to be imitated with a degree of success by those who prepare to teach. This study anticipates that to sit at the feet of the great is to lend life and power to teaching. This study is made in this vein with this hope as an expectation, not just a possibility.

Some preliminary preparation was necessary for this study to evolve. A brief sketch of the development of thought that crystallized into the design of the study provides additional background for understanding the study itself. Knowledge of social science was necessary because so much of the study is grounded in social fact and theory and has social implications. The pursuit of such study led to acquaintance with American Masters of Social Science: An Approach to the Study of the Social Sciences through a Neglected Field of Biography. In this book Howard W. Odum, the author, delivered the promise implicit in its title: a vastly increased knowledge of social science and its possibilities for the study of teaching. The need for knowledge of political science prompted exploration and study in selected writings in that field. Profiles in Courage, a book of political biographies by Senator John Kennedy, was particularly helpful. A knowledge of the principles of creativity was

considered important, and The Creative Process, by Ghiselin, a book of partial biographies of creative men was enlightening. To cite one more example of sources of knowledge and understanding necessary for such a study, the author has some knowledge of the structure of music that he gained from a life-long hobby of reading the biographies of great musicians.

The essence of the nature of this process of preparation for planning this study is perhaps best expressed in The Prophet:

> . . . [the teacher] does not bid you enter the house of his wisdom, but rather leads you to the threshold of your own mind. For the vision of one man lends not its wings to another man.[1]

Gibran suggests that the spirit of teaching is contagious, and while each man catches his own measure, the contact provides the stimulus. So in this study great men and great ideas are to be used as a stimulus to others.

The initial question then that stimulated this study was whether or not one could learn anything about teaching by studying the biographies of great teachers. One must assume that none of the powers of the great teachers were magical, and, perhaps with the exception of a fortuitous combination of circumstances, both inherited and environmental, resulting in a distinctive personality, these powers are within reach of almost anyone. It has already been mentioned that some degree of greatness may result from the times or contemporary codes of popularity; but as it sometimes seems in retrospect that the great men are

---

[1]Kahlil Gibran, The Prophet, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1942) p. 23.

remembered more than is their age, it must be emphasized that this study considers the greatness of men in spite of their times.

As the study was begun it became evident that if one word has to be chosen to strike up the spirit of these great teachers that word would be simplicity. Simplicity and directness characterized their lives, their teachings and their approach to the sharing of ideas. Perhaps an age of complexity cannot fully appreciate simplicity but a study recalling some of the more basic, or simple, elements of the teaching process should make a distinct contribution. This, of course, influenced the direction and process of the study.

There is no scientific proof that a Socrates in the marketplace calling attention to stonecutters would have the same influence today that he had in the Athens of Pericles. There is not direct proof--but a Hitler in the town square used some of the same simple and direct methods that Socrates did. The content of Hitler's teaching cannot be said to be a search for truth in the same way as was that of Socrates but there are similar elements in the way these men presented their material and no one denies that Hitler literally turned the world upside down. The thing then that further motivated this study was the idea that simplicity and directness are examples of factors that characterize the persuasion of a number of men of note and that these can be studied and used by others.

Some people see a threat in the idea that there is truth in the statement of The Preacher that "there is nothing new under the sun."

One reaction might be that recent research into the psychology of learning and the sociology of people brings to light nothing new and is therefore obsolete at its appearance. This is not true. Educational research is invaluable and vitally necessary in its application to the specifics of the learning process. It is well to know, for example, that contemporary learning theory emphasizes the drive, response, cue, reinforcement theory of learning rather than the old training of mental faculties. Specific research relating to social class and the rate at which one learns is extremely useful. This study does not attempt to minimize this research. But a preliminary and cursory reading into the lives of these great teachers revealed a surprising knowledge of the principles of child growth and development, guidance, and learning theory to mention a few items. This lead to the question whether or not pedagogy might sometimes rush ahead when it has failed to make full use of what has already been said and proven effective. Teaching that is not having its full quota of influence may suffer from a lack of attention being paid to these first principles.

There are two ideas of Durkheim that must be given place in the development of this study. One is his claim that pedagogy needs an historical perspective.[1] Pedagogy is the business of building a theory of educational practice. He says, "It requires a constant attempt to fill the gaps in educational practice and to re-balance and harmonize

---

[1]Emile Durkheim, Education and Sociology (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1956), p.

education with reality."[1] The second idea of Durkheim that figures in this study is that of the moral, or normative society that transcends time. Combinations of individuals are always more than the transitory state, or State, to which they give their allegiance. Quoting Durkheim, "Individuals have appeared whose ideas have appealed to that moral society; in fact, they derive their authority from that society."[2]

The decision to do this kind of a study was not complete when reading in Johnson suggested that it has never been established whether teaching is an Art or a science. An appealing idea is that it is both. "The techniques of any Art can be improved by a study of that Art."[3] An improvement in teaching should come about by studying several masters of that part of teaching which can be called an Art.

It is difficult to study these great men without becoming biased in their favor. Each of the twelve men selected for study is an example of the great man theory of leadership. The study shows its bias by deliberately accepting much of that theory of leadership as implied in the selection of the men. This problem has been appropriately discussed at greater length in another section of this dissertation.

There is another bias. The following inscription is engraved on a cigarette lighter given to John O'Hara by Steinbeck:

---

[1]Ibid., p.

[2]Ibid., p.

[3]Earl S. Johnson, Theory and Practice of the Social Studies (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1956), p. 265.

> The lonely mind of one man is the only creative organ in the world, and anything which interferes with its free function is the enemy.

This suggests a bias towards the superior creativeness of the individual as contrasted with that of the group. Group dynamics theory does not exclude all individual contribution, but in some respects minimizes it. In this study emphasis on personality and uniqueness of personality is bias of a type. These are biases which the investigator admits but which have come naturally out of a study of this kind. Less than this he cannot do.

A final word about the nature and purpose of the study is included here. Problems began to arise immediately relative to doing a study of this nature. In electing to carve a thesis completely of words and making no use of tables, charts, or graphs the semantic problem was immeasurably increased. If this were a book for popular use, the format of Profiles in Courage would be a tempting one to follow. But the problem in this study calls for more than biography since deliberate analysis and synthesis is made. Consequently, the clue for approach, organization, and style was taken from Arthur Waley, who wrote, "there is a need for what the French call 'oeuvres de vulgarisation.' These are works that need not be written by scholars, but this does not mean that they must be unscholarly."[1] There is a need for well-informed summarizers of specialist knowledge to act as middlemen between the scholar and the public. This study may help to bridge the gap between

---

[1]Arthur Waley, The Analects of Confucius (London: G. Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1938), p. 2.

some of the best that has been known and said by great teachers and scholars and people who teach.

CHAPTER II

RELATED FACTORS CRUCIAL TO THE STUDY

There are many factors in discussing great teaching related to that teaching. Great teaching has an influence on society, so something must be said about social change. Teaching implies learning and this brings up the various theories of how men learn. Focus on individual personality makes relevant statements about leadership. And some acknowledgment must be made of methods of teaching. These are all factors in the nature and lives of great teachers. Thus they are crucial to this study.

A. The Nature of Social Change and its Relation to Education

The twelve men selected for study in this thesis have at least one outstanding thing in common. All of these men deviated from the status quo. At times men who rebel are eliminated in one way or another and others who rebel are enshrined by the times and history. Which of these outcomes results probably hinges on the temper of the times. If life is rewarding, people do not want change, "while the frustrated favor radical change."[1] Or, those who fear the future usually cling to the present while those who have faith in the future do not fear change.

---

[1]Eric Hoffer, The True Believer (The New American Library, 1951), p. 16.

In spite of this there is more historical evidence to support a theory of periodic mass boredom than a theory of a status quo equilibrium. Like it or not, society is in a continual state of flux. There are a number of variables that contribute to that flux at any given time. The men included in this study can all be considered agents of change in that they had something to say to the society of their times. Each of them in some way freed the minds of men from various confinements. Jesus challenged Leviticus, Comenius questioned the whole Moravian school system, and Gandhi suggested that brown skins could deal and exist equally with white skins.

Society is a complex structure of groups and individuals held together in a web of social relationships. These elements of the social structure are constantly acting and reacting upon one another and in various ways adapting themselves or being adapted to change. Social change is concerned with the transformation of customs and beliefs while history is concerned with the sequence of events. This study makes note of social change but it focuses on individuals who filled important roles--and this is an historical interest. It is very difficult to isolate factors that determine the course of social and cultural change and development. The great man in time is looked upon here as one of the dynamics of that change. Other dynamics of social change are diffusion, innovation, and strain.[1] Diffusion is illustrated by the transfer of custom from one society to another.

---

[1]Ely Chinoy, Sociological Perspective (New York: Random House, 1954), p. 44.

Tensions and strains are the product of change and lead to further changes. Invention and innovation are not always welcome, particularly in a traditional society, but both occur and precipitate change. The interdependence of society is a well-known fact today and probably always existed to some degree. It is not true that it does not make much difference which variable one starts with for the thing becomes a matter of the systematic pursual of variables until the entire relevant range is included.[1] This study deals with one of those variables.

Society exists only as a metaphor; that is, "it does not behave, respond, adapt, or adjust. Only individuals act."[2] Needless to say individuals are social products and it is not necessary here to consider the details of that body of knowledge having to do with culture and personality. The contributions of social relationships to personality have been studied by such people as Piaget, Cooley, Freud and George Herbert Mead, to mention a few. It is their thesis that no one escapes from the influence and society. But, as Chinoy has it, "The close dependence of the individual upon the social milieu and the fact that he derives much of his personality from the norms, values, and beliefs of his group does not mean that the individual is merely the instrument of his society or that his personality is simply a reflection of his culture."[3] The individual is an active being who may likely act according

---

[1]Kingsley Davis, Human Society (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1940), p. 634.

[2]Chinoy, op. cit., p. 49.

[3]Ibid., p. 52.

to a social pattern but who has the ability to innovate and deviate and "through his actions significantly influence and change the nature of culture and society."[1] The twelve men selected for study in this thesis are all examples, to a more or less degree, of men who influenced their times to some extent by deviating from them.

The relationship that exists between social change and education can be seen more clearly from another angle. Social institutions change when human needs change.[2] These institutions must change because they no longer meet existing human needs. New materials may suggest better ways of meeting needs, and new men may favor the adoption of new materials. Education as a social process is built on the preceding concepts. The process of social change can be further subdivided into processes of cooperation, competition, and conflict. Education is traditionally a cooperative method of keeping pace with social change. Durkheim breaks the idea into its simplest aspects when he says "each society forms its own ideal of man. It is this ideal which is the focus of education."[3] Some cooperative educational systems are exhibitions of cultural lag in that they have not been able to adapt when necessary to psychological, environmental, and population changes to say nothing of changes brought about by war and/or great men.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 53.

[2]Norman F. Washburne, Interpreting Social Change in America (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1954), p. 9.

[3]Durkheim, op. cit., p.

There is one more summary approach to social change that should be noted here. Robin Williams lists the following general factors of social change:

1. Changes of physical environment.
2. Intercultural contact.
3. Complexity within a culture.
4. Value-orientations within a culture.
5. Unanticipated consequences of social action.
6. Idiosyncratic and creative variations in individual behavior.[1]

The first five points listed above are self-explanatory. The last point will bear focus as it is basic to this thesis. It is possible to overemphasize the "great Man" theory of leadership as an important element in social change. But the impact of the forceful and inventive personality as a factor in creating change cannot be ignored. No society is ever quite the same after hosting a deviant individual who, as a leader, influences others for good or evil.[2] This is the problem of the relation of the individual to society. This study does not solve it; it acknowledges it.

B. Leadership Theories

Leadership is a term upon which there is little agreement. Historically, and because much history is written from the viewpoint of "great men," leadership has meant the figure of one man standing, symbolically, head and shoulders above other men. In recent times

---

[1]Robin Williams, American Society (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955), p. 541.

[2]Blaine Mercer, The American Community (New York: Random House, 1956), p. 75.

however, social scientists have investigated this thing of leadership with the result that different dimensions of leadership have been defined. Lippitt and White, for example, defined the role of a teacher as a leadership role and then experimented with different kinds of teachers. They experimented with three types of teaching: the autocratic, the democratic, and the laissez-faire type of leadership. Their conclusion is that while groups under an autocratic leader may learn more they do so more rigidly while groups under a democratic leader feel more free, seek the approval of their fellows, and make policy suggestions. The students under the laissez-faire type of leadership are friendly and personal but with a higher level of irritability and aggression.[1]

Social scientists researching into the problem of leadership have all come up with a healthy respect for what is called the "great men theory of leadership." In the interests of objectivity other findings should be mentioned here.

Gibb in an article entitled "Leadership" gives six definitions of leadership which can be summed up by the one of the six which defines leadership as "exercising influence over others."[2] He mentions studies that attempt to correlate leadership with a number of other traits. He reports that, unless correlated with a complex of other factors,

---

[1]R. Lippitt and R. K. White, "The 'Social Climate' of Children's Groups," Child Behavior and Development, Barker, Kounin, Wright, editors, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1943), pp. 485-508.

[2]C. Gibb, "Leadership," Handbook of Social Psychology, Gardner Lindzey, editor (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1954), Vol. II, p. 882.

such things as height, weight, physique, energy, health, and appearance bear no relationship to leadership. Things like intelligence, self-confidence, sociability, and will power correlate slightly but only as traits prized by the group. The summary statement of the article says "studies have failed to find any consistent pattern of traits which characterize leaders, although there is evidence to support the statement that a constellation of traits make up the leader's personality."[1] Groups define what they want in the way of leadership.

Carter did a factorial analysis of several leadership traits. The results gave a loading of .90 to individual prominence, .35 to group facilitation, and .05 to group sociability. It is his conclusion that "leader behavior is seen by observers to be almost identical with that indicating any form of prominence in the group, and to some extent, as behavior that is goal facilitating."[2] A similar study done by Hemphill and others lists two factors as most observable in leaders: consideration of followers, and sensitivity, defined as social awareness.[3]

Bargotta, Bales, and Couch focused on the great man theory in their study reported in the American Sociological Review. They first define six types of groups which are important enough to mention here:

1. The group in which a great man dominates.
2. The group in which all members are chosen for their specific abilities.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 916.
[2]Ibid., p. 891.
[3]Ibid.

3. The group in which all membership is a matter of sociometric choice.

4. The group in which all membership follows the pattern of division of labor.

5. The group in which members reflect similar values.

6. The group in which members have compatible personalities.

The authors of this study conclude that "the great man theory of leadership has much to recommend it." Their findings indicate that (1) great men tend to remain great (in history), and (2) that they tend to make great groups in the sense that productivity and satisfaction of members is increased. The final conclusion in this emphasis on the great man theory of leadership is (3) that great men fuse task ability, individual assertiveness, and social acceptability.[1]

Gibb suggests further that part of the problem lies in dealing with the concepts of groups, organizations, dominance, and interaction. Groups vary with respect to factors or dimensions of organization.[2] Whenever two or more persons "interact in seeking a goal, leadership and followership is present."[3] Studies by Shantle, Stoghill, and Redl are mentioned that, because of their arbitrary definitions of leadership are limited in their application.[4] Moreno defines leadership in terms

---

[1]E. F. Borgatta, R. F. Bales, and A. S. Couch, "Some Findings Relevant to the Great Man Theory of Leadership," American Sociological Review, Vol. 19, 1954, pp. 755-759.

[2]G. Gibb, op. cit., p. 880.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Ibid.

of sociometric choice and its value varies with the nature of the sociometric question asked as social prominence is not necessarily leadership.[1] Cattell talks of syntality and measures leadership in terms of effective total group performance.[2] A number of studies--by Richardson and Hanawalt, Cox, Drake, and Gibb found positive correlations between self-confidence and leadership.[3] Gibb's own summary statements should be mentioned here:

> Any theory of leadership must recognize a constellation of traits rather than a unitary trait. The most evident thus far are (1) energy, (2) self-confidence, (3) intelligence, (4) verbal fluency, (5) persistency, (6) insight into human nature. These personality traits make it abundantly clear that individual personality cannot be left out of the leadership picture. Leadership cannot be exclusively a function of the situation. In general, it may be said that leadership is a fjunction of personality, and of the social situation, and of these two in interaction.[4]

Thelen, in his Dynamics of Groups at Work has a section on leadership in which he emphasizes the idea that the leader tries to channel work, emotionality, structure, and needs towards goals.[5] He has no argument with the assumption that there is a leader.

Cooley, reporting in Sociological Theory, ends by saying that "leadership depends upon the efficacy of a personal impression to awaken

---

[1]Ibid., p. 881.

[2]Ibid., p. 883.

[3]Ibid., p. 886.

[4]Ibid., pp. 916-917.

[5]H. A. Thelen, Dynamics of Groups at Work (Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press, 1954), pp. 296-332.

feeling, thought, action and so to become a cause of life."[1] The leader knows there is energy present and he provides direction for it. He must have a significant individuality and breadth of sympathy. In face-to-face relations he must seem to be master of the situation.

Thus it is that most research on the subject of leadership either tacitly assumes or gains a healthy respect for individual prominence. The following continuum represents types of leadership:[2]

autocratic compeller	exponent, or symbol, or ideal of a group	representative of a group	democratic builder of group
direct individual prompt			delayed action division of labor

The important thing is that leadership is always present; only the process varies. Leadership is dependent on both the individual opportunity to achieve distinction and the ability of people to recognize the superior individual.

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. in "The Decline of Greatness" writes of those "mighty figures . . . who seized history with both hands and gave it an imprint, even a direction, which it otherwise might not have had."[3]

---

[1]C. H. Cooley, "Leadership or Personal Ascendency," Sociological Theory (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956), p. 179.

[2]H. M. Busch, Leadership in Group Work (New York: Association Press, 1934), Chapter V, pp. 119-140.

[3]Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., "The Decline of Greatness," Saturday Evening Post, Nov. 1, 1958, p. 25.

History has hosted many of these "mighty figures" and often unhappily. It is true that often concommitant with awesome men there has occurred an aweful butchery and bloodshed, so much so that pursuant periods have done what they could to nullify the effects of great men. The result of this is to build a fatalistic philosophy of history in the manner of Toynbee, and of Tolstoi. "The hero," said Tolstoi, "is the slave of history"; and Toynbee in his theory of determinism suggests that events in history are part of an inexorable growth which predestines that certain things occur at certain times because they had to--because all previous history led up to them. Quoting from Schleslinger:

> The philosophy of historical fatalism rests on serious fallacies. For one thing, it supposes that, because a thing happens, it had to happen. But causation is one matter; predestination another. The construction of a causal explanation after an event merely renders that event in some sense intelligible. It does not in the least show that this particular event, and no other, had to take place; that nothing else could possibly have occurred in its stead. The serious test of the fatalist case must be applied before the event. The only conclusive proof of fatalism would lie in the accurate prediction of events that have not yet happened. And to say that all prior history predetermines everything that follows is to say nothing at all. It is to produce an explanation which applies equally to everything--and thus becomes so vague and limitless as to explain nothing. Fatalism raises other difficulties. Thus it imputes reality to mystical historical "forces"--class, race, nation, the will of the people, the spirit of the times, history itself. But there are no such forces. They are merely abstractions or metaphors with no existence except in the mind of the beholder. The only evidence for them is deduction from the behavior of individuals. It is therefore the individual who constitutes the basic unit of history.[1]

Men who oppose the fatalistic approach to the study of history admit that great men must operate within the limits of the environment.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 68.

The environment offers the conditions within which history can be made, and this amounts to presenting men with alternatives. Which alternative is chosen is determined by a complex web of things as, for example, the bullet that missed Roosevelt in 1933 and Hitler's survival of the fighting in Munich in 1923. But faced with alternatives, men make history and this, according to Sydney Hook, is "denied only by some theologians and mystical metaphysicians."[1]

In essence, a man becomes a leader as he supplies his group with answers based on his knowledge. Scholars who have worked within the framework of the great man idea of leadership mention a number of characteristics that great leaders possess. As this study focuses on great men, these characteristics should be noted here.

There is a difference, often subtle, between leadership and manipulation. It might be said that the greatest of the great show that they do not seek primarily to dominate others but to help others, along with themselves, to develop fully. If a group under leadership rises as a whole there is a difference between this and a group brought into agreement with a leader. The paradox of true leadership is that the most effective leader is one who can create the conditions by which he will actually lose the leadership. Jesus, for example, said "the truth shall make you free," and Comenius emphasized that education frees the mind from any domination. Often this is unrecognized for being what it is. It becomes difficult for the run of people to live with greatness, not

---

[1]Sidney Hook, The Hero in History (New York: The John Day Co., 1943), p. xi.

the least of reasons being that small men become aware of their smallness when a truly great man is in their midst. Confucius was hounded until bitterness and ill health destroyed him, Jesus was crucified, Lincoln and Gandhi shot. Great men introduce extremes of good and evil and their dangerous living causes other men to hunger and thirst after security. It always takes courage to be different and the first fruit of imagination and originality is often loneliness. But if truth as great men proclaim it has any meaning perhaps it is simply the affirmation of human freedom against what is often thought of as inevitable in history.

The great leader has usually shown physical and intellectual vitality. He knows and acts with intellect and feeling. He has a cause and his methods call not only for persuasiveness but a sympathetic insight into the motives of men. Because he knows people he approaches them with simplicity and directness. He begins where they are and rises above vested interests. He is not satisfied with the status quo and dares make decisions. Woodrow Wilson was convinced that great leadership is a combination of the right time, a persuasiveness that organizes the thinking of men rather than imposes its own dogma, and the ability to act intelligently.[1] From one viewpoint a leader is a follower as he capitualizes on the mood of the times, but he is a leader in that as a man of action he organizes that mood and often changes the times.

---

[1]Woodrow Wilson, Leaders of Men (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1952), pp. 1-15.

Titus' compelling book on leadership gives a detailed analysis of the processes of leadership and introduces them thus:

> Leaders operate organizations in order to realize goals. Many rules exist which have been found helpful in moving followers towards desired objectives. The trained, experienced leader is continuously choosing from among the indefinite number of rules those believed to be most helpful in realizing smooth and efficient operations.[1]

In this introduction Titus considers that these rules can be learned by anyone, but in his final pages he stresses the element of great leadership that is an Art, comparing it to the lost chord found and struck by Sir Arthur Sullivan.

> Whether it be Socrates, Pope Leo XIII, Benjamin Franklin, General Robert E. Lee, President Abraham Lincoln, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Eugene V. Debs, or the humblest contrite leader in an unknown village, followers have found life richer and more understandable as a result of association with one of these who has found (the secret of the Art of leadership) and its significance.[2]

The paragraphs above emphasize the role of the individual. Now lest generalities about great men tend to obscure individual incidents, a final word in the interests of focus. The author of this study became acquainted with a man from Pakistan. Other Pakistanis told of how this man was a legend in many small villages in Pakistan. When asked about this, he said simply, "I enter the village on foot and live with the people there. I come to know them and we talk of problems they have. Then I help them search for answers to these problems and thus they become free men--freed from any suffering that is born of ignorance."

---

[1]Charles H. Titus, The Processes of Leadership (Dubuque, Iowa: W. C. Brown Co.,), p. xii.

[2]Ibid., p. 469.

C. Learning Theories

How people learn has long been a concern of men. Socrates adopted his dialectical method because, in his opinion, this continual probing for first causes was a learning process. Periods of history considered learning to be a concomittant of fear and inflexible authority. To study learning scientifically means "to question (it) with an open and roving mind, and to do it thoroughly."[1] This includes checking ideas against observation, testing them, and applying reason.

Any assessment of contemporary learning theory leaves one with the distinct impression that knowledge about how men learn is definitely theoretical. There is some mention of the "laws of learning," but this is always done within the larger framework of a suggested theory. And this must be so because knowledge of the learning process is still speculation; speculation based on research, it is true, but no such "laws" exist in the psychological world of learning theory as exist, say, in the field of biology, or physics. "There is not the same degree of precision and clearness in the concepts of psychology as in those of the physical or natural sciences."[2] Both the Baconian and Cartesian scientist accepts science as that body of knowledge capable of proof, although both admit that there is an area of knowledge incapable of proof in the same sense. There is a realm of physical psychology that

---

[1]Hermann J. Muller, The World View of Moderns, 50th Anniversary Lecture Series, University of Illinois Graduate College (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1958), p. 18.

[2]Emile Boutraux, Natural Law in Science and Philosophy (London: David Nutt, 1914), p. 158.

lends itself to laboratory experimentation but many psychic effects are not explainable by these demonstrated properties. Science continually restates its law in line with new knowledge but at any given time a principle that has universality and reality is considered a law. Thus the law of gravitation states that bodies attract one another in proportion to their mass and distance from one another, and this has been proven in laboratories. But although much of human response seems to come by way of analogy this cannot be said to be a law in the same way as that of gravitation.

The intensive study of learning theory has fallen to the psychologists, and rightly so, as it is a psychic process. It is natural then that learning theories will reflect the same biases and schools of thought that exist in psychology. It does not detract from the dignity of psychology to recognize this fact of several main divisions along with a number of fringe groups within the ranks of psychology. Any study of learning theory necessarily roves from one such camp to another. Hilgard has performed a real service in putting most of the learning theories under two headings and then recognizing several smaller deviant groups.[1] The Forty-Ninth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education summarizes learning theory also, focusing on practical application to the field of education.[2]

---

[1]E. R. Hilgard, Theories of Learning (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1956), pp. 1-15.

[2]Nelson B. Henry, The 49th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, Learning and Instruction (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1950), pp. 15-35.

The two main types of learning theory are called the stimulus-response (connectionism, associationism) theories and the cognitive, or field theories. As Hilgard says, "what seem to be diametrically opposed points of view may turn out to be . . . differences in preference."[1] The two groups of theories are not always as far apart as it may seem and often differences seem to stem from in which direction one is facing when looking at the subject.

The first thing to look at in assessing learning theory is a definition of learning. Kingsley says learning is the modification of behavior.[2] Melton talks of the process and the product of learning, and, in fewer words than he employs, the process is one of adjusting the organism to a problem situation.[3] The Forty-Ninth Yearbook calls learning "a change in behavior correlated with experience."[4] Hilgard himself defines learning as the "process by which activity originates or is changed by reacting to an experience, but which, while it may be complementary to, is not explained by native responses, maturation alone, or temporary states of the nervous system."[5] In consideration of these definitions of learning, whether stimulus-response or cognitive, learning is considered most simply as the modification of behavior.

---

[1]Hilgard, op. cit., p. 13.

[2]H. L. Kingsley, The Nature and Conditions of Learning (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1946), p. 19.

[3]A. W. Melton, "Learning," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, W. S. Monroe (ed.), (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1941), p. 668.

[4]The 49th Yearbook, op. cit., p. 34.

[5]Hilgard, op. cit., p. 3.

The main divisions between the two categories of learning theory deal with differences over the theory as to what mechanisms are involved, the process, and the results, or what is learned. In this study these will be mentioned briefly and in simple terms.

The stimulus-response theories claim that peripheral mechanisms are involved in the learning process. This means that, according to this theory, perhaps a chained muscular response integrates behavior toward a goal. The cognitive theory favors the idea that central brain processes, such as memory, for one, integrate behavior toward its goal. The essential process in the stimulus-response theory is one of trial and error, and the familiar sequence of drive, response, cue, and reinforcement ensues. The cognitive theories stress the role of insight by which the organism has an understanding of the essential elements involved in any problem situation and applies these elements to the new situation. In this way, cognitive structures are built which serve as models for the solution of problems. The stimulus-response theories say that the product of the learning process is the learning of habits, or responses. The cognitive theories emphasize the product as the learning of facts, which are then built into cognitive structures.

The above paragraph is simple and brief in its presentation because only the outlines of learning theory are necessary in a study of this type. A close look at the Forty-ninth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education reveals that it mentions other things in its attempt to translate learning theory into a practical application for the teaching-learning situation.

Learning is the result of an experience, and an experience is an interaction between a person and the environment. When the focus is on the person study deals with the physiology of the body and thus of nerves, muscles, sense receptors and the like. While Hilgard prefers to leave out maturation as a process of learning, there is no denying the role of maturation in terms of the readiness, or preparatory adjustment of the organism to learn. No attempt should be made to rigidly divide these elements of the learning process as many of them are complementary.

When the focus of study is on the environment it is in terms of the stimulation of the organism provided by the environment. This includes consideration of what constitutes incentive, interest, attitudes, and frustration, or blocking. There is the matter of transferring the learning from one experience to another so that some reasoning by analogy takes place. And there is the interference present in an experience which may result in forgetting--so that forgetting is learning: learning a different thing from that originally intended. All learning that is useful or real has meaning for experience.

Rather than to accept the strict dichotomy of the learning process that results from placing all learning theories in two camps the process might be considered as being more dynamic and changing to fit the conditions of the situation. People learn differently in different situations, and while it is foolish to think that the precesses can be delineated separately as each is in operation at least they can be named.

One situation might employ concept formation, or trial and error, while another might rely more on insight, or rote learning. Another learning situation might make use of conditioning that has taken place, or emphasize goal seeking. In another instance the fact that meaningful activity is involved, or problem-solving is important for the way in which one learns.

In general, the process may be viewed as one in which the human organism is stimulated to reach a certain goal. This can be called motivation, stimulation, drive, or incentive but seldom is progress direct due to blocks between goal and drive. A number of responses ensue and the goal is reached in a successful learning experience. Differentiation as well as integration takes place along with generalization, and, as incorrect responses are discarded efficiency describes the attempt to reach the goal. Each of the foregoing could be treated in a separate paragraph but it is not necessary to become that profound here.

The Forty-Ninth Yearbook lists the following as the products of learning:

1. Motor activities
2. Concepts
3. Meanings
4. Generalizations
5. Motives
6. Interests
7. Attitudes
8. Social behavior
9. Emotional behavior
10. Esthetic behavior
11. Problem-solving[1]

---

[1]The 49th Yearbook, op. cit., p. 27.

All of the foregoing--the section on learning theory--although necessarily detailed, has importance in this study for at least three reasons.

(1) The main body of this study deals with characteristics of great teachers. Truly great teachers could not have been wholly ignorant of generalizations about the principles of learning--even though the copyright dates on the sources used in this section suggest that they may not have been spelled out as such until contemporary times. Consideration of the characteristics of great teachers shows that in one way or another these men had insight into how people learn.

(2) The principles of learning are not new, although the aura of scientific method which now surrounds them may be the result of the ordering and reporting of research data. Hearkening back to a previous statement concerning physical "laws" and their redefinitions, evolution may be slowly accounting for changes in how men learn. Still it is relatively safe to assume that within the span of time covered by this study the human learning process has remained the same. Therefore some consistency should be evident in the understanding of the way men learn shared by the great teachers.

(3) A third reason for a look at learning theory is simply that in a study purporting to say something about the science and Art of great teaching such a perusal has a place. All is not left to mystical apprehension and theories based on some excellent research should be recognized.

CHAPTER III

METHODS USED IN THIS STUDY

A. Nature of Educational Research and Its Special Application In This Study

1. Nature of Research

All research battles the inertia of existing systems of thought. Hermann J. Muller in his lecture entitled "The World View of Moderns," places the blame on any of the organized activities of mankind that impeded the progress of the scientific spirit.[1] Scientific investigation through the ages has had its own built-in resistance in the form of findings that ran counter to popular modes of thought. For a long time, and to some extent today, the organized church refused to acknowledge any research findings that appeared to contradict the mystical teachings of the church. Today vested interests seek to retard research through the use of both legal and extra-legal manuverings. In terms of acceptance, scientific investigation experiences an uphill climb, not the least of the reasons often being the pet ignorances of mankind that it exposes.

All research is essentially problem solving. Where there is no doubt there is little interest in research. It is only when man begins to question that investigation takes place. Smugness and blind belief eliminate problems by refusing to recognize any. In ancient Hebrew

---

[1]Muller, op. cit., p. 18.

mythology Adam had no problem until he began to question the law regarding the tree of Good and Evil. To question anything is usually to call attention to a problem. To seek an answer to the question is to conduct research.

"Research begins with an idea and ends with an idea. It does not furnish the absolute. Research is a faith. It represents a faith in a method of answering questions."[1] Research is not always immediately correct; it probes for new answers to old questions. In this, research is spoken of as a frontier. The essence of scientific method is not the accumulation of facts but the projection of thinking caused by asking why. Science is theoretical in that it projects guesses and then tests the guesses. If the guesses are incorrect adjustments are made and the research continues until the best explanation of observable data emerges. There is no sense of failure attached to incorrect theories because the importance lies with the process and the will to continually question, and seek, and probe.

"Rarely does a given study represent a single method of investigation."[2] It is a mistake to assume that a problem comprehensive of an area of human behavior will always give way under a single type of attack. Not only may many methods be tried but different disciplines

---

[1]T. R. McConnell, D. E. Scates, and F. N. Freeman, The Conceptual Structure of Educational Research, No. 55 (Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago, May 1942), p. 35.

[2]Carter V. Good, A. S. Barr, and D. E. Scates, The Methodology of Educational Research (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1938), p. 223.

may contribute along the way to a solution. Industrial inventions are a prime example of this and one has but to consider Edison's search for a substance that would burn for a long time and glow intensely to be aware of this. One would expect problems of human behavior with their greater complexity to require a combination of techniques for their solution. "There are no truly air-tight compartments in the total range of interest in human welfare."[1] The thread that runs through all such considerations is reflective thinking.

"It would be impossible to devise a standard uniform plan of procedure, for no two research undertakings could be alike in detail."[2] There is always pressure to make any investigation pattern itself after one that went before, especially if the prior one was successful. But each research project is unique if only in that it does not occupy the same position in time. But on a more obvious level, problems of a philosophical nature are bent and misshapen to meet the mold of an experimental design. Again, standardization has been a boon in the industrial world of ball bearings but it often results in anything but a blessing when applied to human affairs.

"Some fields of experience may be cultivated narrowly and by intensive, analytical methods; others require a broad synthetic sweep

---

[1]Frederick L. Whitney, The Elements of Research (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950), p. 194.

[2]W. C. Schulter, How to Do Research Work (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1927), p. 4.

of thought."[1] No one would seriously disparage the concentration necessary in focusing on a narrow but important aspect of some problem. But neither should one lose respect for the investigation that with a purpose steps back from a mass of data in an effort to see what generalizations and principles tie the data together. Synthesis is as much a manner of research as is analysis, and in all probability, both are needed.

"The findings of any single study represent a stage of understanding--a stage through which our knowledge passes on its way from relative ignorance to relative comprehension."[2] Any study worthy of the name of research should carry within it the seeds that will insure continuance of the study so that knowledge will approach ever closer to that stage of relative comprehension, which, in a sense, is always ahead. Socrates was not interested in bringing his hearers new ideas, but in looking at old knowledge in a new way. The very word re-search means to look again. Factual data that results from research is left to technologists while the theorists continue to research as the limits of the horizon expand. If a research project is stopped at any given point and held still for a moment the most that can be said is that possibly there are some answers here. The criterion of a good research project has never been its finality.

---

[1]McConnell, op. cit., p. 3.

[2]Ibid., p. 35.

2. Educational Research

Educational research is study and investigation in the field of education. Essentially, the field of education deals with two things: how to teach, and what to teach. Research that deals with the how to teach deals with a process. The process is often called pedagogy, used in the sense of the art, or practice of teaching. Research that studies the what to teach deals with content--not of pedagogy--but of what should be taught by pedagogues. This thesis is an investigation of how to teach, and thus deals with pedagogy.

Educational research is often patterned after the research done in applied science. There is nothing wrong with this but education has its own problems and "in many instances it will have to develop its own methods of investigation."[1] There is nothing sacred about any fixed form for research. The thing that is sacred is the objectivity of the investigation. If objectivity is scrupulously guarded, there is no real reason why a framework of research may not be invented for an occasion. It is conceivable that worth-while investigation might never be undertaken because it refused to fit some existing mold suggested for research. Einstein and his quantum theory is not the only example of a creative research approach. Educational research can be both objective and creative in form.

"Educational research . . . is a procedure for examining human experience to discover its fundamental characteristics and to discern

---

[1]Ibid., p. 9.

human values."[1] Educational research deals fundamentally with a social process. It investigates an area of activity in which men engage in relationships with one another. Inasmuch as it deals with human beings and especially the way they do things, why they do things, and the outcomes of what they do, it will never be as exact as research in applied science. There is no need to apologize for educational research on that score, given an understanding of what research means as set forth in the above paragraphs. The human element must always be considered in dealing with human affairs. Thus if this study emphasizes the personalities of great teachers as an important trait this can challenge more research on human personality, and it need not lead to deprecation of such analysis. Such analysis points the way to a deeper understanding of human affairs.

3. Types of Research

A look at those forms of research that have been developed will help to set a mood of thinking about research. "Methods of research may be classified from many points of view."[2] Good, Barr, and Scates suggest broad concepts of research in listing the following: historical, descriptive survey, analytical survey, discovering relationships, experimentation, reading, individual case methods, library techniques, and development of new techniques. In their book they take up historical normative-survey, experimental, case-study, and genetic research.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 4.

[2]Good, Barr, Scates, op. cit., p. 210.

Whitney classifies research by the following eight types:

Descriptive
Historical
Experimental
Philosophical
Prognostic
Sociological
Creative
Curriculum[1]

Abelson pulls facets of each of these together and calls the result integrative research. In describing it, he says, "Integrative research does not as a rule add new or original data; it often does add new conclusions, and contributes to the fullness of interpretation of results."[2] The point of all this is that there are gray areas that exist where types of research overlap, and thus it would not be amiss to describe a study as an historical-analytical-integrative-case study. Given these shadings between types of research, for the purposes of simplicity and because it fits as well as any, this study is called an historical study.

"The customary classification of research techniques into types of research over-emphasizes differences which are matters of relative emphasis only. In certain cases the whole investigation comprises a resumé and evaluation of past events, and we have historical research."[3] It is customary to consider historical research as that research which deals with original documents in an effort to establish their authenticity, but this need not be so. This is certainly a kind of research

---

[1]Whitney, op. cit., p. xiii.

[2]Harold H. Abelson, The Art of Educational Research (Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Co., 1933), p. 50.

[3]A. S. Barr, et al., "A Symposium on the Classification of Educational Research," Journal of Educational Research, XXIII, May 1931, p. 375.

and holds a prominent place in research done in the field of history. Still it is possible to call historical research that study which investigates any events from a post hoc position. Thus historical research examines the evidence and experience of the past as an aid in analyzing and interpreting the present.

4. Historical Research

The real meaning of history is a philosophical one. Most often an event occurring in history is unique, individual, and unrepeatable. There would be little interest in these unique events beyond fiction if meaning were not attached to them. Thus generalizations arise from a survey of past events. "Creditable research in (this field) is interested in what past social facts have in common, how and if they repeat themselves, and what generalizations can be made to emerge from reasoning."[1] In some ways this might be considered the highest type of research for it is logical to assume that the trial and error of past human events can have bearing on plots for planning the future of human affairs.

"There is a need for enlarging the scope of historical work. Long practice has led to the elaboration of methods of investigation, the organization of materials and the establishment of interrelations."[2] The establishment of interrelations is the basis of any science.

---

[1]Whitney, op. cit., p. 207.

[2]Historical Scholarship in America. A Report by the Committee on the Planning of Research; A. M. Schleslinger, Chm., (New York: Ray Long and Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1932), p. 12.

As facts by themselves are not science, so unique events are not the story of man. The thing that is meaningful is the thread of contingency that runs from time to time, and event to event. This study began by saying that there is a common thread of ideas held by a number of the great teachers of the past. To discover that thread and establish its relationship to our times is the task of this study.

"Descriptive research . . . abstracts whatever generalization is possible from cross-sections of experience. Historical research deals with past experiences in a similar manner. It traces development in human thought."[1] The findings of historical investigation are more than a record of events. Evidence may show the persistence of an idea throughout the ages, plastic in the hands of a number of men. Perhaps longevity is the mark of a classical idea, as it often is of a classic, in Art. Historical study calls attention to such an idea and perpetuates its importance in the complex fabric of man's culture. Historical study of the characteristics of great teachers marks the ideas and traits that were effective in making teaching great. These can be studied for their contemporary use.

Enough has been said to indicate that this study does not fit exactly into any form set forth in the guides to research. However, nomenclature is unimportant as long as process is clear. The preceding paragraphs suggest the trend of a study of this kind. Good, Barr, and Scates list the following title in their section on historical research:

---

[1]Whitney, op. cit., p. 192.

A Historical Study of the Methods of Teaching as Used by Eminent University and College Teachers. This is a close paraphrasing of the title of this study. By the same token, this research represents extended case studies of a score of outstanding figures in order to trace specifically ways in which they taught.

A final word should be noted on the method of reporting. Thesis writing tries to be objective and rightly so. However, this is no excuse for adopting a lofty and stullifying style. "History . . . is also a branch of literature. The student must perfect himself as nearly as possible in the literary art."[1] This is not a work of fiction, but as the great teachers would be the first to admit that one of their important traits is a sense of showmanship, so would they wish to be reported on in a style that holds a measure of popular interest.

B. Survey of the Literature

Uniqueness is one of the aims of a dissertation. This means that a survey of the literature should show that a study of the proposed type has not been done. Frequently part of the uniqueness of a study lies in the way in which it organizes knowledge already at hand. A survey of the literature is thus more central in this kind of a study. An historical study that deals entirely with documents, people, and events of the past must necessarily depend for its uniqueness upon its organization and interpretation of those events.

---

[1]Historical Report, op. cit., p. 106.

The literature on the characteristics of great teachers is of two kinds. The contemporary emphasis is on the development of scales with which to measure the traits of successful teachers. The Encyclopedia of Educational Research has a section on teaching efficiency. It is not necessary to list all the studies in the Encyclopedia. All of them deal with this problem by way of identifying either a priori or emperically traits of successful teachers. Then a scale is developed to be used as a yardstick for measuring teaching efficiency. For example, Adams calls his A Qualitative Analysis of Certain Teaching Traits.[1] Part II of The Fourteenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education is entitled "Methods for Measuring Teacher' Efficiency."[2] These are typical of the studies of the characteristics of teachers.

The other main approach to the study of the characteristics of great teachers is sometimes called historical, sometimes, philosophical, sometimes biographical. Whatever the emphasis the theme is usually that of a history of pedagogy. "Pedagogy is a complex affair, and their are many ways of writing its history."[3] Some authors focus on cycles of educational development, or movements. This method takes account of ancient educational methods as seen in masters and disciples, the

---

[1]E. W. Adams, A Qualitative Analysis of Certain Teaching Traits (Philadelphia, Pa.: Temple University, 1928) (dissertation).

[2]The Fourteenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, Methods for Measuring Teacher's Efficiency, A. C. Boyce (ed.) (Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Co., 1915).

[3]Gabriel Compayné, The History of Pedagogy (Boston, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Co., 1890), p. xiii.

Rennaisance period with the programs of a Pestalozzi, specific movements such as the Jesuit school, and the modern school programs already referred to in the section on teaching methods.

Other authors write a history of pedagogy by using philosophies of education as a vehicle. Almost any great philosopher has written on education and a history of these can be compiled to modern times, with John Dewey as a recent example.

Another analysis of pedagogy comes from the biographies of famous teachers. These methods are seldom mutually exclusive and it is interesting to note that biography is most often a common element to all approaches. The following title comes from the text of Compayné: "History of Pedagogy--Principle Educators and Their Doctrines."[1] This is the title of a course offered at one time in France that made a study of pedagogy and philosophies of education by using the biographies of principle educators.

"Of the three phases of educational study, the practical, (biography) the theoretical (philosophy), and the historical, the last, as proved by the number of works written on the subject has received very little attention."[2] There are many individual biographies of educators. There are attempts at integrating philosophies by using biographies. There are very few descriptions of method by appealing to the history of great pedagogues. There are books containing a number of biographies but none that go on to suggest a modal teacher type based on these biographies, which is what this study tries to do.

---

[1]Ibid., p. xvii.

[2]Ibid., p. v.

Robert Ulich, in his Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom, says this:

> This book is an attempt to help in the rebuilding of the lost contact between the surface and the depth of civilization. Therefore, if in this book large extracts of the educational writings of such men as Confucius, Plato, Aristotle, the medieval theologians, Luther, Erasmus, Rousseau, Pestalozzi and others are offered, it is not for the sake of these men, they do not need it. It is for our sake.[1]

This book, even by its title, comes close to the subject of this thesis, but as can be seen from the above quotation, it places the emphasis on the writings of great teachers and not on personal traits, or characteristics.

Thwing also has this purpose in mind but restricts it to the contemporary scene and men of lesser scope. "Biographies may be either historical, interpreting a period, or personal, interpreting a man. The following sketches (in his book) are concerned with the personal character and services of the subjects themselves. Yet, I venture to believe that they also may serve a bit to present some of the educational movements, to interpret some of the educational facts . . . of the last half-century."[2] This book contains twenty-two biographies that stand alone with no attempt at a synthesis of what they mean insofar as method is concerned.

The work that comes the closest to this dissertation is Highet's The Art of Teaching. "This book begins by considering the character

---

[1]Robert Ulich, Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950), p. v.

[2]Charles F. Thwing, Guides, Philosophers, and Friends (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1927), p. vii.

and abilities which make a good professional teacher, and then goes on to examine his methods. One of the forces which have helped to make our own civilization is certainly the influence of famous teachers: therefore the most powerful teachers of the past are examined. First, the Greek intellectuals; then Socrates, Plato, Aristotle; then Jesus of Nazareth; then the teachers of the Rennaisance; the Jesuits next, and the best nineteenth century and twentieth century teachers and finally the fathers of great men. . . . ."[1] The major differences between Highet's study and this one are clearly seen in the material just presented in Chapter I of this study. One beautiful thing about Highet's book is that after all this he concludes with a summary of the principles of teaching--on two pages, three principles.

In summary of the literature then, there are books of biographies, histories of pedagogy, and devices for measuring teachers' efficiency. The peculiar slant of this study is explained in Chapter I, but briefly: an analysis of some social relations, an analysis of the characteristics of some great teachers, and the development of a hypothetical model teacher from a synthesis of these.

C. Survey of Contemporary Opinion

It is difficult to select a representative number of great teachers from a survey of the literature. The list could contain hundreds. When one attempts to select a limited number of these, covering a span

---

[1]Gilbert Highet, The Art of Teaching (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1954), p. viii.

of time, the same names occur over and over in the literature. It is no simpler to get a list of great teachers short enough to handle in a dissertation from one's contemporaries. The method finally used was of drawing up a list of forty names found most often in histories of education. This list, with a letter, was sent to twenty-five men in key educational positinns today. (See Appendix for the list of names and the letter.) The letter asked these men to check the twenty names they would list for the purpose of a study of this type. Of the twenty-five letters sent out, one was returned unopened as an unknown address, fifteen were returned that complied with the request, and two letters of refusal were sent in. Several returns included letters commenting on this request. The letters of refusal, however, expressed the spirit and results of this survey of contemporary opinion. Because of its importance, one of these letters is included here:

> Dear Mr. Lamper:
>
> I am returning to you your questionnaire unmarked. I am afraid that I cannot be of much help to you.
>
> You ask me "to take a moment" to indicate the persons on your list whom I believe should be included in your study. This I cannot do. For my judgement to amount to anything in my own sight, I should probably have to do all the thinking and research you have done, to arrive at my twenty "greatest." To do so would require hours of time on my part, hours that I cannot spare. I am sorry. About the best I can do, after reading the names you have selected, is to say that as a group these persons have certainly had "something to say about education,"--and a large "something."

The fifteen lists that were returned indicated almost a complete lack of agreement. As one person said, "If I include Socrates and someone else Plato, who is to say which of us is right?" Following is

the list on which there was the most agreement: Buddha, Confucius, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Jesus, Pestalozzi, Comenius, and Gandhi. It was clear that once some selection was exercised as in presenting a list of forty names to begin with, refinement is a matter of individual preference.

D. Selection of Men to Include in the Study

Robert Ulich says, "All selection is, to a degree, arbitrary."[1] Good and Scates, in their chapter on historical research, recognize the right of the doctoral student to select men and epochs in history at will in the interests of limiting the subject. However, they insist that the student must retain some continuity of theme. All the considerations of objectivity must apply, but continuity of theme can provide a major criterion of selection of men or epochs.

The theme in this study is great teaching. It is possible, of course, to get involved in semantic problems. Hayakawa's approach to the use of words is appealing because of its simplicity.[2] He says the editor of a dictionary acts as a historian, not a law-giver. A word must be defined the way it's used, not the way someone thinks it ought to be defined. A definition must not be too specific and one cannot be bound by a dictionary as new situations call for new meanings. No word ever has exactly the same meaning twice. The key words used in

---

[1]Ulich, op. cit., p. v.

[2]Hayaka, Language in Thought and Action (Harcourt Brace), p. 55.

this thesis cannot be held to their extensional meanings alone but must allow the intensional meanings as well.[1]

Great teaching refers to teaching of influence. The twelve teachers selected for this study were all men of influence. The scope of influence varies from that of Jesus to the more individual and, by comparison, limited, Mark Hopkins. Socrates is selected rather than Plato or Aristotle as the master of Plato, who, in turn, was the teacher of Aristotle. Men like Comenius and Pestalozzi are listed in Webster's Biographical Dictionary as educational reformers. Gandhi is included because he was contemporary and exercised a practical, rather than philosophical influence. As already mentioned, the list could run to over a hundred, or the entire list of forty could be used. It becomes more and more apparent that the importance is not mainly with who is selected but with an analysis of the influence of men whose main effort was in teaching other men. Probably no book on teaching and teachers includes all of these twelve, but any given book will honor groups of them. In the final selection then, the list of twelve is the arbitrary result of lists drawn up by other authors and contemporary educators. It is granted that there could and should be many others included, but at the same time every one of the twelve appears on lists of great teachers compiled by others. Following is a list of the twelve great teachers selected for study, with their dates and titles and given in Webster:

---

[1]*Ibid.*, pp. 58-60.

1. Gautama Buddha (563-483 B. C.)--Indian religious teacher.

2. Confucius (551-479 B. C.)--Chinese sage, founder of moral system.

3. Socrates (469-399 B. C.)--Athenian philosopher, teacher.

4. Jesus (4 B. C.-29 A. D.)--Jewish religious teacher.

5. Marcus Fabius Quintilianus (35?-95 A. D.)--Roman rhetorician.

6. Desiderius Erasmus (1456-1536)--Dutch scholar.

7. John Amos Comenius (1592-1670)--Moravian educational reformer.

8. Johann Heindrick Pestalozzi (1746-1827)--Swiss educational reformer.

9. Friedrich Wilhelm August Froebel (1782-1852)--German educator.

10. Horace Mann (1796-1859)--American educator.

11. Mark Hopkins (1802-1887)--American educator.

12. Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi (1869-1948)--Indian religious and political leader, social reformer.[1]

E. Determination of Common Characteristics Held by the Selected Men

The original outline of this study used the phrase "common teaching techniques." The more reading that was done the more apparent it became that to speak of "techniques," or "methods," was to limit the work dangerously. Gilbert Highet, in the preface of his Art of Teaching says, "This is a book on the methods of teaching. It is called The Art of Teaching because I believe that teaching is an art, not a science. Teaching involves emotions, which cannot be systematically appraised

---

[1]Webster's.

and employed, and human values, which are quite outside the grasp of science."[1] This same idea--willy-nilly of whether teaching is an art, or science, or both--appeared in most of the writing on great teachers, and it soon became apparent that to speak of methods was to include the mystical realm of the emotions, the dynamism of a man, sometimes the subject matter, and always the personality. It was obvious that characteristics was a better word to use than techniques.

In an historical study there are only two sources of information on the characteristics of these men. The first is what they themselves said, and even then one must sometimes make the assumption that they practiced what they taught. Still, the spirit of a man lives in what he says, especially when he says as much as some of these twelve. Two men--Jesus and Socrates--are a problem because they left no written documents. Even the gospels were written by men years after Jesus' death. There is no help for this but to try to get at the most objective secondary sources.

The other source of information is what others have written about these men. In the interests of objectivity it becomes necessary to wade through many books and to select a few which breathe a calm spirit of reason. In this study, books by obvious hero-worshippers were excluded. It is often possible to check on the objectivity of a biography by making note of the way other authors refer to it. If there is substantial agreement that a certain book is "the most scholarly work"

---

[1]Highet, op. cit., p.

on a man the chances are that it is objective. It is the duty of the investigator in this case to ferret out those primary and secondary sources most helpful to an objective analysis of the great teachers.

Chapter I of this study mentioned that what these men taught is helpful only in terms of considering choice of subject matter as a method. In most cases, it is the spirit and way in which a man presented his material that is important here. This has to do with the character of great teachers, not teachings. The characteristics of each of these twelve men in the study will be taken, whenever, possible, from at least one important work by the man himself, and then from a number of secondary sources.

The method of identifying and describing characteristics as common to a number of the twelve will be that of developing a three-way cross reference system. One file will be in the name of the person studied, a second file will contain the names of the authors that write on the characteristics of these men, and a third file will contain the characteristics that can be categorized. To determine whether or not a characteristic is common to a number of the twelve men it will be necessary to consider the number of men that possessed that trait. This in turn, will be decided by the number of references made by an author to that trait, the number of different authors referring to the trait, and the number of times this trait is mentioned as observable in the teaching of one of the twelve. If a majority of the men under study possessed and/or used a certain characteristic in a way that aided in making

them as effective teachers this will be evidence of the common and shared use of this trait.

F. Organization of the Remaining Chapters

The next chapter is the heart of the study. It contains biographical and historical data on the lives, teaching and influence of the twelve men selected as great teachers. The biographical data will then follow the suggestion of Highet, Ulich, and most authors and be brief, only locating the man in time and place. While in some other study it might be important to give the social milieu, or temper of the times, this, too, will be at a minimum. The idea in this study is to analyze great teaching in spite of the times, recognizing as a foregone conclusion the importance of the social situation leading up to, and at the time of great teacher. On this point the study begins where Sidney Hook leaves off in his The Hero in History.[1] The great teachers, products of their times, were free to select alternatives, and the next chapter in this thesis accepts those alternatives as a matter of social process and focuses on the men and their manner of teaching. The main theme devoted to each man will be an analysis, as concrete and specific as possible, of the way he taught.

The next chapter will pull the characteristics common to the twelve together and summarize the extent and nature of these characteristics. In this chapter some mention will be made of any differences that are noticeable enough in the teaching of the twelve to be worthy of mention.

---

[1]Hook, op. cit.

It has never been a foregone conclusion that all twelve men possessed the same traits, or held the same educational ideas.

The main theme of the final chapter will be the attempt to construct a hypothetical model teacher based on the common characteristics of the twelve great teachers studied. This might be called the construction of a modal personality based on these traits. This will imply a practical consideration--a model for great teaching. The study will end with recommendations for further investigation.

CHAPTER IV

BIOGRAPHICAL AND HISTORICAL DATA ON THE LIVES, TEACHING, AND INFLUENCE OF THE SELECTED MEN

GAUTAMA BUDDHA
CONFUCIUS
SOCRATES
JESUS
QUINTILIANUS
ERASMUS
COMENIUS
PESTALOZZI
FROEBEL
HORACE MANN
MARK HOPKINS
MOHANDAS GANDHI

GUATAMA BUDDHA

"Somewhere about the year 580 B. C. there was born at Kapilavastu, a hundred miles north of Benares in what is now Nepal, one Gautama, the son of Suddhedana, chief of the small Rajput tribe, the Sakyas . . ."[1] A curious parallel to other recorded births, this, for the story goes on: born by divine means, possessing amazing knowledge at an early age, going into seclusion, enduring temptation, emerging and teaching, dying with the wreck of the world as a memorial. This is Buddha, Light of Asia, meaning the Enlightened One.

Thus are the beginnings of Buddha buried in the mythology of the East. It is not amiss to trace more of the myth, for as the teaching cannot be torn from the man, neither can the web of his work be sundered from the story of the man. There had been many Buddhas, the idea of samsara[2] making each one a possible former existence of Gautama Buddha. According to the law of karma,[3] Gautama achieved moksha,[4] and at his death said he would not be born again.[5] And to Gautama goes the credit

---

[1]Sir George Macmunn, The Religions and Hidden Cults of India, (London: Sampson Low, Marsten and Co., Ltd.), p. 45.

[2]The ocean of birth and death, i.e., of successive individual existences in transmigration.

[3]Good choices, earnest efforts, good deeds, build good character, while bad choices, inertia, and evil deeds build bad character.

[4]Ultimate release or liberation (of the soul from the cycle of birth and death).

[5]From the Pali Canon.

for "overthrowing one thousand years of priestly tyranny,"[1] and for "impressing Indian thought more than any other teacher or king."[2] History has shrouded a number of great men with the trappings of legend until it becomes almost impossible to penetrate to the heart of the matter and separate the mixture into its elements.

". . . if we subtract from the pseudo-historical narrative all its mythical and miraculous features, the residual nucleus of historically plausible fact will be very small indeed: and all that we can say is that while there may have lived an individual teacher who gave the ancient wisdom its peculiarly 'Buddhist' coloring, his personality is completely overshadowed . . . by the eternal substance with which he identified himself."[3] This is the case with a number of Great Teachers, and the murkiness surrounding their work is in direct proportion to the chronological gap between then and now and to their greatness. It is a curious thing that those who seem to be the least in need of legendary powers are so bolstered by their disciples. The very greatness of the vision of these figures resting to the extent that it does in simplicity is often not shared by those sincere followers who seek to organize and propogate the teachings and in so doing lose much of the spirit of the

---

[1]Charles D. B. Mills, The Indian Saint (Northampton, Mass: Journal and Free Press Co., 1876), p. 11.

[2]Sir Charles Eliot, Hinduism and Buddhism (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1954), p. xx.

[3]Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, Hinduism and Buddhism (New York: The Philosophical Library, Inc.), p. 50.

Master. There is a short but important resumé of the life of Siddartha (Gautama) which fixes him in the stream of time:

> That do we know that can be set down with confidence as sober fact? Very little; but that little is deeply significant. Siddartha grew to young manhood amid scenes of luxury and surrounded by all the paraphernalia of sensuous enjoyment; he was protected by his father from learning about the sorrows and frustrations and perplexities to which ordinary flesh is heir. Somehow, when in his early twenties, he became acquainted with the sad facts of old age, of disease, and of death; for the first time he knew the major miseries to which human nature is inevitably subject in a world of decay and dissolution. This experience moved him to anxious and puzzled reflection, and then--having also met a monk full of wisdom, insight and serenity--to determined, undiscouraged action. He must learn the meaning of life in such a strange world. He left his father's palace with its constant stimulations to self-centered indulgence, left his beautiful wife and newborn son, and wandered into the forest--the accepted haunt in India for those who have found the ways of ordinary life spiritually cramping. His purpose was to discover the truth--the essential and saving truth--about life and death, about sorrow and happiness. For seven years he sought and struggles, in relentless, torturing self-experiment. He inquired of renowned hermit sages. As would be the case in India, with its traditional insistence on renunciation, he tried ascetic denial of the body's demands in extreme form, finally succumbing to the dull blankness of a starving swoon. When he returned to consciousness again he was convinced that this was not the right way,--such radical punishment brings, he saw, not spiritual illumination and peace, but exhaustion, torpor, and impotence of the mind. Gradually he found more successful clues to the understanding and liberation he sought. After being persistently tempted by the clever demon Mara, his quest reached its culmination in a long period of meditation under a spreading tree, which became for that reason to Buddhists the sacred Bodhi tree, not far from the present city of Gaya in northeastern India.[1]

This is sufficient for the life of Buddha in this thesis. Judgment is not to be made as to any supernatural qualities of Buddha or the exact time and location of his existence. This study focuses on the

---

[1]E. H. Brewster, The Life of Gotama the Buddha (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1926). The author quotes the translation by Rhys Davids of "Digha-Nikaya, IV."

methods of Buddha as implied in his supposed teachings and as commented on by his biographers and those who write about the Buddhist religion.

There are some things already mentioned in the short sketch of Gautama's life that have bearing on the method of this great teacher. It is impossible from the beginning to separate the personality of the great teacher from the method. If a teacher is compassionate, that is method. If he is persuasive, that, too, is method. Just as a cantankerous teacher discourages learning so a kindly one attracts, and this is method. The foregoing account of Buddha emphasized his compassion and his intense search for knowledge. His compassion was aroused during the Four Encounters with old age, disease, death, and the recluse. That compassion can be called the key to the personality of Buddha, for every writer, without exception mentions this. Great claim is made for the compassion of Buddhism as a religion--not being a religion of the sword--in overcoming conflicting dogmas, and the translations of the Buddha's life from the Pali Cannons are filled with stories of Buddha's conversions effected by his extreme compassion. The seven years he spent in searching for truth are characteristic of his concentration on problems and his thinking through to solutions. With this much set up as a stage it is possible to write freely of what one feels as he pursues the greatness of the teaching of Buddha.

"Truly, sirs, the Samana Gotama hath a pleasant voice, and a pleasing delivery, he is gifted with polite address, distinct, not husky, suitable for making clear the matter on hand."[1] Buddha was a young man

---

[1]Macmunn, op. cit., p. 47.

born to riches and the satisfaction of desire. He was handsome and had an average physique. But he was thoughtful and early in life the problems of other men made it impossible for him to accept his life of indolence. He came by his knowledge of the Right, or Middle Way, hard. He thus arrived at an intensely practical outlook on life.

It is fashionable to consider all mysticism--aided by the ignorance of a Hollywood-developed stereotype of Oriental thought--as impractical, dreamy, and the opposite of the world of action. Meditation is for monks, and eyes raised to the heavens are for mendicants. But most psychologists will agree that central to man's happiness is his self-concept. And a self-concept is arrived at by thinking long and hard about the questions: who am I? And: what am I doing here? In terms of the phenomenological self these are the most important questions that can be asked, and to answer them is to establish the basis of life. Carl Sandburg says a man must learn to be alone with himself to amount to anything. Robert Lindner, the deceased psychiatrist, lays many psychological difficulties at the feet of an inability of people to be alone sometimes. Part of Buddha's method was to set aside times for meditation, and to encourage others to do likewise, and thus to answer the basic questions which, unanswered, often make the rest of life a mockery. In this, his method of teaching stressed the intensely practical, for every man, be he beggar or bank president, must answer these questions.

Then when Buddha taught he was excited. His excitement was the excitement of knowing he possessed some measure of truth. He knew what

his study did for him and he could often see what it did for those he taught. He was animated and vigorous and his confidence added to his persuasive powers. His method was sincere, and direct and his delivery was never anything but natural. These are qualities that can come only from a teacher who feels that he is master of what he teaches and who speaks with an authority born of confidence in his ideas.

This authority is a theme common to most great teachers and it is certainly true of Buddha. In the case of Buddha this was one of his strengths and has resulted in others characterizing him as being stately, and having great dignity. "I know whereof I speak," can be applied to Buddha and this is basic to his utter earnestness. He worked hard at his teaching and encouraged others to work hard both in their search for knowledge and their carrying it to others.

Buddha had a great knowledge of people and his essential humanity shows through all of his teaching. If compassion was the key to his teaching, toleration is the other side of the coin. Buddha had a patience that knew no end and the parables in the Pali Canon attest to the fact that often people who came to revile, tempt, and spit on him remained as converts. He never seemed to rebuke, but his prodding, gentle question and answer method revealed that often there was a better way, a higher truth. His teaching is laced with tenderness and he is entirely reasonable in his expectations of people. This gave his teaching an affirmative note and he was not interested in delving into the past that could not be changed but dealt with the future that could be fulfilling rather than futile.

Buddha set the example himself by emphasizing individual effort. He knew that a man must enter actively into the pursuit of knowledge or it would escape him. He knew that pupils must work and seek and concentrate and that seldom, if ever, does learning enter passively into the mind of anyone. He demanded a life of consecration and himself set the standard of self-sacrificing labor and unselfishness. No one outdid Buddha in self-discipline and it was part of his commanding gesture that he knew the way of truth didn't reveal itself to every casual observer. There was nothing absentminded about his teaching and even his meditation represented an intense focus on a problem.

Buddha emphasized the meaning of things and not the form. Tradition, signs, symbols—none of the trappings and tinselry of established knowledge—were of themselves sacred if their position served but to conceal truth. He exposed falseness wherever he found it, and his imprint on the thousands-of-years old Indian religion gives proof of this. He was brave and as an observer of life he knew that often pomp and circumstance obscure issues which would be seen for what they are if brought out to the light. He never suggested that details or pattern were not important but he did point out that too often knowledge is accepted as being truth because it fits a form and the content is not questioned. To be enlightened is to question all things and to arrive at a true meaning of the knowledge itself.

Buddha's ideas were advanced far beyond his times but he taught in the simplest terms possible. He would explain over and over again and he aimed his teaching at the level of his hearers. He suited his

teaching to the capacity of those he taught, and he drew his disciples from those who pursued the commonplace activities of the life that surrounded him. He used parables and the concreteness of these parables was based on his use of everyday images. He used humor when it aided and his wit added to the effectiveness of his teaching. He made his teaching available to all people of high and low estate and to him all men were equal. He accepted everyone as a fellow human and of this was begotten his essential humility. He affected no airs as a learned man and he drove no one away with the degree of sophistication of his knowledge. He was kind, friendly, and serene and was not conscious of any status differences between the beggar and the Brahmin. He exposed the tyranny of the latter as quickly as the ignorance of the former; he had no use for impostures.

If there is nothing new under the sun, it is still possible to make teaching appear original in the way it looks at old knowledge. Buddha was always ready to question vested interests and he encouraged his pupils to be faithful to the task of tracking knowledge to its source. No facades of authority could keep out the inquiring mind, and this is as it should be for truth has nothing to fear in the revelation of its nakedness. To ask what a thing really means and to think critically is often to be original for this does not always occur to a man in an environment of propaganda. Buddha was faithful to this task. He opposed ritualism and in so doing he opposed the rule of the privileged few. Wisdom is a cup from which all may drink, and Buddha offered it to all in his genuine interest in men.

Buddha himself made modest claims. He said, "One thing only do I teach, suffering and escape from suffering."[1] At first he dispaired of his task and as a consequence his early teaching failed. But he labored uninterruptedly and the gemlike clarity of his teaching began to take hold. "In those days the intellectual classes of India felt the ordinary activities of life to be unsatisfying: they thought it natural to renounce the world and mortify the flesh; divergent systems of ritual, theology and self-denial promised happiness but all agree in thinking it normal as well as laudable that a man should devote his life to meditation and study. Compared with this the teaching of the Buddha is not unsocial, unpractical and mysterious but human, business-like and clear."[2] "His teaching is formulated in severe and technical phraseology, yet the substance of it is so simple that many have criticized it as too obvious and jejune."[3]

Then what of the teaching of Buddha? Is it not true that what a man teaches can give a clue as to how he teaches? If a man claims that selfishness is a virtue it is reasonable to expect that he himself is selfish; if he teaches an eye for an eye he probably takes an eye for an eye. It has been stated that it is not the purpose in this thesis to deal at any length with the teachings of the great teachers. Comment is only made here because it has direct bearing on Buddha's ideas of

---

[1]*Ibid.*, p. 48.

[2]Eliot, *op. cit.*, p. xx.

[3]*Ibid.*

teaching. From the Pali Canon come these suggestions for those who would teach:

> So long as the brethern train their minds in self-possession that good men among their fellow disciples shall come to them, and those who have come shall dwell at ease--so long may growth be expected of the brethern, not decline.
>
> So long as the brethern shall not be in the habit of, or be fond of, or be partakers in idle talk--so long as the brethern shall not be addicted to, or be fond of, or indulge in slothfulness--so long as the brethern shall neither have, nor fall under the influence of wrong desires--so long as the brethern shall not become friends, companions, or intimates of evildoers--so long as the brethern shall be full of faith, modest in heart, afraid of blame, full of learning, strong in energy, shall have presence of mind and wisdom--so long as the brethern shall exercise themselves in mental activity, search after truth, energy, joy, peace, earnest contemplation, and equanimity of mind--so long as the brethern shall create in themselves the idea of impermanence, the idea of no unchanging principle--so long as the brethern shall persevere in kindness of action, speech, and thought, so long as they shall teach without partiality--so long as the brethern shall live among those whose virtues are productive of freedom, which are untarnished and which are conducive to concentration of heart, so long may the brethern be expected not to decline, but to prosper . . ."[1]

It was the dynamic personality of Gautama that enabled him to win followers to these teachings. The strange thing is that this list of suggestions has never been a new thing in the world; it is only that each age sees men passing them by for other values that makes them seem fresh when someone calls attention to them.

It is possible now to build a summary statement of Buddha and to present it in the simple terms he would prefer.

> What sort of man did Buddha impress others as being? Guatama the Buddha seems to have combined in high degree two qualities that are rarely found together and each of which is rarely exemplified in high degree. On the one hand he was a man of

---

[1]Brewster, op. cit., pp. 176-178.

> rich and responsive human sympathy, of unfailing patience, strength, gentleness, and good will. His friendliness, to all who came to him in sincere search, was genuine and unreserved. He therefore aroused in his followers a wondering, eager, affectionate devotion such as only the greatest leaders of men have awakened. On the other hand, he was a thinker of unexcelled philosophic power. His was one of the giant intellects of human history, exhibiting a keenness of analytic understanding that has rarely been equaled. He probed throught the virtues and the deceptions of the thought of his day, adopting it where it seemed to him clearly sound and abandoning it or radically revising it when he saw that it was missing the true and the good. Buddha was a pioneering lover of men, and a philosophic genius, rolled into a single vigorous and radiant personality.[1]

In addition to this, it is also possible to extract the specific qualities and things mentioned thus far in this section on Buddha, and present them in the form of a list:

He had a great knowledge of people.

He was excited when he talked.

He emphasized meaning, not form.

He knew learning involved activity.

He demanded consecration to the task of teaching.

He was animated in the presence of pupils.

He cultivated a pleasant voice, pleasing delivery, spoke distinctly and in a polite manner.

He used parables--simple stories with lessons drawn from the everyday, common experiences of his listeners.

He knew the value of occasional solitude in thinking through problems.

He had a boundless compassion for people.

His teaching was intensely practical: he dealt with the profound questions that affected all his hearers.

---

[1]E. A. Burtt, The Teachings of the Compassionate Buddha, (New York: Mentor Book, 1955), pp. 22-23.

He exercised self-discipline.

He exposed falseness in his search for the truth.

He was brave.

He was kind.

His delivery was natural, simple, earnest, and sincere.

He had an air of dignity, stateliness; an authority born of confidence that gave him a commanding presence.

He stressed the equality of all; many of his ideas were advanced for his day.

He was persuasive.

His teaching was affirmative.

He was a careful observer of mankind.

He was self-sacrificing; he worked hard; he was unselfish.

He explained a thing over and over; he had patience; he was reasonable in his expectations of people.

He was friendly, willing to help, gentle.

He was enlightened on many matters; extremely tolerant of others; faithful to the trust others placed in him.

He aimed his teaching at the level of those who came to learn; he suited his teaching to the capacity of each.

He was vigorous, could see the humor in a thing, and maintained a tenderness with people.

He presented his material in an original way.

Such was the method of Buddha. Something must be said of his times. "His teaching was Indian. Without the intellectual work of his predecessors his own work, however original, would have been impossible. He was no doubt the greatest of them all; but Buddhism is an Indian system."[1]

---

[1]Rhys Davids, The History and Literature of Buddhism (Calcutta: Susil Gupta (India) Ltd., 1952), pp. 78-79.

It often happens that a great teacher detects a hollow sound to the age in which he lives. Jesus lived during the height of Pharisaical hypocrisy; Socrates denounced the decadence of a decaying democracy in Athens; Lincoln attacked the departure from constitutional rights; Gandhi coped with caste. Buddha challenged the sophistry set up by the priesthood and his teaching was stimulating because it questioned a questionable authority. And this, about his activities: "He had constant intercourse with all the most cultured and earnest thinkers of the day . . . which gave him an opportunity for comparing ideas. Moreover, by mixing daily with all sorts and conditions of men, from kings and wealthy merchants down to the peasants in the villages, he was able to enter into the needs and aspirations, the hopes and fears of humanity."[1] His method made enemies as well as friends. There are always those who, called to a higher challenge they cannot meet by the example of another, respond with sloth, decay, or violent difference of opinion. They must then peck at the prince in a gesture of guilt. But the modern reach of the teaching of Buddha leaves no doubt as to the power and influence of his teaching. Cyril Connelly remarked that to meet anyone over thirty who cannot teach you something new is a waste of time. This could not be said of Gautama Buddha, for truly, he was an Enlightened One.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 77.

CONFUCIUS

He was human. No god, this sage whose teachings held sway for generations; schoolboys drinking at the fount of his wisdom in an intellectual empire that has evidenced man's highest civilized attainments for thousands of years. He was human. He yearned, was ambitious, grew restless, had some success, was rejected, and uttered bitter words near the time of his death. In this lay his humanity. He didn't always succeed. A few weeks before his death he said, "Alas, there is no one who understands me."[1] He became discouraged.

And yet, to meet him was to be inspired, to feel the challenge of meeting life. Students flocked from all over China; princes sent their sons to him and when he died disciples mourned him for three years. He taught all, of high and low estate. He served princes and spoke with paupers. He never did anything specific but he specified the training of great men and left behind the Talmud of China. His humanity was based on humility and he said "I don't know" so often that as a teacher today he would run the risk of unemployment. His disciples said, "Our Master (learns) through his gentleness, his humility, his restraint, his complaisance."[2]

---

[1]H. G. Creel, Confucius, The Man and the Myth (New York: The John Day Co., 1949), p. 56.

[2]The Analects (book of sayings ascribed to Confucius).

The Jews were returning from captivity in Babylon, Greece was invaded by Xerxes, the Persians conquered Egypt, and Shuliang Ho became the father of one K'ung Fu-tzu, the later name given as The Master. Legend glorifies the birth with angels and dragons, but the young and beautiful mother, Cheng-tsai, simply knew of the pain and push of birth. Thus it came about that Confucius was born of an old man and a young girl in the town of Tsou, Shantung Province, hard by the modern city of Ch'ii-fu. Shu-liang Ho soon died, and had he not been a minor official, the young mother would have had a more difficult time. As it was, Confucius later said, "I lived without rank in humble circumstances."[1] It didn't matter; his life was to influence human history as few have done. He became a teacher at twenty-three and the rest of his life burdened him with a task which burned with a consuming passion.

It is enough to say of his times that there was confusion and chaos. China was divided into a number of feudal states which raped one another as size and alliances gave opportunity. Lu, the home state of Confucius, was one of the smallest. Later, Confucius was to help stabilize Lu and other states by his teaching and organization. But basic lusts attracted the kings and Confucius' services brought a sense of guilt that could not be tolerated. So while venerated the vitality of acceptance was not given to him or his teachings.

> What happened in Confucius' day has occurred more than once. Old religious beliefs and old social, economic, and political patterns had persisted for many centuries. But then, as the

---

[1]Creel, op. cit., p. 1.

> political pattern of early Chou feudalism gradually broke down, every one of the other spheres was affected. The ties that had long held men together failed, bringing relative to the individual and near chaos to society. A very similar crises occurred in Egypt, around 2100 B. C. Something comparable happened in ancient Greece. As Windelband describes it: "The more the luxuriant development of individualism loosened the old bonds of the common consciousness, of faith, and of morals, and threatened the youthful civilization of Greece with the danger of anarchy, the more pressing did individual men, prominent by their position in life, their insight, and their character, find the duty of recovering in their own reflection the measure that was becoming lost." In Greece, such conditions gave us the philosophy of Socrates. In China, they gave us that of Confucius.
>
> In times of such moral and political crisis, men are thrown back upon their essential humanity. It is no longer enough to conure up the old gods and quote the old authorities, for they command but a dubious respect. It is necessary to get down to the fundamentals, to deal with things that all men can understand. Those who dare to pioneer in such times do not win easy acceptance of their ideas. The need constantly to contend with sceptical criticism keeps their philosophy lean and hard.
>
> Such philosophies have a universal quality. They may employ some terms that have little meaning for us. Confucius may speak of "Heaven" as the guarantor of his mission; Socrates may talk of "beauty" as a thing existing in itself apart from any beautiful object; and we may not agree with them. Yet despite the difference in time and culture they seem to speak our language. We feel that they are dealing with real problems and that what they say may make some contribution toward a solution.
>
> Such philosophies cannot last. If they are successful, their very success leads to their perversion. Those who inherit them elaborate their concepts far beyond their original forms. The crisis passes and society is stabilized. New institutions replace the old, and philosophy conforms to the existing order.[1]

It remained for time to attest the greatness of this man who wandered from state to state, hoping that someone would attempt to design an earthly Utopia. Men in season are not wont to accept the teachings of one who makes them uncomfortable focusing on the gap between what is

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 109-110.

good and what is. Future generations have little to lose as acceptance and veneration can be verbal and actions need not be modified beyong the degree of desire to do so. But there was some change, and now it is said that "he excavated a channel of thought for future ages, and projected his teachings upon such a plane, that, without addition or change, they have held sway over an empire of intellect for eighty generations, perhaps the greatest mental wonder in the world."[1] Confucius, in his time, was not a big and important figure, and true to the spirit of the above, his disciples organized and ruined much of what he taught. His simple truths were disturbing to those who sought power, and around 100 B. C. false biographies and critical works were written that now make it difficult to trace the real Confucius. Scholars now probe past these times and weigh the writings of contemporaries of Confucius, and those sayings in the Analects attributed to him. And it is well to do so, for "uncounted millions have been teachers. But the number of teachers who have changed the course of human history, as individuals and solely by their instruction, is small indeed. The fact that Confucius did so gives peculiar interest to the methods and content of his teaching."[2]

Methods and content--is there a difference? Scrutiny narrows the gap--if there is one--and a moot point might be made that the more perfect the teacher the more his practice parallels his preaching. Confucius, like Buddha, wanted to alleviate human misery. To him the

---

[1]Hampden C. DuBose, The Dragon, Image, and Demon (Richmond, Va.: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1899), p. 89.

[2]Creel, op. cit., p. 75.

key was character. "He conceived education as being largely directed toward the cultivation of character. It was designed to develop such virtues as loyalty, sincerity, good faith, justice, kindness . . ."[1] Man must learn to live as a social being and thus the teaching of Confucius had a practical objective--as practical now as it was then. Confucius' central idea is called the Doctrine of the Middle Way which gave a vision of a cooperative world without strife. To do this was to develop the whole man, one possessing wisdom, free from covetousness, brave, accomplished, well versed in courtesy and sincerity.

Like all great teachers Confucius held the individual responsible for learning. He trusted men, he put faith in them and he knew that his teaching was intensely practical. No one learns by osmosis. Even the carrot reaches out for the water in the soil, and the apple decides how much sun it will absorb to ripen. So man must make the effort to pluck from his universe that knowledge of the true, the good, and the beautiful that is needed for his peace of mind.

> The Master said, "To study, and when the occasion arises to put what one has learned into practice--is this not deeply satisfying?" These famous words, with which the Analects opens, at once tell us that Confucius was a scholar, and that the aim of his scholarship was practical.
>
> Confucius was curious, asking all sorts of questions about things he considered important and not caring whether or not this got him the reputation of being ignorant. Although it cannot be claimed that he was always as careful as the most scientific standards would demand, he did advocate a critical attitude toward information. He advised a disciple to see and hear much but "suspend judgement concerning what is doubtful."[2]

---

[1]Ibid., p. 129.

[2]Ibid., p. 100.

Confucius dealt with ideas but the ideas had to stand the test of practical application, and practical application is always made in terms of what it means to him who is applying. "Thus Confucius offered that most priceless possession, peace of mind. 'If looking within his own heart, one finds no cause of self-reproach, why should he worry, what shall we fear?' He put peace of mind within the reach of every individual. . . ."[1] That is content, but what is taught is also method, for men are not apt to buy that for which they feel no need. And even so, again, specific method is more a matter of the personality of the Master.

Every teaching method rests on some assumptions, called, perhaps, requisites for learning. Confucius demanded two things of his students: an intellectual curiosity and a willingness to work. When it came to pass during the Chou dynasty that princes recognized Mast K'ung as the one to train their sons it was customary for Confucius to hold an initial interview to determine the presence or absence of these characteristics. With these traits given, all Confucius' training aimed at teaching men to think for themselves. Confucius knew the dynamic power of the self-motivated individual, and while this is not to say that he rejected any laggard from the start some design of dormant potential needed to show.

The framework of training the solitary mind then fell into place. Solitary is used here in the sense of the mind that displays the confidence and daring of standing alone having assessed what others say. No student of Confucius needed to accept his or any other man's word as a final, unquestionable authority. No book rode roughshod over individual

---

[1]Ibid., p. 130.

interpretation. Books, teachers, priests, prophets, and Confucius himself were to be weighed in the balance of each man's mind. Confucius was never afraid to be challenged, never afraid to say "I don't know." The very essence of his method was that all men were engaged in a search for truth.

The search for truth--wild, elusive, erratic thing that it is--has always suffered when confined to classrooms, codes, books, and the paths of pedants. Confucius would have none of it. There is no evidence that he wrote any books, though adoring disciples ascribe many to him. His doctrines decree that he wouldn't found a school. Truth, knowledge, is free; it soars where it will. How can it be delineated by a design, placed in a pen, beckoned by a book, alloted to an area, or manipulated by a mind? If the search leads to a book, or a man, or an experience, this is to be expected; but the sage knows that the final authority comes from within the searcher. Confucius knew of no rules regarding teaching. He gave one answer here and another there depending on his knowledge of the man and the situation. Two-thousand five hundred years ago Confucius used discussion, debate, and role-playing. He knew learning involved activity and his pupils were put through the paces of problem-solving. He was not as interested in new knowledge as in restoration, or evaluation of the old.

There was a personal magnetism about Confucius. This is said so often of Great Teachers that it bears analysis. It is important to recognize a fine-line distinction between two parallel traits. On the one hand is a respectful humility, the flexibility of a democratic

listener. This is compounded of a genial frankness, simplicity, a moral excellence, an intellectual and practical honesty. On the other is the quiet confidence of a brave and forceful character. Confucius was affable yet firm, commanding yet not austere, dignified yet pleasant, moving and noble yet not flowery and fancy. These two loci of traits combine to form a character of tremendous authority. Such a one is approachable because of his deep understanding of humans, his flexible and humble nature and yet unassailable because of his self-confidence, his individual assessment of the wisdom of the ways of men. Here is the personal magnetism, the persuasion in place of coercion, stimulation instead of punishment, the positive instead of the negative. Men who feel caught in the ebb and flow of social tides stand amazed at one who dares defy these and act as an agent of his own destiny. History records men standing thus who were cut down but they themselves never suggested that unassailability of mind was synonymous with that of body.

There is another trait that has appeared in most great teachers. Aside from the analysis of Eric Hoffer in The True Believer, Buddha, Confucius, Socrates, Jesus and others felt a keen sense of appointment. Other leaders--Napoleon, Calvin, Hitler, Mussolini, Joseph Smith, Prophet Jones--have felt a sense of appointment. Be that as it may, outstanding figures on the "crowded canvas" of time have felt a calling, and perhaps only time can decide who was really called and for what. To the Chinese, these would represent separating the warp from the woof--the Chinese ideogram for the word "classic" comes from the craft

of weaving and warp refers to the basic part of the fabric without which there would be neither cloth or weaving. There could hardly be any objection to considering the "appointment" of one whose contribution through the ages has added to the humanity of man.

Confucius was a democratic spirit long before democracies were heard of. This is seen in his insistence on self-cultivation--the individual's responsibility for self-improvement. Democracy is an informal form of government, and Confucius stressed informality as a process and in the acceptance of authority. Mention has already been made of the fact that there were no prescribed books, no classes, or set examinations. Neither was Confucius' word sacrosanct, pupils could disagree, he did not seek to impress them with his authority. He could learn from them and all he asked was sincere research and action. Pupils talked and questioned and thus he gained their confidence--the confidence resulting in enthusiasm. "The Master's manner was free and easy, and his expression alert and cheerful; (he) addressed men in a way cordial, frank, courteous, temperate and deferential."[1] "There were four qualities from which the Master was entirely free: he had no foregone conclusions, he was not over-positive, not obstinate, and never saw things from his own point of view alone."[2] He took careful measure of each pupil: he had a knowledge of human character: he put students at ease and asked them to frankly state their ambitions, and desires; then he shaped the teaching

---

[1]Maurice Collis, The First Holy One (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948), p. 23.

[2]Creel, op. cit., p. 134.

to his analysis of the individual. And what is democracy but a belief in and cultivation of the individual? Application of Confucius' methods and teachings would insure democracy.

Confucius had a sympathy for people. He was popular with the mass, even though a disturbing influence with vested interests. He chose his examples in teaching from the everyday experiences of life. He could point a lesson from the flight of a pigeon and taught men to scrutinize common things rather than the complexities of sophistry. He himself was conscious of his own defects and was not able to affect arrogance. He had no selfish motives, was not boastful, and possessed a genuine generosity. He believed emotions useful to enlarge sympathies. He considered happiness a part of life and thus was a social mixer, had fun, and was no ascetic. As a man he was cheerful, and his self-control helped him to rise above the pettiness of his personal misfortunes. He was a zealot with a sense of humor. He worked hard and made learning seem the highest of all callings.

There is another important characteristic of great teachers, present also in Confucius. He kept a youthful outlook. He believed in study and meditation but as a part of the fabric of learning this did not mean a mock seriousness. If youth is a period restless under restraint then it is easy to see where the values of Confucius have their appeal. He taught that it is useless to memorize minus meaning. He did not instruct chiefly with books. Cultivation of character came in for discussion and for all of this there was no final authority save

the dedication to learn more, to continually pursue truth, and to untie the knot of knowledge. He established a sense of basic human equality. This kind of a man never seems old, despite the body. The flash and sparkle of a quest never ended in itself is a proclamation of youth.

None of the preceding paragraphs are legend; none are fiction. They describe Confucius the man, the teacher--his method. There is no evidence to allow division of the man from his method. He had no book of techniques to follow; the method was so much the belief of the man that it is possible he taught as he did without rational inquisition on his part. Pupils loved him for many reasons, not the least of them their discovery of the ordinary, sincere, fallible, at times heart-broken man that he was. "His life had little of the dramatic. There was no climax and no martyrdom. None of his chief ambitions had been fulfilled. There is little doubt that when he died everyone considered him a failure. Certainly he himself did."[1] He was often disheartened by the long and bitter struggle against circumstances and the evidences of evil, but disgust never overcame him. In this was his greatness. Thus is the cycle of the tale told back to the humanity of the man. He was human, this Confucius, no god.

Then a recapitualation, a listing, a resumé, a summary of his characteristics that must be mentioned as method:

He never refused to teach anyone.

He emphasized solitary study.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 3.

He was loyal, faithful.

He accepted a basic human equality.

He inspired confidence; was self-confident.

He spoke as man to man.

He taught men to think for themselves.

He had a personal magnetism.

He was generous.

He demanded intelligence and hard work.

He had a simple and genial frankness.

He exhibited a brave, forceful character.

He had a practical honesty.

He had a sympathy for people; a psychological knowledge of people.

He questioned all things, was an individualist.

He felt a sense of appointment.

He concerned himself with restoration and evaluation of knowledge.

He was humble and conscious of personal defects.

He believed in a democratic principle.

He had no rules, creed, set method of lectures, books, examinations, unquestionable authorities.

He worked hard.

He kindled enthusiasm.

He offered practical training: a self-concept, peace of mind, understanding of the universe.

He used lecture, discussion, debate, roleplaying, problem-solving.

He was flexible, informal, respectful.

He was cheerful, affable, firm, commanding, dignified, humorous, moving, a good listener.

He was social; had self-control; was interested in people and their desires and needs.

He was persuasive, stimulating, positive, youthful.

He gained the confidence of others.

He did not seek to impress others with his authority.

His pupils could freely disagree.

He stressed sincerity, research, action.

He invested learning with a thrill.

He emphasized the responsibility of self-improvement; the cultivation of character.

He initiated independent thought.

He was not boastful; had no selfish motives, pride, or arrogance.

He was no pedant; he was above pettiness.

He thought it useless to memorize.

He saw no sanctity in books alone.

He had no foregone conclusions, was not over-positive, obstinate, or saw things only from his viewpoint.

He was simple, unassuming, fluent, with a certain reserve.

He was cordial, frank, courteous, temperate, and deferential.

There is no evidence that Confucius wrote any books. "Confucious was not primarily a scholar any more than he had intended primarily to be a teacher. He was a man who found the world about him full of misery and wanted to exchange it for happiness. In working for this end he

used many tools, among them books. But his interest was not in knowledge for its own sake. He explicitly deplored extensive learning that could not be turned to some practical use. . . ."[1] Teaching with him was an all-consuming passion. He was harrassed by the herd of small men and the last twenty years of his life made it difficult to control cyncism. He traveled the Provinces of China, offering his services and getting no bids. He died melancholy and felt that he had accomplished little.

In the minds of men he is given the epitath of: The Uncrowned King. "The prominent causes of the influence of Confucius were, first, (the sayings attributed to him) which became the standard of religious, moral, and political wisdom; second, he organized the literati into a host of well-disciplined minds; third, the power he exercised over his personal disciples; and lastly, their enthusiastic admiration. There can be no doubt that he exerted a greater influence on the destinies of the empire than he could have done had he been seated on the Imperial throne."[2]

There he goes, bent, withered, uncommemorated at the time of his death. "The course of my doctrines is run," he said. "The strong beam must break; and the wise man wither away like a plant."[3] But sing of the phoenix bird; apply the salve of time to the wound of the immediate. Centuries have swelled the chorus of Confucius and paens of praise have placed him in a central location in the hierarchy of intellect. He was just a teacher, a sympathetic one. He was human.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 107.

[2]DuBose, op. cit., p. 97.

[3]Alfred Koehn, Confucius (Peking, China: At the Lotus Court, 1944), p. 39.

SOCRATES

Sing a song of Socrates. Call the roll of Great Teachers and summon Socrates. For he is there. There is no list of great teachers leaving him out. He was and is: as vital, frank, probing and searching now as then. There is still a method called the Socratic method. The drama of the cup of hemlock is recalled each year. New democracies turn to his ancient teachings which undergirded the democracy of his beloved Athens and find them fresh and prism-clear today. History is littered with the corpses of those who disturbed the dogmas of thought in high places, and thus, too, was the commemoration of Socrates. And his crime? It still stands in the worn writing of yesterday: he taught.

He who pledged himself to the power of ideas was destroyed by an idea. He who insisted on the sanctity of men being allowed to draw their own conclusions had the book of his life concluded by those who saw their own ends in their own way. Socrates, who insisted on justice for all men, was weighed and found wanting in the balance of five hundred men who judged. The judgment? Go to the scrolls of the law and there read: he taught.

It was said of him that he taught the sons of men to turn against their fathers. It was entered in the books that he encouraged thoughts which could not be tolerated by the State. It was stated that his unique teachings undermined the old order. The judgment was that justice

meant nothing to him and every man was encouraged to validate his own views. In a tottering state he was termed a menace to the measure of rottenness that remained. His rottenness? He taught; he went about the marketplace upsetting the equilibrium of society.

In this thesis too much design devoted to chronology and geographical location would be to detract from the meaning of the man whose spirit soared beyond boundaries of any kind. It was his destiny to be born in the city-state of Athens, and his star rose and hovered as did that of Pericles--ruler over the Golden Age of Athens. The measure of time gives some aid to understanding but the stellar attraction is how Socrates taught. The study of the rise, stability, and decay of Athens is stimulating; but central to pedagogy is how Socrates taught. Even the sentiment of society--a decided factor in the greatness of Socrates--is but harmony to the theme of how Socrates taught. What unique historical alternatives did he toy with that attested to his greatness?

Not only has Socrates lived on in the minds of men. His pupils immediately set about erecting an intellectual monument to his memory. Plato codified his thoughts into an impressive philosophy--and thereby insured some loss of the spirit of the Master. Aristotle went on and in some circles snatches more glory than the simple teacher who never wrote or talked in riddles. Thus it is possible to try to understand Socrates by giving heed to the distinguished pupils. But as with St. Paul, the heirs of Confucius, and the sincere priests of Buddha, intense and loyal fervor of the disciples reaches beyond the simplicity

and humanity of the Master and loses something in the process. Socrates--like Buddha, Confucius, and Jesus--left no written words. This simple statement is in itself a clue to these sages. Written words represented an external authority to them--and they recognized no such external authority. Men of their stature have always suffered somewhat at the hands of the sincere and honest followers who sought to preserve the breath of the Master. But as no man shares completely the vision of another neither do the disciples and followers of a Socrates encase the roots of his meaning in original soil. The dream of the man is never seen in all its aspects by another dreamer, who peoples his world with the shapes and figures of his own Republic. The best that can be done in the present period is to weigh the praise of those who followed, the words of those who write the story of Socrates with as much immediacy as possible, mull over the quotations that creative legend bequeaths him and then give as much body to the spector that arises as possible and try to answer the one question: how he taught. In this study an attempt will be made to do so without excessive recourse to authority--aside from time and place descriptions--so that the influence of Socrates may flow unimpeded today as it pulses through the thoughts of one person seeking an answer to the question of how he taught.

Socrates was put to death in Athens in 399 B. C. This is not the first time in recorded history when there has been a conflict between democracy and communism. Socrates lived during the long conflict between Sparta and Athens. Sparta was a communistic society and Athens attempted to form a democratic government. Sparta left no legacy beyond

a story about a boy who had his insides eaten out by a fox, while Athens left an heritage of creative products in all areas of human achievement that has seldom if ever been paralleled. These facts make the imperfections of Athens forgotten items until inquiry delves into the death of its leading citizen.

The majority of the people that lived in Athens were slaves, and at one time Athens held an empire. Neither of these concepts are democratic. The courts of Athens were paid juries and were too huge to make more than a mockery of much of justice. Men on trial were expected to try to sway the juries and the more hretoric and emotion the better. Record has it that Socrates could have saved himself if he had resorted to these devices, but his "elementary" sense of justice would not permit it.

The trial of Socrates turned out to be one of these huge entertainment affairs. He was a homely man of the marketplace who loved to talk, argue, ask questions and engage in critical appraisal of common topics. He had the ear of many of the young men of his day and it turned out that some of them were responsible for his death.

As a young man, Socrates was apprenticed as a stone-cutter, but he could soon be found in the marketplace talking with the other youth of his age. He did not stumble on his mission in life full-blown and had to go through a period of intense introspection before he decided what it was he would do. The story with the most interest on this point is that on one of the military campaigns in which he took part Socrates stood barefooted in the snow for a day and a night staring into space.

His friends feared that something had happened but he regained his usual state of behavior, the only change being that he seemed to have decided once and for all that his mission in life was to teach. He approached this teaching with such a passion that he never satisfactorily supported his wife and two sons and criticized people of all positions so soundly that he never wanted for enemies. But Pericles, ruler of Athens walked with him on occasion and asked advice, and criticism from Socrates came as an offering of love for his city of Athens.

Athens. The song of Socrates must contain as a counter theme something of Athens. Athens was a city-state, and in the interests of simplicity, it rose from obscurity to power which became putrid with a smell of decay which is almost indescribable. Athens represented the most noble form of government and heady civilization known to man. It had been virtuous and strong with the pulse of youth and importance under Aristedes, the Just. It had flung the mantle of its empire wide under Themistocles, the trader. Everywhere Athens was known for the freedom and high standard of living it made possible for its citizens. This splendid organization of men--a new combine of ruling and working interests on the face of the earth--became careless and luxury-loving under Cimon. And then--rumbling and rumor of doom--even the caricature of a Golden Age of Pericles could not dispell the corruption and conceit of the corpse of the Athens that was.

Men had worked and built but Socrates saw the rise of the sophists: men who fed on the confusion of barbers and battle commanders in ceaseless and aimless verbal duels. Justice had been bled for by defeating

Sparta but at home it became a show to be held in an arena. Democracy had been demonstrated as a government by serious people but in Socrates' day it became the word of a drunken boy who rouged his cheeks and sought the love of an aging millionaire whose purse helped build the Parthenon of Pericles. It is enough to say that the tangled web of the times was such that an amoral Pericles trusted by almost no one could appeal to heroic but ignorant peasants to vote on a useless war with Sparta that none believed in and that Pericles had already decided on. Socrates' later life was a time when men, perplexed by the forces that propelled them, followed blindly where there were no leaders and complained in confusion of powers that didn't exist. Men who thought their voices sounded in the clamor of self-rule were themselves ruled by complex codes that seemed to sway with the tones and harmonies of oratory in public places. Sincere men thought they were true to a principle when the principle itself was a tool of tyrants. And no one cared. That is the key to the Athens of Socrates' day. No one cared. A large segment of the citizens was so rich, so well-fed, so secure in the ability of Pericles to again lead a victorious fleet to buy off the enemy that the mad dance whirled faster and faster until Athens lay spitted by Sparta. And, as a moth, sensing danger flies faster and more frantically around a flame until the idiocy of its motions glues it to the very thing that destroys it: so the dying Athens begat strange gyrations in an attempt to convince itself that it was doing something constructive about the destruction that began with its own looseness of the bowels.

But one cared. Of obscure origin, son of Sophroniscus, the sculptor who died with chisel in hand carving stone for the glory of the Acropolis, Socrates came strolling--barefoot, unkept--into the marketplace. Unwieldy, great protruding eyes but with an irresistible twinkle, Socrates questioned the Athens he loved more than any of its bemedalled heroes who in time killed him because that pristine love disturbed the muddy waters of their false loves.

It is not the purpose here to write a history of the times and tides of Athens, of the world's first democracy, or of the wars or contributions of Hellas. Rather, what sort of a man was this Socrates? Why has his name become synonymous with some of the greatest teaching the world has known? He wrote nothing; there is no record of his exact words; only his spirit lives. And yet men follow one another in generations and proclaim his greatness as a teacher.

His obscurity lends brevity to the tale of his teaching. He was to be a stonecutter but wandered into the Lyceum and impressed people as being odd with his continual questions. He was not sure what he wanted until a combination of things inflamed him with a purpose that became a passion. He noticed the little game of the sophists--paid, clever men who only exposed ignorance by tricks but pointed no solutions. He looked for knowledge and found ignorance; he asked for definitions and got instances. People moved in mental ruts and were unreflective. He saw systems of thought developed for the sake of the system rather than the searching out of truth. Above all, he was disturbed by the growing stench of Athens. It took him many years to harmonize all the chords of his

being into the symphony that eventually thundered the theme to which he devoted his life.

Once sure of a calling, Socrates never relented, and minutes before his death he discussed with his disciples the meaning of that death. He had a physique that became a legend of endurance during military campaigns. He was for a time a social lion and could drink and play but never lost sight of his only love in life: teaching men to consider everything they did and ask why. He darted his questions at Pericles and the sons of the rich and noble who came to him, which in time insured his death. He taught anyone who came to him and never charged anyone a fee, which drove a wedge between him and Xantippe, his wife. He believed firmly in principles and he died by them when the very corrupt jury that condemned him hoped he would bribe or beg his way free. And yet the thing that makes an understanding of him so difficult is his utter simplicity.

Suffice it to say that he has not been contained by any who have written about him--Plato notwithstanding. The fact that he wrote no words and founded no schools helps unlock an understanding of him. Plato began by writing about the Master, but the more he devised and described a system the farther he strayed until the teaching of the Master is not contained in the codes of any Republic. Socrates knew of only one system: the system of continually probing for first causes until the bare bones of truth stand naked and revealed. He taught that each man must search and discover for himself, and the Republic of Plato ruled by philosopher-kings who become entrenched by questionable means was not representative

of this utter freedom from coercion of any manner. His disregard of convention resulted from a conscious refusal to accept codes that were based on convention alone. His belief that he was in a better position than most to know was because of a consciousness of his knowing nothing. He did not claim to impart knowledge, but only to lay open the mind to seeking. He thought anyone wanting to know the how and what of life could learn these soon from the appropriate specialist; he was interested in the why of life and the broad principles on which it rests. In this, he was again, like the other great teachers, intensely practical: he knew the how and what never satisfy men unless they can grasp the why. This is all there was to his teaching: its bare-wall simplicity. And anyone who trys to devise a system out of it deviates that much from the teaching of Socrates as his attempt succeeds. Socrates would have none of it. Fervent disciples, while sincerely recording him in history and giving all they can of the man, cannot give the man, as his spirit cannot be contained.

It was said of Socrates that one could not be in the same room with him and he unaware of his presence. The sheer force of his personality announced him. But the announcement carried no threat with it. Socrates' criticism was never directed at anyone in a superior manner. He was gregarious, convivial, loquacious, hearty and had a sense of humor. He radiated self-confidence and sympathy. He was gay, happy, and genial. He had a vitality and dynamic enthusiasm that spoke of an interest in life. He had the magnetism of a mystic; he was a prophet in the old sense of the word: not a fortune-teller but a seer. He was mystical

in that he did not feel that all knowledge is apprehended by the senses. His courage had been established and he was frank and friendly with people. He never considered himself a disseminator of information and he himself was always willing to learn. While he was humble he was skeptical, and while he was critical he was virtuous. He had a great power of concentration and a genuine liking for people. He did not deal with abstractions such as society, or humanity, but with the individual. His thinking began and ended with man. He didn't teach about life; teaching was implicit in life. He is supposed to have said, "The substance of my teaching is human affairs." His teaching was conditioned by utility. He knew there is a need for specialized knowledge but saw his role as one dealing with the basic knowledge that transcends time and place.

What more is there to sing of the song of Socrates? Is it not that a pattern is already being plotted in pursuing the greatness of a Buddha, a Confucius, and a Socrates? The same things must fall in line based on the above description of the personality of the man. But value lies in the mapping of the method if it truly establishes a base underlying great teaching.

Socrates was dedicated to his task. His dedication resulted in his often running counter to societal and family norms but his vision was not shared by those more in tune with the times. His intense dedication shows to what degree a man's confidence can be built on a certain awareness of some say in one's destiny, which is the only true foundation for fearlessness.

He emphasized critical thinking and this was a way of life. This meant the student didn't have to agree with the teacher, and every source of authority or information should be questioned. He set the example for this himself, and he looked at teaching as essentially learning with others. He knew of no fixed system and he stressed the sanctity of the individual in the search for knowledge. This made his views seem highly original. When men are wont to deal in cliches, asking new questions about old things seems eccentric and like a new approach. This feeds on an ability to be non-conventional, and the person accepting the creeds and cliches of whatever brand of conformity is in power cannot share this view of teaching.

Thus Socrates led an intense intellectual life. In his continual search for knowledge he urged pupils to form their own ideas. He encouraged freedom of ideas and opposed ritualism of any sort. His honesty of thought held little respect for formality and by refusing to accept creeds and dogmas he removed the errors often contained in tradition. He did not believe there was much meaning in convention imposed by mass acceptance of the ready-made truths of popular phrases. He examined all sides and did not force the superficiality of preferences on others. He was fearless of authority, opposed the rule of a privileged few, and exposed ignorance wherever he found it.

Socrates went out to the people in the marketplace. This is an interesting thing. Buddha was not afraid to be seen in conversation with the lowest caste; Confucius was loved for his personal contact with the peasants; Socrates padded about the marketplace, and later Jesus

disappointed John the Baptist with his social contacts with raucous rogues. Socrates was attentive to human nature. He taught all classes of people and had a compassion for social outcasts. He understood people and this formed the core around which he shaped his teaching. The fact that he knew all along that the eloquent richer classes could not be trusted behind their honeyed words did not deter him, nor them from disposing of him.

The simplicity of Socrates has already been mentioned: it applies also to his teaching. He got beyond the complex to understand first things. He probed until he broke each lesson down into its simplest units. He used common illustrations based on topics of common appeal. His words were in the form of short, pithy sayings: when Glaucon asked for a political philosophy to improve the state, he said, "When you are better the state will be better." He was simple and vital in his human relations. He began his teaching at the level of his pupils and geared it to the development of those pupils. He began talking with stonecutters about stone cutting and later had them discussing affairs of state.

Socrates is most famous for his question and answer teaching, and the method is still called the Socratic today. This was more than the clever questioning of the sophists as Socrates used his questions sincerely to stimulate insight, to force the student to examine closely. He encouraged the student to ask questions.

Socrates' teaching was another example of what is actually the most practical kind of teaching. He used experiments and kept away from sweeping generalities. He insisted that knowledge must have an aim,

and aside from the modern stereotypes regarding philosophy he knew that the content and result of his teaching was the most practical and basic because it dealt with fundamentals. This is a difficult idea to express as it is obscured by semantic difficulties. What it says is that training is most practical that frees man from the trivia of that which is often considered practical because it deals with content that is concrete. Thoughtful men know that to deal with things of the human spirit that seem beyond control is to lay a foundation for the most practical grasp of life. To do otherwise is to be caught up in the technology of life which only creates problems but cannot control them.

Socrates was patient and a good listener. He knew his own limits and did not think himself omnipotent. He never considered himself an expert at telling others. When he did have something to say he knew how to make use of his voice, the right gesture, and effective pause.

But in his probing, his uniqueness, and his disdain of convention and creed lay the seeds of his destruction. It is human that people seem not to like a gadfly--and Socrates called himself the gadfly of Athens. Parents said he corrupted their youth; rulers rebelled against his unmasking of sham; even disciples turned in anger because they could never see an end ot his probing for perfection. There never seemed to be any answers, only questions. The society that had once accepted him turned on him when discomfort at unveiling made people aware of the makedness of their lust for pleasure at whatever cost. This is not the way to be popular, and as he was alone though amongst people all his life

he was executed as almost the lone survivor of a belief in principles his beloved Athens had once proclaimed to the world.

Socrates' death immortalized the principles Athens had forgotten. He knew the charges against him were false and represented the gyrations of a society that had died before him in its attempt to convince someone that there was breath in the corpse. Every move during the trial of Socrates attested to his purity and dignity and the decadence of Athens. The jury of the five hundred were angered because Socrates would not plead and put on an emotional show. The execution of his sentence was postponed and it was expected--even by his pupils--that he would bribe his way free. But to him a pronouncement of justice was a justice of principle, not a matter of whim regardless of dishonorable sources. His prophecy has become truth: Athens is the more dishonored and the name of Socrates grows with each generation though the cup of hemlock silenced the song of Socrates.

In keeping with the other portraits of great teachers drawn thus far, a brief recapitulation:

He was highly original in his approach and views.

He did not fear the non-conventional.

He emphasized clear thinking.

He asked new questions about old, familiar things.

He stimulated critical thinking.

A student need not agree with him; disagreement did not threaten him, or represent an attack on him.

He led an intense intellectual life.

He stressed the continual search for knowledge.

He encouraged pupils to form new ideas.

He used questions to stimulate, to force insight.

He welcomed student's questions.

He went out and associated with people where they were.

He understood people and shaped his teaching around this understanding.

He was genuinely interested in people and attentive to human nature.

He taught everyone with whom he came in contact; he had a compassion for social outcasts.

He set an example and looked at teaching as a process of learning with others.

He was dedicated to the task of teaching.

He stressed the freedom of ideas and honesty of thought; he opposed ritualism and did not respect authority for its own sake; he subscribed to no creeds, systems, or dogmas.

He tried to remove the entrenched errors of tradition; he did not believe in the convention of the mass, popular phrases, or ready-made truths.

He unmasked superficiality, was fearless of authority, opposed rule by a privileged few, and exposed ignorance wherever it occurred.

He examined all sides of a question, not only his personal preferences.

He did not force his convictions on others.

He began his teaching at the level of his pupils and kept its pace with their rate of development.

He is characterized by simplicity; he broke his lessons into their simplest parts, used simple, pithy language, common illustrations and topics of common appeal.

He was simple and vital in his human relations.

He dug behind the complex to fundamental things.

He stressed the practical aims of knowledge.

He was patient and a good listener.

He used his voice, poise, and gesture effectively.

He knew his limits and did not consider himself an expert at telling others.

He was courageous, virtuous, self-confident, sympathetic, happy, and genial.

He had a great power of concentration, endurance, self-control, and humility.

He was critical, skeptical, frank, but willing to learn.

He was dynamic, enthusiastic, magnetic and had the temperament of the mystic, the visionary.

He had vitality and an interest in life.

He knew all knowledge is not apprehended by the senses; he did not regard himself as a storehouse of information.

He was loquacious, convivial, gregarious, hearty, and had a sense of humor.

There was a sheer force to his personality.

In Socrates' final speech before a jury that had already voted him guilty he said if he were released the world would take little note of either that day or of Socrates; but if they took his life martyrdom would help make him immortal. Then, when Xantippe was to end her last visit to him in jail, she said, "I shall live in our old house; I can remember you there. Will you be there with me, Socrates?"

"I do not know where I'll be. Perhaps nowhere."

"But if in spirit you could be with me--."

"My spirit you and any others can have who want it."

JESUS

"Who do men say the Son of Man is?"

But they said, "Some men say John the Baptist; and others, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets."

He said to them, "But who do you say that I am?"

The question has never been answered in a way acceptable to all people. In his own time, the twelve pupils that lived with Jesus did not all give the same answer. But Jesus said, "He that hath ears let him hear; nothing is hidden that will be made manifest."

Then who was Jesus? A common name in his day; but this particular one--who? There are some clues. It is said of him that men despised and rejected him. What does this tell? That he was not liked. By whom was he despised? Not the mass; they held an impromptu parade a week before he was killed. A small, select group of "whited sepulchers"--as he called them--who had vested interests at stake. They said, "He is stirring up the people, teaching."

Then who were his friends? It is said a man is known by the company he keeps. His friends included a thief, an adulterer, a murderer, a drunkard, a gambler. His father, a carpenter. His country, ruled by Rome. His town, Nazereth: out of which "nothing good could come." His honor students: rather dull fishermen, jealous, tempermental, liars, cowardly, dishonest. His social movements caused others to say, "He is a winebibber and a gluttenous man."

Who did Jesus say he was? The son of God. Simple, direct, naive: calling himself the Son of Man but talking most often of "the Father that sent me." He said he didn't work to rule an ant-hill for a day. He talked as though he encircled the earth. He said, "My kingdom is not of this world." Yet he was executed on the Hill of the Skull.

What did others say? "Rabbi, we know that thou hast come a teacher." There is the heart of the matter. Good or bad, acceptable or not, divine or human, fact or legend--this Jesus lived and continues to teach new tens of thousands in each succeeding generation. More words are written about him than about anyone else. More good and evil has been occasioned by his name than by that of anyone else. And he never wrote a word that has been passed on.

To reveal him in writing is not to recount the acts and background of his life. Neither is it to note his achievements or their spacing in time. No gathering in of facts or exposition of experiences can explain the reality of Jesus. It has always been a matter of one's breath and blood knowing what the brain may not be able to accept. Any explanation is rooted in the individual's answer to the question of who he was.

What is the knowledge about him? There is none except that which men choose to build in their hearts. The human spirit resides in the vessel of time, and while the spirit of Jesus shines in each new age there is no new knowledge added because there was none to begin with. Belief is a matter of conviction, not fact; and conclusions about Jesus

are undemonstrable. Still, these conclusions have proven to be the most durable and men have died and continue to die for their right to believe them. Despite the points that may be inferred from all this, it attests to great teaching: teaching of great influence.

Most men who write about Jesus stray into the world of legend. This is unavoidable as all that can be said of him is how one feels about him. Even those words claimed to be his in the Bible were written by men years after the death of Jesus. It is a matter for theology to continue the controversy over the inspiration of the Bible and the divinity of Jesus. It was said to the author of this study that the greatness of the teaching of Jesus can only be explained by his divinity. This author subscribes to this belief but the point here is to learn how to become a great teacher short of assuming divinity which is not in the realm of the humanly possible. Thus every word written on the greatness of the teaching of Jesus must be based on those words from the Bible ascribed to him and the interpretation of those words. Thus any man may go to the Bible, study the sentences and situations presented in the four gospels of the New Testament and come away with his own impression of the potency of the teaching of Jesus. Thus is the circle complete back to the first question, "Who do men say that I am?"

To this investigator, the essence of the teaching of Jesus is one of wide-eyed wonder and awe at its simplicity. The pupil is almost caught off balance by the power of teaching in the form of direct statement rather than the sophistry of subtle and suggestive sayings. An attempt will be made to write about the teaching of Jesus in that same

direct way. The main emphasis will be on the specific words of the Scriptures with some aid from the findings of the impressions of other scholars.

The facts of the life of Jesus are meager. He was born in Bethlehem of Judaea in the days of Herod the king. His father Joseph and his mother Mary went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth to be taxes, at the decree of Caesar Augustus, the Roman ruler. And so it was, that, while they were there, the days were accomplished that (Mary) should be delivered. And she brought forth her first-born son, and wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in the manger, because there was no room for them in the inn. And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom. And when he was twelve years old, (the family) went up to Jerusalem. And when they had fulfilled the days, they returned, but the child was not with them. And when they found him not, they turned back to Jerusalem, seeking him. And it came to pass that they found him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions. And all that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers. There was a period of solitude and wandering. He departed into Galilee; and, leaving Nazareth, he came and swelt in Capernaum, which is upon the seacoast, in the borders of Zabulan and Nephthalim. From that time Jesus began to preach. After a number of years of teaching, pressure groups convinced Pilate that Jesus should be crucified, and on the Hill of the Skull, outside Jerusalem, hanging on a cross of wood between two thieves, he said, "It is finished." Three days later, Mary Magdalene and the other

Mary met Jesus who said, "All hail. Go tell my brethern to meet me in Galilee." The eleven disciples went into Galilee and Jesus said, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

So much for the outline of the story coming from the nearest thing to a source one can get in studying Jesus. Jesus lived under Roman rule. There was a Roman governor over Judah and Herod, a Jew, helped expedite things. The wealth of a few bred lust and corruption at the expense of the many. The Jews sought to preserve their identity by fanatic exposition and adherence to the teachings of the Torah, as handled by the Pharisees. There were many prophets, ascetics, Messiahs: Nazarenes were desert wanderers who ate locusts and permitted their hair to grow. Each supposed seer had his group of devotees. The Pharisees, a proud and vain group, taught the upper social classes known as the Saduccees. A common form of teaching was the use of the parable: a story illustrating a point. The times were confused, chaotic, depressing, and characterized by a hierarchy of authority. One could not approach his respective god unless he bought a sacrificial dove from the fat priests who sold them in the courtyard of the temple. Initiative and hope were non-existent as both foreigner and Pharisee ruled on the flick of every man's wrist.

Onto this stage strode a teacher who said, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life." In the short life of this teacher was the force that turned the world upside down and echoes even today, with no loss of power. His influence--in ever-widening circles from that day his parents were astonished in the temple--cut into that of the entrenched teachers of

his day: the Pharisees; crossed borders to reach the corners of the then-known world; leaped the boundaries of time throughout each century and provokes men to thought in this, the year of Our Lord. The content of his teaching is best summarized in a lecture of his usually called the Sermon on the Mount. But the best single statement of what he taught is, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Light."

The method of the teaching of Jesus is as difficult to describe as in the case of the other Great Teachers presented thus far. Out of the welter of material on the method of his teaching--in an attempt not to add words to those which have already been well said--it is basic to say that here especially is method defined by what Jesus taught, how he presented this, and his personality.

> "Rabbi," said Nicodemus to Jesus, "We know that Thou art a teacher." If Jesus was a teacher extraordinary, as has been said so many times, what were the essentials of His teaching genius?
>
> He was not interested in giving His hearers new information. He was interested in giving them a new way of looking at all information, old and new.
>
> He was not interested in having his hearers absorb a mass of standardized information, but in having them think about the pressing problems of their own lives.
>
> He was not interested in increasing their knowledge. He was interested in increasing their understanding. He was not concerned to have them practice in remembering. He wanted them to practice thinking.[1]

Basic to the teaching of Jesus is the fact that he raised the practical to the level of the universal. This is the essence of the

---

[1]Harl Douglass, Teaching in High School (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1948), p. 18.

idea of "spiritual" teaching; not the contemporary mis-notion that spiritual is somehow synonymous with religious, but spiritual in the sense that the teaching of Jesus leaped the boundaries of time, place, specific situation, and the individual. The teaching of Jesus grouped men in appealing to their common humanity. This was done by considering two basic questions with each pupil: who am I? (the pupil). And what is my relationship to the cosmos, to time, and to God? (God may then, as now, have been identified as any feeling of force outside of things known. Jesus adopted a viewpoint on this and identified God as the Father, his Father.)

These questions are deceptively simple, but consciously aware of them or not, each man concerns himself with them throughout his lifetime. To neglect coming to grips with them is to remove the purpose from all other considerations. Tenets of technology and principles of practice solve problems of industrial production and a man must know a "trade," must be aware of some facts, but the process never satisfies man's craving to know why he is here and what he must do. Modern day proof of this lies in the fact that the world's most opulent society is it's most unhappy one. Apparently pursuit of things does not suckle the soul satisfactorily.

Jesus, as other great teachers, knew there was a place and a time for learning specific things. He himself mastered Jewish law before he taught a revision of it. A man must learn skills, but contrary to popular thought, these are the icing that each individual man pursues in compliance with his interests. They are acquired in a number of ways,

usually best right on location, but they are built on the basic knowledge that all men must first gain in order to be men. It is significant that the great teachers sharing the plaudits of the world all dealt with these universal aspects of man. This is not to say that it is not possible for greatness to be bestowed on a man teaching a chemical formula to another, but the greatness will be in direct proportion to how well knowledge of the formula is related to the basic considerations of universality. This matter of the Gestalt of knowledge is truly the most practical teaching that exists.

Jesus spoke with authority on these matters. A good portion of his authority resulted simply because he adopted a viewpoint. Others were concerned with swaying opinions from one side to another as they interpreted the jot and tittle of the law. Speaking in elementary perspective, there was not too much for the Jews to do in Jesus' day. They couldn't become concerned with ruling themselves, establishing their economy, planning their future, or even living their own lives. Rome had taken over these functions for them. So the Jewish people became introspective and busied themselves with themselves. Being relieved of administrative duties they were free to deal with these basic matters of what they were and why. There is undoubtedly a correlation between this and the number of wandering ascetics, each with his small band of followers. The traditional guardians of this knowledge--the Pharisees--continually refined their thinking until in Jesus' day it had all become too cumbersome and unwieldly for many to handle.

Along came Jesus and said, "Ye have heard it said of old . . .; but I say to you. . . ." He did not assume the arrogance of substituting his opinion in the place of another. He studied the law, confounded the lawgivers when he asked them to think rather than to accept the ruts of routine, and often said, "It is written . . .; but thus saith the Lord. . . ." People listening to him were astonished and even the Pharisees said, "No man ever taught with this authority." The essence of this as a teaching method is simple and available to anyone: he studied intensely the existing state of knowledge, projected his thinking and formulated new ideas, realized he had something to say and said it boldly. In his relationships with men he was humble--he washed his pupil's feet--but in his teaching he almost sounds arrogant in the degree of his authority. The process that has been described here not only underlies great teaching but also progress. And it is natural that authority ride on the new ideas projected from a thorough knowledge of what is extant. This analysis of Jesus' teaching method deals with the mundane as distinguished from the theological consideration that his authority was rooted in his divinity. The focus in this thesis must be on processes that are available to all as divinity cannot be adopted at will.

This author has taken the trouble to underline all those words in the four gospels ascribed to Jesus. It is interesting to note that all of the teaching of Jesus that the authors of the gospels chose to record deals with: helping men build a self-concept in terms of accepting Jesus for who he said he was ("I am the vine; ye are the branches.")

and what their relationship to the universe was in terms of how to get along in it (Sermon on the Mount). When discussing the first question Jesus used the bold pronouncements of authority previously mentioned. When discussing matters of conduct Jesus most often used a common form of teaching of which he was a master: parables.

(Mention should be made here of a fundamental fact. Some people are so sensitive about the question of Jesus' identity that they lose sight of the process discussed here. Regardless of what he taught--considered something akin to fanatic misinformation by some--it has already been stated it is a matter of record that he was a remarkable teacher. The inquiry here is into the process, and despite a lack of agreement over the authority implied in teaching "I am the Son of my Father, who is God," the point here is in the value of the matter of speaking positively and presenting pupils with <u>an</u> answer to basic questions as teaching method.)

The first prominent note in Jesus' teaching then is his assumption of authority. The second is his use of parables. Before this is lightly dismissed as something everyone knows but evidently ignores because so few use it the implications should be noted. The use of a parable in teaching bases that teaching firmly on sound psychology. All people, including pupils, love a story--and a parable is a story. Secondly, a good story deals with the common everyday experiences of the lives of people. Thus a parable places the lesson on the level of the pupils--not necessarily "down" to them, but helping make an abstraction concrete.

When Jesus talked about fishing, farming, and sheep he was building his teaching around the everyday experiences of his hearers. Thirdly, a parable may indirectly use visual aids. When Jesus sat with his pupils in the middle of a grain field and talked about the surrounding scene he had the visual essence of a laboratory close at hand. He illustrated a great lesson with the very fishes the disciples pulled into their boats. In his teaching with parables great truths were not obscured by a smoke screen of double talk too often thrown up in poor teaching to awe a pupil if not to convince him that a lesson is somewhere about but not apparent.

Another method of teaching Jesus used, too often lost sight of, is that of example. At the risk of oversimplification, it goes like this: when Jesus taught the value of sincerity he was sincere. When he taught men to be of service to men he was in the marketplace. He was patient in extolling patience. He had faith in people when he taught men to love one another. He shared his vision when he talked of vision. He was active in teaching the value of activity. And so on.

There are books enough to fill a library on methods of teaching used by Jesus. All of them are based on what some solitary person felt as he scanned the words ascribed to Jesus. The best way for the student of teaching method to share in this knowledge is for he himself to scan these words. A critical look at the talk of Jesus reveals that even his choice of language was a method. Basic to all good teaching is the necessity of initially attracting the attention of a student, holding

it, and inciting him to action. When he said, "Come with me," he had their understanding; when he went on to say, "I will make you fishers of men," he had their curiosity. Extreme speech is not necessarily a measure of arrogance but a matter of focus. If a man has a message, to give it to others is to direct the focus from them to him and his message. This can be done in a number of ways: tricks, giveaways, movement, force, shock, degree of noise, or the speech used.

> The words of Jesus have the rugged fiber of the cypress tree and the jagged edge of the crosscut saw. Nothing but an excessive familiarity with his words or an insulated ignorance can keep us from perceiving this element. His language is extreme--extravagant. Hyperbole, anththesis, and paradox mark his style. His figures of speech are crammed with energy. Explosive as hand grenades, they are tossed into the crowds that listen. A tremendous vigor, an exuberant vitality, surges through his words.
>
> In Jesus' words a man with a log in his eye tries to pick a cinder out of his brother's eye. In his words a man who has been forgiven a debt of ten million dollars refuses to forgive a debt of twenty dollars. In the words of Jesus a giant hand hangs a millstone around the neck of one who exploits a little child, and hurls the sinner into the midst of the sea. If you visualize that scene, you can catch the truly extreme quality of his utterance. What giant hand would seize the millstone, hang it around the neck of the offender, and jurl both out into the midst of the ocean?
>
> In the words of Jesus one asks for bread and is given a stone; he asks for fish and is given a snake. In the words of Jesus men strain out the little gnats and gulp down the camels.
>
> In his words, a camel crawls through a needle's eye. A mountain gathers its limbs under it, summons up all its strength, and leaps into the sea. The corpses bury one another. The man who would save his life must lose it. The first is last, and the last first.

> If your right eye is between you and the Kingdom, tear it out and throw it away; if your right hand would keep you from the Kingdom, cut it off.[1]

The above quotation leads into a series of impressions about the teaching of Jesus:

The teaching of Jesus was unsystemativ. He met no regular classes, gave no lectures, had no logical divisions of his thought. Someone asked a question and he answered it. He walked through a field of grain and taught a lesson. He met a woman at a well and discussed things of the utmost importance to her. The celebrated Sermon on the Mount is an editorialized compilation of Jesus' talk over a period of time; at least punctuated by long silences during which men could <u>think</u> about what he said. He did not list eight objectives of a daily lesson plan. The human mind can really <u>learn</u> but one potent idea at a time.

The teaching of Jesus was incidental. It was incidental to the everyday business of living. There was no formal exposition of the law which meant little or nothing to people troubled with harlotry or taxes. His teaching was not confined to a time or a place. It was life: in the temple, on the shore, in a boat, while visiting friends, or sitting on a hillside.

His teaching was concrete. It was concrete in the problems with which it dealt and concrete in the references it used. He referred to a lamp, salt, a basket, grapes, thorns, thistles, figs, children, mustard seed, weeds, yeast, fish net, money, dogs, a vineyard, tombs,

---

[1] E. C. Colwell, <u>An Approach to the Teaching of Jesus</u> (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1947), pp. 11-12, 14, 20-21.

chickens, bridesmaids, robbers, water, coins, foxholes, lambs, bread, snakes, and barns. No definition of terms is needed. Pointing would do. He used popular rather than academic language, although he could confound the experts.

His teaching is narrative. The best short story in the world is that of the Prodigal Son. Others are of The Good Samaritan, The Talents, The Woman at the Well, and the man who sent his representatives to oversee his business in a far country.

His teaching is original. It is original in the same way the teaching of Socrates, Confucius, and Buddha was original. It takes a new look at old knowledge. When in the bustle and ado of daily life men rush on to new things before they have understood the old, Jesus establishes the fundamental. And when men have accepted the rut of routine blindly for too long, the teaching of Jesus stimulates thinking.

His teaching is one of humility. The spirit of his teaching is not rooted in who he was (honest scholars will admit we don't <u>know</u> beyond a personal belief) but in who God is and what God's will is. He taught often about humility: the story of the two different men praying in the temple; the correct way to give alms; in rebuking his follower's ambition; when washing the feet of his disciples.

His teaching has a compassion for people. He wept over Lazurus, refused to judge the harlot, associated with Samaritans, publicans, sinners, thieves, taxgatherers, fishermen, idiots, foreigners, sick people, farmers, and outcasts.

His teaching stresses activity and in so doing gives a purpose to life. He taught that thinking results in doing. The disciples were to go to the whole world and act on their knowledge. He himself acted until the authorities drove nails through him into the wood on which he hung.

Now it is a true thing that others, being well-meaning, may affect these same postures and yet fail in their teaching. Final reckoning is complete only by attending to the most important aspect of the teaching of Jesus: the personality of Jesus. It comes down to the present only as an awareness one feels in reading the words ascribed to Jesus and descriptions of his deeds as reported by those who knew him.

There are words to help describe him but they do not contain him. He was dynamic. There was a force and a vitality about him that amounted to magnetism. Kahlil Gibran, writing in a legendary vain, has Mary Magdelene say, "It was in the month of June when I saw Him for the first time . . . Men do not pace the earth in that manner . . . And I gazed at Him, and my sould quivered within me, . . . And He looked at me, and His night-eyes saw me as no man had seen me . . . And the voice of the sea was in (His) words, and the voice of the wind and the trees. And when he said (those words) unto me, life spoke to death . . . And He said, 'All men love you for themselves. I love you for yourself.' And because I could bear His light no more, I turned and walked away, but not in shame. I was only shy, and I would be alone, but with His fingers upon the strings of my heart." His contemporaries said,

"Never man spoke like this before."[1] His parents were astonished. He said to some fishermen he had never seen before, "Follow me," and they dropped their nets and followed him. He crossed a lake to get away from the crowds and rest and they walked around the lake and awaited him. There was something about him that awed the rulers of his day.

He spent time in solitary study. In reflecting on personality this infers that Jesus knew what it was to be alone--such as during the forty days in the desert--and to feel alone--as when he was thrown out of his home town of Nazareth.

He was sincere. Much of his teaching dealt with the idea of doing good for its own sake rather than for public display. He used as an object lesson the story of the tree that brought forth bad fruit.

He was above pettiness and personal resentments. "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." The minor problems of the Pharisees brought to him in an attempt to trick him were waved away with a word.

He knew people well. History commended his choice of disciples even though contemporaries could not. He used praise rather than punishment, as when after Peter denied him.

He was patience. He explained some of his parables over to his disciples. He was gentle with those who came to him.

He had faith in people. He built Peter to greatness; overcame

---

[1]Kahlil Gibran, Jesus (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1928), pp. 12, 14, 108.

the jealousies of James and John; excused the doubting of Thomas; had a genuine warmth for the social rejects with which he associated.

A gage of the greatness of Jesus was his accessibility. "A friend of publicans and sinners," he said "Come unto me, all ye that labour . . ." Men came to him by night, in secret: Nicodemus, the rich young ruler, the centurion, the Pharisees, children, the disciples, harlots, officials--as he walked, when he rested, when he sat down to eat. He was dedicated to his work and his watchword was service.

One of the most remarkable things about his personality was his vision. He, too, had something of the mystic and woven through his teaching is the vitality of having a vision: a vision of what is possible, of what might be, of what will be.

A part of his humility was based on his refusal to judge those who could be helped. He judged the Pharisees harshly, but for different reasons; and even then, he attacked ideas more than individuals. "Judge not, that ye be not judged," he taught. And when the adultress was brought to him and he had finished writing in the sand and her accusers had left, he said, "Neither do I accuse thee."

He knew no fear. He threw money-changers out of the temple, called the most powerful leaders of his day vipers, whited sepulchers, and walked forward to meet his death when the Roman soldiers came looking for him in Gethsemanee.

He was kindly. He stopped at a well while traveling and talked with a woman of Samaria--a social taboo for a Jew. He stressed and

exemplified genuineness, simplicity, and truth over craft, artifice, and hypocrisy. He had a psychological and sociological insight into the needs of individuals and groups.

He taught and was himself an example of brotherly love, sincerity, loyalty, service, and action.

> Whenever some egos are forced to yield absolutely to the claims of other egos, one part of humanity is stunted to serve the unhealthy fattening of the other part. One human being or one group exercises its creativity at the expense of all the rest. . . . The law of Jesus resolves this by resorting to a rule of mutual yielding. Its measure is not a maximum egotist, but the maximum servant. . . . surrender to the law of loving others more than self.[1]

In his method he was skillful and practical. An outstanding example of this occurred when the sneering Pharisees sought to trip him up with the question about the coin with Ceasar's inscription. His answer was skillful parrying, simple, honest, and the only practical one possible. His method was always determined by his aims.

He knew that doubt bred conviction. Modern educators say, "An uncertain situation leads to problem-solving." Jesus said things and left his disciples to ponder, saying, "He that hath ears, let him hear." The sequence of his method was thought, word, action. He urged the disciples to think about a thing, talk about it, and act on it.

He used simple language; short, pithy proverbs. His words were poetic and balanced with careful thought.

It is said that fire cannot keep company with flax without kindling it. In this vein, he rejected all traditionalism, formalism, and

---

[1]Jeremy Ingalls, The Galilean Way (New York: Longmans, Green and and Co., 1953).

mechanism for its own sake. He tore the bandages from the eyes of men and lead them into the sunlight from the shadows. He jostled the smugness of men, cut into their consciences and gave them at the same time a breathless sense of freedom and a boldness unheard of in his day. He provoked people, revealed new realms of thought, illuminated the illusions men lived by, and stimulated them to a sense of purpose. The truth was a matter of more moment than the manners men expected in their circles of social stagnation. He quivered with a prophet's fervor and flung his words at men that they might live up to their potentialities despite their institutions. Smallness was not a sign of his feeling or thinking.

Knowledge for him began in the awe of a child. He did not emphasize philosophical, scientific, or intellectual truth subject to change but moral truth. Thus, though more dogma has been formed because of him, he himself had no dogma or creed. To ask questions entailed the responsibility to answer questions. A small mind answers the question; a large answer is one that applies to the question and illuminates the whole subject matter and shows a grasp of the truth in its broadest dimensions. He went to the heart of the matter and thus stressed the heart rather than behavior. He alone is the real teacher who is illuminated by the true knowledge. The blind should not lead the blind.

Jesus juggled big ideas. When he trained teachers he placed no limits on them. He said to them, "Go ye into all the world . . . to the whole creation." He strode in the steps of the tradition of the prophets. Moses, when men worshipped many gods, shocked people by

proclaiming one God. Then he took a disorganized group and convinced them that this God would free them. Amos, in a day of reprobate gods like Zeus, taught a just God. Hosea, after he took back his wife when she had deserted him, talked about a good God. Then this Jesus, in a day of bigotry, and prejudice, taught of a God, Father of all men. Jesus stood as a central figure in his day, and oddly enough his teachings are central today, many years later.

A listing of the things that made the teaching of Jesus great is a long one and yet never complete:

> Learning is a process of growth rather than spectacular reformation.
>
> Facts, not propaganda, are important.
>
> Ritualism, the conventional, traditional, formal, and mechanical has no intrinsic value to truth.
>
> Concentrated attention is important.
>
> Teaching is based on brotherly love, service, loyalty, sincerity, and action.
>
> Great teaching is based on great vision.
>
> Authority is rooted in self-confidence, which in turn is born of a knowledge of something to say.
>
> Teaching that defies boundaries raises the practical to the level of the universal.
>
> Questions and answers often provoke original thinking.
>
> Constructive thinking is a positive force.
>
> There must be a constant insistence on truth.
>
> Teaching must adjust to individual differences.
>
> Concrete teaching emphasizes essentials and goes to the heart of the matter.

A permissive, non-threatening atmosphere is encouraged by allowing questions and interruptions.

Teaching should reflect the needs of men.

Silence and time spent alone allows for a depth of knowledge.

Great teaching is magnetic, dynamic and filled with force, vitality, and sincerity; it is not afraid of a sense of showmanship, or of the mystical element of personality.

Doubt often leads to conviction; problem-solving begins in uncertainty.

Knowledge is often obscured and esoteric due to the learned and abstract manner of its presentation.

A great teacher makes himself accessible.

Truth has nothing to fear from authority.

Thoughts must lead to words to action.

Learning involves activity.

Method is determined by aims.

Knowledge takes root best in awe and wonderment.

Great teaching catches the interest, gives something that can be understood, and retains curiosity by projecting onto the new.

The intellect and feelings must be constantly encouraged to vigorous action.

Knowledge that is obscure should be presented so as to make it plain.

All teaching should relate the specific to the realm of knowledge in its broadest relations.

Spontaneity adds vigor to teaching.

Ideal teaching excludes external force, penalties, compulsion.

The will is central in learning.

Good teaching is simple, direct, effective, charming.

There is no room for dogma.

A teacher must be cognizant of the state of mind of his pupils.

There is a difference between the basic teaching of Jesus and the pursuit of a special knowledge--which also has a place.

Good teaching transcends time and place.

The parables could be interpreted in many ways and thus relate to a wide, general knowledge.

Teaching must be related to a sense of purpose in life.

Learning is not a completed circle of ideas, or lessons that may be mastered by repetition and conformed to by habit. It is a development of principles.

Slow learners require kindliness and patience.

The teaching of Jesus was plain, not pretentious.

"The truth shall make you free."

The teaching of Jesus is charged with a sense of reality.

There is humility in teaching; it is based not on condescension but on a common humanity.

Jesus used role-playing. (He drew an object lesson as he went around and washed the feet of his disciples.)

All knowledge is not demonstratable; some is a matter of belief.

Jesus presented his teaching as his personal belief, not a matter of creed or dogmatic assertion.

New truths are necessary when old truths prove inadequate.

"If you seek aught save the kingdom of the spirit then it were better for you to leave me, and go down to the caves of your dead, where the crowned heads of yore hold court in their tombs and may still be bestowing honors upon the bones of your forefathers."

Teaching can take place anywhere.

Teaching must appeal to thought, emotion, decision.

Good teaching uses the natural inquisitiveness of man.

Teaching involves repetition, not necessarily as memory, but as a matter of understanding.

One must forget oneself in consideration of others.

Jesus believed character should transform environment, not vice versa.

To affiliate with a group does not impute learning; an inner awareness is necessary.

True knowledge points to the underlying relationships of its various parts.

Jesus did not seek to do away with all authority but to discover anew the ideas on which authority was based.

Great teaching kindles the spirit in man; man himself learns whatever else is necessary.

Teaching must affect the lives of people.

Teaching is not to satisfy idle curiosity.

Good teaching appeals to the imagination.

Jesus did not appeal to a spirit of rivalry, or self-interest; rather service, altruism, cooperation.

He had self-control.

He was genuinely interested in men.

He stresses the importance of proper mental attitude.

He used the popular parable method with large groups, and the intimate question and answer method with small groups.

He created confidence and did not close minds with an attitude of superior, final knowledge.

He was allied with progressive forces.

He condensed his teaching.

He was tolerant; frank.

He created desire, aroused interest and triumphed often in one sentence.

He used his knowledge of psychology to advantage.

He anticipated counter-arguments.

He was skillful at throwing the burden of proof back to his hearers.

He was never trite; he had no routine.

His teachings were open to all; there were no prerequisites. He was surrounded by publicans, sinners, fools, rich, elite. He inferred: As the sick need a doctor most, so do one ignorant need to be taught.

He dealt with topics of common appeal.

He had a knowledge of people and of society.

He went out to where the people were to be found.

He was above pettiness and personal resentments.

He knew how to choose and organize men.

He was patient.

He had faith in people.

He was dedicated to his task of teaching.

He did not judge others; he attacked ideas, not men.

He was kind.

He taught with parables; with short, powerful speeches.

He was original in his probing for truth.

He was skillful in handling what he taught.

His teaching is characterized by genuineness, simplicity, fervor.

He used things near at hand as illustrations.

He bared the real motives of men.

He sternly denounced ignorance.

He taught the sacredness of human life.

His disciples were influenced more by his personality than what he said.

His language was vivid, even extreme, concise, rigorous.

He stirred Palestine so deeply he was executed as a threat to the government.

He was not partisan or provincial.

He used thinking aloud as an effective method.

He emphasized nobility before intellectual achievement.

He regarded his teaching as a means, not an end.

He adapted his procedure to the moods of his pupils.

He mastered existing methods of teaching and improved on them.

He often spoke a truth a little above his pupils and then brought them up to it with questions and answers.

Jesus set men to thinking.

Jesus did the extra bit his task required.

He stressed giving rather than receiving.

He associated with all manner of men.

He had no fear of those in authority.

He stressed alertness of mind.

He was inspired by love.

He emphasized the objective.

He was aware of human growth and development.

He was pragmatic: he began with the experience of his listeners; this was a pedagogy of commonsense: from the easy to the difficult, from known to unknown; individualized instruction.

And even so is this chronicle of the teaching of Jesus ended for this time and place. And with it is the knowledge that, as its very spirit is alien to the spirit of Jesus, it has failed. This is not a cause for despair but an affirmation of the only final answer to the greatness of the teaching of Jesus. It is a matter of record that "he opened his mouth and taught them, saying. . . ." But the seed of the greatness of the teaching of Jesus is never sensed until one answers the question, "Who do men say the Son of Man is?"

MARCUS FABIUS QUINTILIANUS

A bearer of the torch, this Quintilian: the body of knowledge that transcends time and location and is handed down from the hearts of men in sequence to numberless succeeding generations. The line can be traced, although it is never known how many men share in the glow of the torch, never coming to light themselves. Quintilian is entered in the record of history as one who came to light and also held the light for the span of time alloted him on this earth. But there are some difficulties.

"(It is) peculiarly difficult after a lapse of time . . . to form a vivid idea of a . . . personality. . . ."[1] Such is the case with Quintilian. So much has been written and believed about the other Great Teachers discussed thus far that a certain spirit breathed if only from the legend. Quintilian is mentioned by many coming after him--down to modern times--and all have surmised the man from his manuscripts. There is a bit by pupils and fellow Romans: Juvenal describes Quintilian as fortunate, handsome, clever, wise, high-minded, and open-hearted. This in itself, taken in depth, would be enough description of a great teacher and this book could be closed here. Pliny the Younger, a pupil, knew him as kindly, human, and sympathetic. Tacitus, while perhaps not a pupil, also describes him thus. Petrarch says of

---

[1]Charles D. Warner (editor), Library of the World's Best Literature (New York: The International Society, 1896), p. 11980.

him, "Thou hast performed the office of whetstone rather than that of knife . . . thy greatest merit lay in thy ability to ground and mould great men."[1]

Quintilian was recognized by his contemporaries as the foremost teacher in Rome. He was immensely popular. And his written work is interesting and readable after nineteen centuries. Sharing the light that was Quintilian during these centuries are such men as: Jerome, Erasmus, Vittorina da Feltre, Luther, Ben Johnson, Swinburne, Pope, and John Stuart Mill. His influence is recognized during the Renaissance. Monastaries studied him, and one Cassiodorus of Viriers said, "He had the power of putting into practice what he taught."[2] Quintilian was the most quoted Roman of his day. Who was he, and from where did he come?

A road is a thing of two ways: there is a destination at both ends, dependent on the direction of travel. The expanding destiny of Rome decreed that legions would march along a road with their destination in a town called Calahorra--conquered: Calagurris--on the river Ebro, in Spain. So it was, that sometime during the decade 30-40 A. D., Marcus Fabius Quintilianus was born a Roman. In time he reversed the direction of travel and became a professor of rhetoric in Rome, under those who commanded the legions: Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian. While their fathers subdued Spain, Quintilian taught the sons and nephews

---

[1]William M. Smail, Quintillian on Education (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938), p. xliv.

[2]Herman H. Horne, Quintilian on Education (New York: New York University Bookstore, 1936), p. 63.

of the emperors, being the first man to be paid some four thousand dollars per year for this service.

The mores of the moment crowned and killed nine rulers of the temporal during the time of this man Quintilian who ruled the spirit. All but one of the nine who wielded the sword died by the sword, the roster of nine embracing the madmen Nero and Caligula. But it was a time of expansion, a period of pride. Rome was undefeatable and would last forever. The times were tense politically and socially and since that time men have piled up many books seeking to measure the decay of Rome. In the day of Quintilian, conquered countries and court people had to curry each moment of favor lest the next one cull them out. Thus twice did the human Quintilian compromise his dignity and sing praise to men in power who exemplified the opposite of everything he stood for. Love of life is a moving force and no one can judge him who wishes to retain it. "Into such a world, a grandly imperial world, made by force and controlled by fear, decaying from the top down,"[1] lived, loved, and labored Quintilian who put prime emphasis on goodness. The pride of empire was eating at the guts of Rome; slaves and citizens were shells, each carrying his own bit of germ. Education had become a superficiality; politics was a constant dread; and the climate of slavery made a mockery of the doctrine of brotherhood. And a kindly, sympathetic man with lofty notions taught so forcefully that the decadent emporers paid him. It was too late and too small a gesture

---

[1]Horne, op. cit., p. 29.

to save the empire, but it revived the torch of learning and Quintilian held it aloft for the years of his labor.

Quintilian is the first man included here that deals with formal education. He had a school, he had a salary, and he had pupils. He was the most popular teacher of his day. Yet, there is so little said or definable of his actual method that this must be determined by trying to catch the spirit of the man from what he wrote. And at that it may not be too wild an assumption to make that a man who wrote in twelve books--halfway interrupted by heartbreak--what he thought about teaching practiced that which his brain birthed. As an aid to the picture, there are wisps of what the man was like. These considerations must do to create the method of the man.

Quintilian seems to have been a man of high social standing. At least he was not raised in poor circumstances, and as his work of preparing youth for public service apparently paid him well he was able to acquire quite an estate. He himself was a combination of Greek culture and Roman practicality. The Romans had conquered Greece but the subtle spirit of Hellas already pervaded Rome when Quintilian stood as an example of the fusing of these two cultures. Thus it came about naturally in his time that the sons of the leading families were sent to him. Quintilian was devoted to this work and his life in retrospect was that of a busy, useful man who worked hard. For his time, his success and fame were unequaled.

His spirit is that of the liberal educator of any age. Rhetoric was the important thing of his day, and the specific aim of his

Institutio is the training of public orators. But he emphasized the foundations of knowledge and considered that knowledge as one organic whole. If the field theory, or the term gestalt of knowledge can be used here, Quintilian was aware of the fact that every bit of knowledge related to every other bit. Quintilian suggested learning from the models of the past and felt there was honor in treading the footsteps of the great. The criterion is to strive always for the best. Within the framework of the Roman gods, religion had failed and education, emphasizing the old-fashioned virtues, must build a serene and undismayed character. This was not to be accomplished in any great degree by philosophical specualation.

Quintilian emphasized the idea that the way the twig is bent determines the growth of the tree. He writes in detail of the inroads on later character of early influence. He said failure is often due to lack of care. He could not himself attribute failure to the nature of the pupil and defined his own role as one of acting as a parent to his pupils. The task begins in infancy of raising man above his instincts and establishing his dignity. The good man, the truly educated man, for Quintilian, is physically strong, intellectually alert, emotionally sensitive, socially efficient, vocationally successful, and spiritually adjusted. Recognizing that forces lieing outside the individual may make attainment of this ideal difficult, still selective experiences build strength and help preserve it. The teacher must, by his own example and his teaching illustrate ideals which invigorate.

Despite the emphasis in the Institutio, the aims of education for Quintilian were not narrowly utilitarian. One of the most enduring and noticeable things about Quintilian is his moderation in all things. On the one hand is his insistence that education must be broad--in the tradition of the truly practical--and on the other hand is his fear of the danger of oratory divorced from public service. The theory must be constantly in tune with the practice and little is to be gained from vague, easy declamation. Prior to Quintilian the system had been a formal one, passive and relying most on rote memorization. "There is one common practice which I think should be radically altered in the case of pupils of the ages with which we are now dealing; they ought not to have to learn by heart all their own compositions and to recite them, as the custom is, upon an appointed day."[1] Part of Quintilian's popularity was due to the fact that as a shrewd organizer he knew how to work within the established framework of the day. In this case, any memory work was set up with practical ends and there was no artificiality. He emphasized the good sense of experience: to do otherwise, he thought led to a sham that eventually cloaks vice. Repetition of a lesson was helpful in learning but the ends altered the approach and memory took on a new meaning.

The task begun in infancy must be geared to the development of the pupils. "Let this first instruction be in the form of play for one

---

[1]Marcus Fabius Quintilianus, The Institutio Oratoria, Book II (trans. by H. E. Butler) (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1921).

thing above all is to be guarded against, viz. that one who cannot yet love studies should come to hate all learning."[1] In this passage Quintilian sounds most modern. "The strong emphasis . . . laid upon the individuality of the pupil and the close psychological observation revealed in the building up of a reasoned system of training are peculiar to Quintilian among Roman educators and to his strongly defined personality as a teacher. The average child, he insists, is intelligent and eager for knowledge, and it is the fault of his training if he ceases to be so; the main purpose of education is to foster mental activity."[2] And added to this, "Many of his points of view are essentially modern. All are marked by the same judicious spirit. He would have the work of the school fitted to the disposition and ability of the child; he calls upon teachers to study the characteristics of their pupils. . . ."[3] This striking "modernity" can be seen in the following passage from the Institutio:

> It is usually and rightly esteemed an excellent thing in a teacher that he should be careful to mark diversity of gifts in those whose education he has undertaken, and to know in what direction nature inclines each one most. For in this respect there is an unbelievable variety, and types of mind are no less numerous than types of body. Accordingly, most teachers have thought it expedient to train each pupil in such a way as to foster by sound instruction his peculiar gifts, and so to develop varied endowments most effectively in the direction of their natural bent.

---

[1]Ibid.

[2]Smail, op. cit., p. xxv.

[3]Paul Monroe, Source Book of the History of Education (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1948), p. 450.

> It is certainly of fundamental importance to distinguish the peculiar gifts of individual pupils.[1]

Thus Quintilian urges the teacher to study the abilities, tastes, and personalities of his pupils. The teacher must be aware of the psychology of the child's mind and the teacher then arranges the material on the level of the pupil. Quintilian does not regard it a lowering of standards to make learning interesting. It is not necessary to enhance the difficulty of learning; learning should be made interesting. He clothed difficult subject matter in palatable form. He assigned work that was within the grasp of the student. It is sometimes necessary to "pour slowly into a narrow-necked vessel, or to instil drop by drop."[2]

Along the way, there is no need for corporal punishment. As a disciplinary device this is degrading, and ineffective. True incentives are praise, interest, genuine affection, and competition. Pupils react to the living flesh of a great teacher's human interests. A teacher embodies self-control in refraining from being abusive, and self-control is its own lesson. Quintilian exemplified tact, patience, and kindness. He himself was a thoroughly good man with a genuine warmth of feeling. His concept of discipline involved a sense of service to humanity; he had faith in people and encouraged with praise. His sound common sense is ideally illustrated when he describes a good teacher as one of good morals, benevolent, with self-control, having authority tempered with mildness and courtesy, dignity with accessibility, dedicated, able.

---

[1]Institutio Oratoria, op. cit.

[2]Ibid.

This next is crucial to great teaching, and does not receive contemporary emphasis. One major lesson learned from Quintilian, and he so well cut the pattern for it, is the value of eloquence. In the training of an orator one can himself use some of the skill of an orator. Contemporary emphasis is on technique, but as Quintilian says, ". . . scientific rules are of no value unless supplemented by natural ability."[1] This leads again--as it did with Buddha, Confucius, Socrates, and Jesus--to an acknowledgment of the importance of the personality of the teacher. Quintilian taught with authority and it was an authority based on the power of clear exposition and earnestness. He had a personality to inspire enthusiasm and he knew the teacher that wants enthusiastic pupils must be enthusiastic. Quintilian had alert pupils because he was alert; his living, rich, nourishing voice carried conviction. He had an easy, conversational manner and his teaching was clear and lucid. He taught with warmth and was not pompous, vicious, high-sounding; neither did he adopt any forms of affectation. He was not "dry," he was vigorous, exciting, persuasive, and pleasing. He was not afraid of just the degree of showmanship needed to excite, interest, and retain the curiosity. All of these attributes attest to the potency of the teacher who paces from challenging idea to living thought, employing every natural device of the magnetic personality to arouse a like dynamism in his students. Techniques of planning and organization are important but they need the mystical element of the powerful personality to bring them to life.

---

[1]Horne, op. cit., p. 100.

Such a personality was Quintilian, not necessarily revealed in the concise prose of the Institutio but certainly a factor in the popularity of the man. As he said, "The most important thing, it seems to me, if we are to move the feelings of others, is that we ourselves should be moved."[1]

There are other things need mentioning to round out the teaching of Quintilian as revealed in the man and his convictions. To string them out as a catalogue of adjectives would seem to be circumscribing a saint; yet there are that many characteristics of the man that have rooted him in history as a great teacher.

He based his work with people on the principle of finding good in men. He was sympathetic and his consideration built a mutual affection. He was kindly, loving, and patient. In his presentation he used anecdotes and fables to make points clear and plain. He knew the value of simplicity. His pupils knew him as fair and just and record has it that he was gentle in judgment. He was ambitious in his degree of devotion to his work. "His success as a teacher was mainly due to the sweet reasonableness of his nature and his untiring devotion to the welfare of his pupils."[2] He was tolerant, affected no vanity, and was humble in relationships with other men. As a working rule, he said, "The teacher should everyday say something--or rather many things--which his pupils may retain in their memories."[3]

---

[1]Ibid., p. 39.

[2]Smail, op. cit., p. xxxix.

[3]Institutio Oratoria, op. cit.

He was conscious of the importance of style in teaching. His style, like that of the other great teachers, emphasized short, concise statement. He used questions to stimulate probing the horizons of knowledge. He was inventive; the originality engendered gave an air of daring. He was careful of details the way an artist is but was flexible enough to vary procedure. To him discipline meant the discipline of compotency in one's subject and the sacrifice of work. Learning involves activity, and he said the master must know much more than he has to teach. He wrote of the importance of relaxation and of "breaks" to aid concentration. He was known as one using good judgment and who had good taste. He was modest yet capable and learned. He was noted for his justice, courage, and especially his moderation.

Quintilian used the method of inquiry to encourage his pupils to inquire. He would question unresponsive people. He commended when it was earned and gave reasons for what he did. He corrected his pupils when necessary and set himself as an example. In line with his understanding of people his rules were not inviolate, shaping themselves to the plastic human material with which they dealt. He knew the value of silence and time alone to think and established wisdom as a value. A description of what greatness meant for him can be had from Book XII of his Institutio:

> Thus will be achieved greatness without excess, sublimity without violence, courage without recklessness, austerity without mournfulness, weight without sloth, exhuberance without wantonness, pleasantness without licence, solemnity without bombast. The same principle will apply to other qualities and,

in general, safety will lie in the middle course, because extremes on either side are faults.[1]

And now for a topical summary, a catalog of the characteristics that establish his commonality with the other great teachers:

Knowledge has a practical end.

He stressed individual differences.

He was friendly.

He broke his teaching into simple parts.

He worked hard.

Questions and answers were used to stimulate.

He did not suggest corporal punishment, abuse, forms of affectation, was not pompos, or vicious.

He cultivated a rich voice.

He knew his subject.

Lessons were placed on the level of the students.

Clearness and lucidity were the virtues of his eloquence.

Vanity is not a suitable garb for a teacher.

He did not enhance the difficulty of a subject.

He deplored the many distracting duties of a teacher.

He strove for the best; learned from the past.

Slow learners were handled more slowly.

He was kindly, generous, humane, sympathetic.

He spoke with the authority bred of confidence and self-control.

He had good sense, taste, judgment, and originality.

---

[1]Ibid., Book XII.

He was self-sacrificing.

He did not condone artificiality, sham, or vice.

Learning involved activity for him; he was not narrow in his utilitarian focus.

His teaching paced the progress of his pupils.

He interested with fables, anecdotes; aroused curiosity.

He had a psychological knowledge of men.

Relaxation, changes of pace and routine were emphasized.

The personality he exhibited was alert, vigorous, magnetic, enthusiastic, moving.

He knew the power of clear exposition and repetition.

He respected people.

Indulgent when it came to judging, he was gentle and sincere.

He believed in the oneness of knowledge.

He was a good organizer and worked within the framework of what was available.

His teaching was in an easy, conversational manner.

His warmth and feeling carried conviction.

Each day he tried to do something that would be remembered by the students.

There is one aspect of Quintilian that has purposely been left for a conclusion. The experience of sorrow and pain was not unique to Quintilian as the other teachers shared in this, leading at times to despondency, death by poison, or the Place of the Skull. It is true that knowing pain increases one's capacity for pleasure and in the end a warm person like Quintilian benefits in increased understanding and acceptance of people. Would that in the bearing of it the man need not

lose so much, but listen to its affect on Quintilian. His nineteen-year-old wife died, followed by his son of five summers and, prior to the writing of the sixth book of the Institutio, his last son of ten on whom he had placed much promise. Speaking of the five-year-old, it is even in the prose revealing of the man that was Quintilian:

> "It chanced that he had been greatly attached to me, preferring me to all his nurses, to his grandmother who looked after him, and to all those who, as a rule, win the affection of young children."[1]

Sorrow? Yes. Despair? Listen:

> ". . . let my fortitude, through all my remaining days, make me worthy of those I have lost."[2]

The spirit of a great man shines between the tear drops of those words. And even then, his extreme virtue drove him to end the work in triumph:

> "The very completeness of my bereavement has conspired to make for me a strange peace out of unbelievable anguish. Perhaps men will be indulgent to my work if they reflect that I am not continuing it because of any possible usefulness it may have for me. My only hope is that it may be of some profit to others. In my unhappiness I shall pass it on . . . to others than those for whom it was originally intended."[3]

---

[1]Horne, op. cit., p. 188.

[2]Ibid., p. 190.

[3]Ibid.

ERASMUS

Perhaps Erasmus should not be included in this study. It may be that a man who was never a schoolmaster cannot be called a Great Teacher. And as the introductory pages to this study claimed it would try to deal as specifically as possible with the method used by which each Teacher influenced his pupils then perhaps Erasmus is not at home here. All of this depends upon how a teacher is defined, how the situation is seen in which some people learn and some teach. There is much evidence during the age of Erasmus to fix him as a teacher. In spite of a pope at the head of the church and the blazing star of a Luther shaking world foundations it was to Erasmus the heads of men were turned for a word. "With his irrestible need of teaching and his sincere love of humanity and its general culture, Erasmus introduced the classic spirit . . . among the people. Not he alone; but none more extensively and more effectively. Erasmus is the only name in all the host of humanists which has remained a household word all over the globe."[1]

A thoughtful reading of Eric Hoffer's The True Believer raises the question of the fanaticism of any great leader. Jesus is called a fanatic by some, as are others of the great teachers included thus far in this study. It is, of course, a moot point to consider delineation

---

[1]J. Huizinga, Erasmus of Rotterdam (New York: Phaidon Publishers Inc., 1952), pp. 39-40.

between fanaticism, call to duty, earnestness, hard work and sincerity to mention but a few key concepts. In the event that this be the case Erasmus makes a distinct contribution to this study, as a basic term of description applied to him is moderation. It is a matter of interest then to discover other facets of great teaching--perhaps not yet uppermost in the others--which leave as a legacy, Erasmus, as one of the great teachers.

This study does emphasize the personal, face-to-face contact between two or more people in a learning situation. But it is not possible to carry the lamp of universal thought regarding teaching procedures through the Middle Ages without regarding Erasmus; and so a study of Erasmus shows something about teaching not in the usual manner associated with a classroom. Two important things left, then, have to do with the times and the personality of the man.

Every age can, measured by one criterion or another, be considered one of chaos. Men and events do not stand still and on the one hand movement is considered away from that which was good by conservatives while on the other, men favoring change see decay in the measured tread of that change. Erasmus lived in an age of explosive change. Nations were establishing identity, monarchs were flexing muscles, and the spirit of individuality was soaring. Erasmus was born around 1466 in Rotterdam. The political organization was loose and Holland, such as it was, leaned French and Dutch. The supposed illegality of the birth of Erasmus apparently was a factor in the life-long configuration of his

personality--often a morose and ever sensitive man. He seldom had any fixed residence and traveled much.

> Remember the social environment in which Erasmus lived. The constant factors of his experience were unceasing wars, plague, famine, gross vice, coarseness, cruelty, political tyranny, indifference to spiritual and intellectual light. In the stir and movement of the sense of nationality he perceived an inevitable hindrance to order and peace: local character, ambition, languages, were so many barriers to unity of culture, to progress through intercourse, to amelioration of common life. The church instead of commanding respect as the symbol of a world-order, was debased, ignorant, and a source of danger. The New Learning, then, opens to him a window from which he looks out upon another world. Like the Italians he recognizes in it a Golden Age of humanity. Its notes of distinction were, first, its universality: government and order were then secured to mankind: there was one law and uniform justice: was impossible. Again, language was one, with free intercourse thereby opened between all peoples; whilst Learning laboured under no obstacles of race and speech.[1]

Thus much of the life that surrounded Erasmus seemed compounded of two things: sham and formalism. As seems to be the case with all men who spoke to an age, Erasmus did what he could to hammer at these twin characteristics of his society. And because of this, coupled with his character, it is remarkable that he had the influence he did. As an introductory statement to his influence, this description of Erasmus:

> He was rather a small man, slight but well-built; he had, as became a Teuton, blue eyes, yellowish or light brown hair, and a fair complexion. The face is rather a remarkable one. It has two chief characreristics--quiet, watchful sagacity--and humour, half-playful, half sarcastic. The eyes are calm, critical, steadily observant, with a half-latent twinkle in them; the nose is straight, rather long and pointed; the rippling curves of the large mouth indicate a certain vivacity of temperament and tenacity of purpose; while the pose of the head

---

[1]W. H. Woodward, Desiderius Erasmus (Cambridge: The University Press, 1904), pp. 33-34.

> suggests vigilant caution, almost timidity. As we continue to study the features, they speak more and more clearly of insight and refinement; of a wordly yet very gentle shrewdness; of cheerful self-mastery; and of a mind that has its weapons ready at every instant.[1]

There are a number of things contained in this description that relate to the "method" of a teacher, method being inextricably woven with personality as it is in this study. But his middle-of-the-road emphasis even shows up in his character: he is very human in his weaknesses.

Erasmus departs from the other teachers studied thus far in that at least he affected a distaste for the masses. Having some of the actor in him, there is evidence that he consciously adopted a role and played it well. He saw the aristocratic man of letters as the fit leader. He was too verbose to be commonly popular. He set as a standard a degree of material and moral purity he had difficulty attaining. He was often reckless, precipitate, and inconsistent. He constantly justified himself; in all this it is well to remember that mixed into the man was a great Erasmus and a petty one, which can be said of most men.

The influence of Erasmus in his day was extensive rather than intensive. He influenced men who hardly knew the source of the influence.

> . . . practical men of undivided will often make a terrible mess of what are supposed to be practical affairs. . . . Not every call to action is as immediately urgent as a fire alarm; and men touched by Erasmian folly--and Abraham Lincoln was one of them--have sometimes planned and controlled and executed

---

[1]W. E. Campbell, Erasmus, Tyndale, and More (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1949), pp. 56-57.

> palpable tasks. Erasmus was a pacifist. The relation of the Erasmian spirit to democracy is a subject in itself; but it must occur to anyone at this point that democracies, as states, have proceeded on what we have seen to be the Erasmian principle in individuals. That is, the democratic belief is that a state can exist and be strong without being totalitarian; that it can endure considerable divisions of sentiment within it, and that it can even protect the right of the individual conscience. . . .[1]

The essence of the influence of Erasmus is modern in that he was ahead of his times. This in itself is a paradox. A man is often considered ahead of his times when he re-emphasizes the strengths of old truths which a contemporary age is neglecting. Erasmus acted like the leaven in the parable of Jesus. He was relatively diffuse and his influence was widespread. He was in the public eye, much like a modern actor, for forty years. As a tutor, he was popular with the one or two pupils he had. John Colet, a contemporary of Erasmus, dean of the St. Paul's cathedral in London, said of Erasmus, "There was something about the Dutch scholar which made one feel intuitively that one stood in the presence of a mental giant, who was certain to leave a lasting impression on the minds of coming generations."[2]

So it is that Erasmus is called a great teacher: not in evidence in any formal school situation. The only clues to why he had this influence must be gleaned from what he wrote, and, built on that, what of the personality of the man can be seen. "The foundation of Erasmus' mind is his fervent desire of freedom, clearness, purity,

---

[1]D. Erasmus, The Praise of Folly, (trans. by Hoyt Hopewell Hudson) (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1941), p. xxxix.

[2]Albert Hyma, The Youth of Erasmus (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1930), p. v.

simplicity. . . ."[1] His was a light, elastic nature, in turn with the moderation he preached. "Men recognized in Erasmus some quality larger, sweeter, riper, and nobler. . . ."[2] He was a pacifist and stressed gentleness, decorum, and kindly courtesy. It is known from his contemporaries that he was stimulating in whatever situation he found himself. He could not talk with people without considering it his duty to bring them a little more to life. He was able to do this because of his astonishing energy and liveliness. He had imagination and wit which he used with rare gusto and humor. He was active, vigorous, and ambitious. He had faith in human nature revealed in his tolerance and charity. He named as dominant requirements in a man, simplicity, naturalness, purity, and reasonableness. He was clever and entertaining. His work is frank, and in the right places, modest. His energy revealed itself in his hard work and intense concentration. One of his basic characteristics was his warm, human personality. "Erasmus was no dry pedant or professional scholar and theologian, but a very warm human creature, who bled if you pricked him, loving, hating, enjoying, suffering, and occupied with many things besides Greek grammer and the classics."[3] He had a deep knowledge of life as he was an observer of life. There is a passage in his De Pueris Instituendis that so catches his spirit that it can be quoted here:

---

[1]Huizinga, op. cit., p. 106.

[2]J. S. Phillimore, "Dublin Review," July, 1913.

[3]J. A. Froude, Life and Letters of Erasmus (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912), p. 33.

> Seeing, then, that children in the earliest stage must be beguiled and not driven to learning, the first requisite in the Master is a gentel sympathetic manner, the second a knowledge of wise and attractive methods. Possessing these two important qualifications he will be able to win the pupil to find pleasure in his task. It is a hindrance to a boy's progress which nothing will ever nullify, when the master succeeds in making his pupil hate learning before he is old enough to like it for its own sake. For a boy is often drawn to a subject first for his master's sake, and afterwards for its own. Learning, like many other things, wins our liking for the reason that it is offered to us by one we love. But, on the other hand, there is a type of man of manners so uncouth, of expression so forbidding, of speech so surly, that he repels even when he by no means intends it. Now men of that stamp are wholly unfit to be teachers of children; a man who loves his horse would hardly put such a man to have charge of his stable. Yet there are parents who think such a temper as I have described well adapted to breaking in the young child, thinking, perhaps, that seriousness of that sort betokens a proper gravity. Therein may lie a great error, inasmuch as that demeanour may cloak a depraved nature, which, delighting in tyranny, cows and breaks the spirit of the pupil. Fear is of no real avail in education: not even parents can train their children by this motive. Love must be the first influence; followed and completed by a trustful and affectionate respect, which compels obedience far more surely than dread can ever do.[1]

This speaks for itself in emphasizing the compelling force of love, and sympathy. This awareness grew from a knowledge Erasmus drew fresh from life.

Perhaps the crowning proof of Erasmus' attitude toward authority is his Moriae Encomium, or Praise of Folly. A description of this work as delightful falls far short. It is modern, bold, witty and evidence of a most keen insight into men and motives. As Erasmus himself proclaimed the necessity of a psychological grasp of people and pupils, he reveals in Praise of Folly that he has this knowledge. And the theme

---

[1]Woodward, op. cit., p. 203.

is one of removing the sham and hypocrisy often attending formalism and authority. There is much evidence to support the notion that honesty and sincerity coupled with a fearlessness of authority always has an appeal. Erasmus had a suspicious practical interest in removing the ignorance of the past. Traditionalism stifled him. He scoffed at the learned men of his day as narrow and opinionated in many cases. Routine and thoughtlessness prevent seeing things in true proportion. He had a distaste for narrowmindedness, along with coarseness and intemperance. He upheld the freedom to err, and jested at dogmatic authority. He felt the age was overburdened with scholastic dogmas. The best and most witty statement of this must be taken from his Praise of Folly, despite its length:

> "Here they erect their . . . Crests, and beat into the people's ears those Magnifical Titles of Illustrious Doctors, Subtile Doctors, most Subtile Doctors, Seraphick Doctors, Cherubim Doctors, Holy Doctors, Unquestionable Doctors, and the like; and then throw abroad among the ignorant people Syllogisms, Majors, Minors, Conclusions, Corollaries, Suppositions, and those so weak and foolish that they are below Pedantry. There remaines yet the fifth Act, in which one would think they should show their Mastery. And here they bring in some foolish insipid Fable . . . and Expound it Allegorically, Tropologically, and Anagogically."[1]

The meaning of Erasmus as a humanist must be noted here. Mention has already been made of a body of universal knowledge, intensely practical in its application to the spirit of man, which is held by a number of minds in every generation. For Erasmus, humanism meant overthrowing

---

[1]Desiderius Erasmus, The Praise of Folly, (trans. by Hendrik Willem Van Loon) Classics Club (New York: Walter Black, 1942) p. 207.

the false authority of creed and form and a return look at the sources of this knowledge about men and their affairs. Emphasis in his day was added by using the Latin language as the vehicle of expression. Part of the popularity of Erasmus was due to his definite creative and eloquent flair at writing with this form of expression. He had an ease of expression and articulate mood of speech. Returning to sources emphasized truth as being simple, stated clearly, and liberal. Stress is laid on the practical temper and education has a social aim. The enlightened individual has a reverence for learning. Virtue lies in knowledge of anything, not seeking to disguise by the use of the cloak of formality, or prejudice. Erasmus felt he called men to commonsense in attending to the principles of ancient but transcendent learning. He considered dogmatic definition a disease, one he never contacted as his role in the Reformation shows. He himself was well read, and broadly educated. He said he could teach only what he had learned himself. He expressed his wealth of subject matter in fine form, stressing simplicity. Strange it is how a recall to old virtues can seem like new wealth:

> What made Erasmus the man from whom his contemporaries expected their salvation, on whose lips they hung to catch the word of deliverance? He seemed to them the bearer of a new liberty of the mind, a new clearness, purity, and simplicity of knowledge, a new harmony of healthy and right living. He was to them as the possessor of newly discovered, untold wealth which he had only to distribute.[1]

One key to the character of Erasmus is this exposé of self-deception. The implications for teaching were that from the outset the

---

[1]Huizinga, op. cit., pp. 100-101.

child should become acquainted only with the best that is available. The practicality of this passion for learning inheres in the necessity to be able to judge prior to any learning by experience. Then facts are an adornment to the liberally educated mind. This learning, too, must be reduced to its simpliest elements. Erasmus has his own conception--not new in this study--of the practicality of the learning process.

Care and nurture of the young must begin early, at the cradle. Children should begin learning by playing and the use of pictorial illustration. The teacher must have an insight into the child's mind:

> The insight into child nature which Erasmus displayed was accompanied by a definite concept of the conditions of right discipline, which he properly understood as including both stimulus and restraint. This psychological theory implied that the growing mind is by nature curious, imitative and tenacious; and that it is by nature amenable to right guidance. Hence the boy may be counted upon to obey suitable incentives. These are in part personal to the teacher, in part they belong to his instruction.
>
> The first step is to secure the respect and the affection of the pupil for the master, an affection which will not be allowed to degenerate into familiarity. This leads to the second stage: the affection for the subject taught. But this will not be maintained unless interest is aroused. Now interest in the subject matter may not be at first strong enough to survive: it must be nourished by associating pleasure with the actual teaching process. This is secured by wise devices, which Erasmus describes "per lusum discere"; by encouragement of ambition; by emulation; by alternation of subjects, and intervals for relaxation.[1]

And,

---

[1]Woodward, op. cit., pp. 98-99.

> . . . the third qualification required of the master: his insight into the moral and intellectual disposition of the pupil, and his ability to order discipline and instruction accordingly. Erasmus shows a most remarkable power of observation on his own part in regard to personal bent, capacity and disposition in boys. He insists that such insight is as easy to acquire as it is essential. Looks, expression, gesture, degree of self control, facial conformation, personal habits in respect to dress and speech, temper in games, all carry their message to a skilful observer. Intellectual taste and capacity are, he affirmed, always purely individual; ready perception of such special endowments is the first step towards adapting instruction to the pupil. The master must be competent to adjust means to ends. Young boys entering upon new and, at first stages, unattractive subject-matter must be won by patience, by incentives of rivalry and reward, by devices such as pictures, stories and moral lessons. Excess of preparatory work, undue stress on learning by heart, ill-judged themes for composition, all imply that the master forgets what a boy is. The teacher must never take his own mental interests and capacities as his guide either in discipline or instruction. "Remember that your pupil is a boy still, and that you were a boy yourself not so long ago." Then the master will show himself at once reasonable and humane.[1]

Then teaching must be geared to the development of the pupils while allowing for creative release. It almost goes without saying that Erasmus saw no place for brutality or corporal punishment. This was not in keeping with the development of character. And the development of character stresses the practical nature of the education desired by Erasmus.

> "There may be too much weight attached to speculation, or to rhetoric . . . too much craving for a reputation for learning. Character and usefulness in life are primary ends . . . scholarship is but a means. A sense of the right application of knowledge to life is a crucial test of a good teacher."[2]

---

[1]Ibid., p. 95.

[2]Ibid., p. viii.

Inherent again in this scheme is the value of the emphasis on individual differences.

Finally, there are expressions in the work and character of Erasmus that add dimension to the subtilties of the teacher. "Assume no airs in speech or dress," he says; "be polite to all, and never adject. Respect your own position and be fair to everyone."[1] He lived simply and acted as he thought honestly. He used vigorous language, which thing is emerging in this study as a positive value in teaching. He stressed the importance of looks, expression, gesture, facial conformation, temper, personal habits, patience, and intellectual taste and capacity. The teacher should be worthy of confidence.

The life of Erasmus was full of strange incongruities. It has the appearance of a man not afraid to battle abuse and mediocrity but too timid to move on to the new. He talked of high morality and sincerity yet begging support and being abrupt with friends. Despite his near obsession with dirt, disease and commoners he was the idol of his day and held the friendship of leaders of the Reformation and the popes. Perhaps in the telling of these inconsistencies is buried the subtle secret of his success. Basically, as he taught of respect for the rights of children so he respected all sincere and honest men. "He was primarily an artist and therefore knew that in nature and intermediary colors predominate and an absolute white and an absolute black are rarely found. He recognized that this lack of a definite

---

[1]Froude, op. cit., p. 41.

differentiation also prevailed within the realm of the spirit and never could quite make up his mind where absolute right bade farewell to absolute wrong. In consequence whereof he became the ideal follower of the middle-of-the-road."[1] So his great lesson was lived: moderation, based on a refusal to judge from any absolute vantage point.

As mentioned, Erasmus is not an example of a formal teacher in the contemporary sense of the word. It would thus be difficult to offer a list of characterizations of the teaching act as a summary here. Instead, a list--not exhaustive--is offered of descriptive words and phrases that characterize what is known of the man and his teachings:

- peace.
- moderation.
- learned, liberal education.
- opposed abuses, mediocrity, sham, formalism.
- some sense of showmanship, entertaining, clever, witty, humorous, creative.
- practical, hard worker, intense concentration.
- tolerant, charitable, kindly, generous, sympathetic, gentle.
- warm, accepting; compelling force of love; social.
- fervent, sincere.
- knowledge of people, observer of life, respect.
- respect for individuals, and differences.
- passion for independence.
- stimulating, energetic, vigorous, ambitious, active.

---

[1]Erasmus, The Praise of Folly, (trans. by Hendrik Willem Van Loon) op. cit., p. 19.

- light, elastic nature.
- stressed simplicity, development of individuals.
- mannerly, polite, fair, sensitive.
- no corporal punishment.
- use of interesting material, visual aids; used lively language; kindle spontaneous interest.
- frank, friendly, decorous.
- aware of power of looks, expression, gesture, self-control, bodily configuration, habits, temper, patience.
- keen mind; sanctity of knowledge.
- not opinionated, narrow.
- importance of command of subject-matter.
- self-knowledge as beginning of wisdom.
- freedom to err.
- clarity, naturalness, reasonable, eloquent.
- lively, imaginative.
- importance of affection; modest.

To conclude this brief and all to cursory look at Erasmus, a statement from another scholar from Rotterdam:

> "He wanted mankind to be set free from fear and disaster by being set free from its own ignorance; he hoped for a world in which intelligence, common sense, good manners, tolerance, and forbearance should dominate the scene instead of violence, ignorance, prejudice and greed."[1]

---

[1]*Ibid.*, p. ix.

COMENIUS

The principles of the present-day philosophies of life make it difficult to appreciate the success of one, John Amos Komensky. The trend of this age is to reward less effort and little devotion to ideals than was the case with a Calvinist like Comenius. And is any portrait of Comenius is to persist in the mind it is one of tireless zeal and a doggedness of purpose almost impossible to grasp when subjecting sections of his life and work to compartmental analysis. His list of works, his activities, travels, influences, and projected projects stagger the reality to say nothing of the imagination. If it is possible for a moment to step out of the confines of dates and names of places the visual image of Comenius that appears is subjective but stimulating.

Comenius was born, lived a few years of a normal childhood, and then forever was routed along a path of tragedy and wandering such as is meted out to few men. Orphaned, defrauded, educated in the current poor fashion with more blows than benefits--at least it made an educational reformer out of him--his commencement exercise spun him right into the Thirty Years War, a war of contemporary religions over who possessed the true peace of God that passed understanding. Enough people perished defending particular interpretations of the gentle Jesus to insure the judgment of history that Christianity had decayed into anything but a way of life suggested by the Prince of Peace.

The result to Comenius of all this clamor was that the rest of his life he shared the lament of the Israelites clutched captive in the claws of Babylon. By the rivers of Babylon, lamenting, unable to sing when bid to do so, the symbol stands as one of wandering, rootlessness, with no place of one's own to lay his head. This fits the fortunes of Comenius, a Moravian bishop of the Unitas Fratrum, interested mainly in restoring fallen man to his God, seeing education of the young as the only means by which to accomplish this, driven from hidden castle to cave, welcomed many places but too "hot" to handle with Catholic and Protestant rules rapidly succeeding one another with a weakness for setting new records in executions and tortures successfully performed. "Central and much of western Europe suffered disastrous losses in population and accumulated wealth of human endeavor. Cities disappeared. Commerce declined. In the holocaust, poverty and degradation of civilization became the lot of most who survived."[1]

Comenius survived as a Titan in a tainted age. To understand him one needs an understanding in depth of the type of person he represented: somber, sagacious, hard-working, undaunted, above the vacillations of the age, determined, simple, humble, too busy to give up, given over to a child-like faith in God. His specific aim was narrow--that of improving education of the young in his native Bohemia--but his educational breadth was truly amazing. He sincerely and earnestly planned projects that included the organization and practice of all the knowledge in the

---

[1]John Amos Comenius, The School of Infancy, (Ernest M. Eller, editor) (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1956) p. 17.

world. One of his own principles proclaims the process of proceeding from the particular to the general. So it can be seen from the title of his most famous work--The Great Didactic--that starting from a textbook for teaching Latin he finishes by conceiving the world.

THE GREAT DIDACTIC
Setting forth
The Whole Art of Teaching
All Things to all Men
of
A Certain Inducement to Found such Schools in all
the Parishes, Towns, and Villages of every
Christian Kingdom, that the entire
Youth of both Sexes, none
being excepted, shall

QUICKLY, PLEASANTLY, & THOROUGHLY
Become learned in the Sciences, pure in Morals,
trained to Piety, and in this manner
instructed in all things necessary
for the present and for
the future life,
in which, with respect to everything that is suggested,
Its Fundamental Principles are set forth from the
essential nature of matter,
Its Truth is proved by examples from the several
mechanical arts,
Its Order is clearly set forth in years, months, days,
and hours, and finally,
An Easy And Sure Method is shown by which it can be
pleasantly brought into existence.[1]

The depth and modernity of idea can be seen in a careful reading of this title, amazing as it is when the date of its publication is considered. Comenius is criticized for being a hopeless visionary and attempting too much, but who will condemn him for his grasp on a grand vision, in an

---

[1]Tadasu Misawa, Modern Educators and Their Ideals (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1909), p. 29.

age lacking the courage of a vision? There is a certain nobleness in the attempt.

It is not the purpose to trace here all the wanderings of Comenius. Enough well-written books are extant to fill a library on the subject of Comenius alone. They make excellent reading, no more thrilling in each succeeding age than his own works, especially The School of Infancy, and The Great Didactic. His fame as the father of modern education is proclaimed so from every housetop that no one seems to have delved into just plain John. What was he like? How did he operate? And what did he say?

The last question is the easiest answered, as he wrote what he had to say: sixteen hours a day, and he lived long. The first two questions can be contained in three paragraphs, so this study will be brief on Comenius and try to outline the spirit that stalked the age and then quote a few of his main thoughts.

But back to the tragedy. If sorrow so shapes a man that his understanding and human sympathy make him acceptable as a teacher to many men, then Comenius is partly explained in the tragedy of his life. Time and again, flitting armies burned whole libraries of his manuscripts that represented years of his work. His first wife and two children died. He was unable to live much of the time with his second wife as persecution prodded him from country to country. However, he was intensely vigorous and plodded on: he wrote his Janua--a text for teaching languages--and it was immediately translated into twelve tongues. Publishers beseiged him and printed unfinished drafts when he

only presented them as proofs to be read and corrected. Called to England, Holland, Sweden, and Hungary, he reformed the complete systems of education in Sweden, Hungary, and what was left of Bohemia. For the others, he wrote texts. His School of Infancy has never been surpassed, it is the opposite example of modern jargon. If there is a phrase to characterize his work and life it is utter, indescribable simplicity.

Comenius felt the education of his day to be largely useless. "He was keenly aware of what he regarded as the greatest fault of the contemporary educational system--that pupils were taught mere words without understanding the things which the words signified."[1] Listen to Comenius himself say it:

> My whole method aims at changing the school drudgery into a play and enjoyment. The youth, including the well-born, are treated altogether as if they were slaves; the teachers rest their esteem upon stern faces, rough words, and even in beating, and wish to be feared rather than loved. How many times have I pointed out--privately and publicly--that this is not the proper way, but always in vain! I have also advised from the very beginning that some theatrical plays be introduced, for I have learned from experience that there is no more effective means for the expulsion of mental flabbiness and the arousing of alertness.[2]

This intense sympathy with beginners breathes through all his work. ". . . and, as a master of the Gymnasium at Lissa . . . he had ample means of putting his theories into practice, and of bringing them into harmony with the dust and friction of the classroom."[3] These are

---

[1]Matthew Spinka, John Amos Comenius, That Incomparable Moravian (Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press, 1943), p. 62.

[2]Ibid., p. 129.

[3]M. W. Keatinge, Comenius (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1931), p. 11.

additional characteristics of Comenius--his concern with the practical ends of knowledge and its comprehensiveness.

Now to some considerations of the man. In all the web of words woven about him--13,300 publications by 1911--few describe the man and the act of his teachings. Monroe has this on him:

> . . . it is apparent that he was a man of imposing figure, with high forehead, long chin, and soft pathetic eyes. It is not difficult to read into his sad, expressive countenance the force of the expression in his last published utterance, "My whole life was merely the visit of a guest; I had no fatherland." There is no conflicting evidence on the personal life of the reformer; but rather unanimous agreement on the sweetness and beauty of his character. Says Palacky: "In his intercourse with others, Comenius was in an extraordinary degree friendly, conciliatory, and humble; always ready to serve his neighbor and sacrifice himself. His writings, as well as his walk and conversation, show the depth of his feeling, his goodness, his uprightness, and his fear of God. He never cast back upon his opponents what they meted out to him. He never condemned, no matter how great the injustice which he was made to suffer. At all times, with fullest resignation, whether joy or sorrow was his portion, he honored and praised the Lord." Raumer says of him: "Comenius is a grand and venerable figure of sorrow. Wandering, persecuted, and homeless during the terrible and desolating Thirty Years' War, he never despaired, but, with enduring and faithful truth, labored unceasingly to prepare youth by a better education for a better future. His unfailing aspirations lifted up in a large part of Europe many good men prostrated by the terrors of the times and inspired them with the hope that by pious and wise systems of education there might be reared up a race of men more pleasing to God." Well might Herder say, "Comenius was a noble priest of humanity, whose single end and aim in life was the welfare of all mankind."[1]

However, gleaned here and there by scholars studying this incomparable Moravian and from his own statements, a patchwork results pertaining to Comenius.

---

[1]W. S. Monroe, Comenius (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912), pp. 81-82.

Comenius was a born psychologist and pedagogue. His strong, unyielding faith gave him his sense of purpose. Typical of his undaunted, obstinate courage are his words, "If the corruption of the human race is to be remedied, this must be done by means of careful education of the young."[1] That education begins on the mother's knee, according to Comenius, and continues in harmony with nature. He is the first man to deal scientifically with education, but he said the aims of education are not complex. "Let all things flow spontaneously,"[2] and do not fear the amusement and excitement of the process. Kindle the desire to learn and free the understanding to look squarely at facts. Then, "Let your theories be inseparable from your practice."[3] In that day, he even spelled out growth curves of child development that parallel those plotted today.

Comenius devoted his whole life to the service of mankind. He had a striking personality and strength of character. He was far-seeing, broadminded, and had infinite patience. He himself was a careful and diligent student and said one must know more than he teaches. His gentle nature cloaked a zeal and devotion that tolerated no sham or pretense. He felt his times called for a well-educated generation as a safeguard against chaos. He stimulated the minds of men and had an almost magical influence. He had a quick mind but stressed patient

---

[1]Keatinge, op. cit., p. 15.

[2]Comenius, The Great Didactic, (trans. by M. W. Keatinge) (London: A. & C. Black, Ltd., 1921).

[3]Comenius, The School of Infancy, (Ernest M. Eller, editor) Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1956), p. 4.

repetition in learning. This was in accord with his concern over individual differences.

Today ill things are breathed about the graded system in schools. Be that as it may, in Comenius' time, everything and everybody was placed in the same position regardless of any of the factors that now determine grade levels. His reformation resulting in the introduction of these grade levels was most logical as implementation of his theories of the differences between individuals. As such, it helped escape the rigid formula that bound education at that time.

Comenius was concerned with the shaping and growth of the whole man. His observations in line with this are penetrating and powerful. He implored the shift of focus from words about things to the things themselves. This called for the use of training aids, models, examples, stories, role-playing, pictures and drama. He makes much of the apprehension of knowledge through the senses; he arouses interest by making practical appeal to the student's daily life. Repetition is not dull and lifeless, but makes use of a discreet emotion. Curiosity is aroused by going from the known to the unknown. Comenius, like Socrates, stimulated questions with questions. His introduction to knowledge was natural and sweet. His own inspiration was a joy to pupils which lead to enthusiasm, to excitement, and held attention. His works and teaching illustrate the principle of simplicity, the topical, the useful, and pithy understanding. He held that education is a process of action and reaction.

Comenius' common sense led him to adapt to the intelligence of the pupils--with no clamor of lowering of standards. He did not separate his life from his method. He accepted all social classes of children and was one of the first educators to realize the importance of the social foundations of education. He even advocated educating girls, so Eller says of him, ". . . this Copernicus of education set in motion a tide of educational reform that still swells strong and powerful and affects all our lives. Since then, the world has been trying to convert the visions of this prophet into realities."[1] Being a man of longing, Comenius was extremely tolerant. He appealed to pupil's pride to build in them a sense of dignity. All of this speaks of a philosophy of education, but there is no reason why it can't be called method as the above is all most practical translated into activity rather than semantic squabbles.

Amos "means" loving of knowledge." Of his own vision and sense of purpose, he says, "Thereupon I was continually full of thoughts for the finding out of some means whereby more might be inflamed with the love of learning. . . ."[2] He was humble enough to be willing to learn from others, even pupils. He might have undervalued the past, but with the contemporary emphasis on formalism it is understandable that he wanted to throw out the traditional. He urged teachers to demonstrate rather

---

[1]Ibid., p. 33.

[2]Robert H. Quick, Essays on Educational Reformers (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1912), p. 119.

than persuade. He stressed the essential unity of knowledge and broke his own teaching into simple units. He did not believe there was any value in forcing pupils to learn if a teacher was unable to motivate them. In line with this, he was one of the first educators to acknowledge the importance of peer groups.

Comenius was noble-minded, a man of many and diverse interests who believed in education. He rebelled against the amount of time the schools spent with rules and forms. He himself didn't know how thirsty the world was for what he had to offer, but the astonishing reception of his School of Infancy proved the value of simplicity. The principle underlying his work was that the everyday objects, sights, and occupations of the child had an educative influence which it was the teacher's duty to employ in his own particular task.

There is much of the spirit of Comenius that can only be grasped today by becoming acquainted with his writings. There is ample evidence that he practicised what he suggested and thus time and space would not be wasted to extract his principles from The Great Didactic and present them here:

> The universal requirements of teaching and learning are as follows:
>
> Nature observes a suitable time.
> Nature prepares the material before she begins to give it form.
> Nature chooses a fit subject to act upon, or first submits one to a suitable treatment in order to make it fit.
> Nature is not confused in its operations, but in its forward progress advances distinctly from one point to another.
> In all the operations of nature the development is from within.
> Nature, in its formative processes, begins with the universal and ends with the particular.

Nature makes no leaps, but proceeds step up step.
If nature commence anything, it does not leave off until the operation is completed.
Nature carefully avoids obstacles and things likely to cause hurt.
All the subjects that are to be learned should be arranged to suit the age of the students.
That the knowledge of things should precede their expression in language, and that examples should come before rules.
Nature begins with a careful selection of materials.
Nature prepares its material so that it actually strives to attain the form.
Nature developes everything from beginnings which, though insignificant in appearance, possess great potential strength.
Nature advances from what is easy to what is more difficult.
Nature does not overburden itself, but is content with a little.
Nature does not hurry, but advances slowly.
Nature compels nothing to advance that is not driven forward by its own mature strength.
Nature assists its operations in every possible manner.
Nothing is provided by nature of which the practical application is not soon evident.
Nature is uniform in all its operations.
The method of instruction should lighten the drudgery of learning.
Each rule should be expressed in the shortest and clearest words.
All explanations should be given in the language that the pupils understand.
The student should not be confused with many studies at one time.
Everything should be arranged to suit the capacity of the pupil.
Nothing should be learned by heart that has not been thoroughly grasped by the understanding.
Nothing should be set for pupils to do until its nature has been thoroughly explained to them, and rules of procedure given.
Only those things should be taught whose utility can be easily demonstrated.[1]

This study has not especially emphasized those reformations for which Comenius is credited with the paternity of modern education. Rather, it is considered important here to follow as much as is possible the lamp of universal knowledge again transcending time--as the figure has now been established here--and for a time held aloft by Comenius.

---

[1]F. V. N. Painter, A History of Education (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1912), pp. 228-230.

There are many others not mentioned but no one surpassing Comenius, although it might seem so from the brevity of his treatment here. But brevity is enforced where a man's writings overshadow meager mention made of specific method. Yet it cannot be said that Comenius is lost here. He strides through these pages, as he did across the scarred land of his day "a grand, venerable figure of sorrow. Wandering, persecuted, homeless . . . he yet never despaired, but with enduring truth, and strong in faith, he labored unweariedly to prepare youth by a better education for a better future. He labored with a zeal and love worthy of the chief of the apostles."[1]

Now at the end of this sketch, where it can't interfere with the spirit that this study has attempted to capture; his birth and death. Comenius was born March 28, 1592, at Nivinitz, Moravia. Mention has already been made of the poverty, incredible disaster that dogged him, and his uncomplaining perseverance. At an advanced age, trailing all the tragedy, he wrote, "The one thing needful for myself, therefore, is this: 'Forgetting the things that are behind, and reaching towards those that are before, I press forward.'"[2] In this, the year of Anno Domini, Comenius is still characterized by a forward look.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 230.

[2]Comenius, The School of Infancy (Ernest M. Eller, editor) Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1956), p. 45.

JOHANN HEINRICH PESTALOZZI

> "And yet, however painful this want of help and support was to me, it was favorable to the success of my undertaking, for it compelled me to be always everything for my children. I was alone with them from morning till night. It was my hand that supplied all their wants, both of body and soul. All needful help, consolation, and instruction they received direct from me. Their hands were in mine, my eyes were fixed on theirs.
>
> We wept and smiled together. They forgot the world and Stanz; they only knew that they were with me and I with them. I had neither family, friends, nor servants; nothing but them. I was with them in sickness and in health, and when they slept. I was the last to got to bed, and the first to get up. In the bedroom I prayed with them, and, at their request, taught them till they fell asleep. Their clothes and bodies were intolerabley filthy, but I looked after both myself, and was thus constantly exposed to the risk of contagion.
>
> This is how it was that these children gradually became so attached to me, . . ."[1]

Pestalozzi, with his compulsion for simplicity, called the father of modern education, would abhor the word method used in connection with a description of his work. He had no such thing as a system. A system would have meant the end of his work, for him; and he was quite sure education could not be reduced to a system. Also, he lacked the administrative ability to organize, much less operate, a system.

Faith, hope, love--and the greatest of these is love. The most important characteristic in the acutal teaching of Pestalozzi stands

---

[1]Roger DeGuimps, Pestalozzi, His Life and Work (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1909), p. 154.

stark in the first paragraph quoted from a letter written by the man. His method was love. Despite the sophisticated sneers of those trained in techniques, poor Pestalozzi didn't know enough to do much more than simply accept people for what they were. And even though disciples of lesser vision warped the work of Pestalozzi into a system his basic method was a modest spirit and understanding of people. If one were to limit himself to a strict and specific definition of the teaching method of Pestalozzi it would end here--plotted in the first paragraph. But there are sub-themes to be heard in listening to the man and building a brief characterization of him. The story can be kept simple--as he would have it--while details and expounding can be read in any of the literally hundreds of books written about him since his death.

Pestalozzi was born on the twelfth day of January, the year 1746, at Zurich, a town bordering a lake in the German part of Switzerland. His family was common, his physician father dying when Pestalozzi was six. Accounts of his growing up begin a description that follows him throughout life: odd-looking, careless of personal appearance, brave, an intelligence that grasped things easily, no organizing ability, despairing of detail, he apparently had little to recommend him. Yet, he somehow reached the deeper places of the human soul, and his only tools were boundless spirits, a zeal that at least gave a great sense of purpose, imagination enough to defeat any possibility of fixed method and insure constant experimentation, simplicity, and originality. These things were made manifest when Pestalozzi served at Neuhof, Stanz,

Bungdorf, and Yverdon. These are the names of schools or orphanages where Pestalozzi tried his experiment. Thus endeth the reading on Pestalozzi, unless it be to elaborate.

The best understanding of Pestalozzi comes from his own words: there are two themes. The first theme is of the basic method of Pestalozzi around which he did all his work:

> The principle to which I endeavored to conform all my conduct was as follows: Endeavor, first, to broaden your children's sympathies, and, by satisfying their daily needs, to bring love and kindness into such unceasing contact with their impressions and their activity, that these sentiments may be engrafted in their hearts; then try to give them such judgment and tact as will enable them to make a wise, sure, and abundant use of these virtues in the circle which surrounds them.
>
> In the last place, do not hesitate to touch on the difficult questions of good and evil, and the words connected with them. And you must do this especially in connection with the ordinary events of every day, upon which your whole teaching in these matters must be founded, so that the children may be reminded of their own feelings, and supplied, as it were, with solid facts upon which to base their conception of the beauty and justice of the moral life.
>
> I have generally found that great, noble, and high thoughts are indispensable for developing wisdom and firmness of character. Such instruction must be complete in the sense that it must take account of all our aptitudes and all our circumstances; it must be conducted, too, in a truly psychological spirit, that is to say, simply, lovingly, energetically, and calmly. Then, by its very nature, it produces an enlightened and delicate feeling for everything true and good, and brings to light a number of accessory and dependent truths, which are forthwith accepted and assimilated by the human soul, even in the case of those who could not express those truths in words.
>
> I believe that the first development of thought in the child is very much disturbed by a wordy system of teaching, which is not adapted either to his faculties or the circumstances of his life. According to my experience, success depends upon whether what is taught to children commends itself to them as true, through

> being closely connected with their own personal observation and experience. Without this foundation truth must seem to them to be little better than a plaything, which is beyond their comprehension, and therefore a burden.[1]

So it is seen,that, lacking any administrative ability, Pestalozzi possessed a deep love and noble enthusiasm for humanity. He was utterly unselfish. He had a compassion for those who inherited much of the world's misery; the implication for his teaching is simply that he warmly accepted people and had a profound knowledge of human nature. He knew life itself and yet retained a benevolent, honest confidence in people. This led to no special airs, as his pupils, penning his portrait, write of him as modest and unassuming. Pestalozzi is described as a poetic man with tenderness and a great sense of purpose. He lived his teaching, which was plain but on a high level. He was humble but brave and even spent time in prison by exposing sham in official areas. In all of his teaching, Pestalozzi tried to reach the heart of the child as he never considered education to be concerned with a knowledge of facts, but rather a useful, active involvement of the mind.

Pestalozzi spent much time among people to better understand them. He called himself a servant, dedicated to helping others, especially believing in education of the young. He wrote of going through many years of his own inner turmoil and came out with a deepened sense of humanity and a sympathy that shone in his teaching. It is interesting that most of the pictures recorded of Pestalozzi at work show him surrounded by children, pulling at his hands and hanging on his back.

---

[1]Painter, Great Pedagogical Essays (New York: American Book Co., 1905), pp. 361-363.

He went on to write, as Jesus had said, that all men learn better when knowledge is received as little children. A child without love cannot grow, and the essential principle of the teaching of Pestalozzi is, again, love: a matter of affections, not intellect.

Appropriate here is a list of descriptive words and phrases as a summary to this first theme lying within the teaching method of Pestalozzi:

Pestalozzi was characterized by human sympathy.

He felt a burning sense of mission.

He was honest, faithful and energetic.

His own experience with misfortune deepened his compassion for those with whom he worked.

He won the confidence of people.

He was humble, and also learned from his pupils.

He stumbled on things while experimenting by being ignorant--naive of sophisticated theory.

Pestalozzi made learning a happy experience.

"Simplify, simplify, simplify," he wrote.

He made knowledge exciting to people.

He had a deep understanding of people.

He was generous, sincere, and believed in the importance of each individual.

His teaching had a high moral tone, sound common sense, and reflected a deep, ardent love.

He had a rare insight into human character.

His work reflected enthusiasm, ardour, imagination, originality, wit, eloquence.

Pestalozzi was animated, excited, penetrating, and his teaching was based on a subtlety of observation.

His consciousness of duty made him often lonely, and at times convinced him of failure.

He was an incessant worker; he taught all classes of people.

He wrote, "The first thing to be done was to win the confidence and affection of the children."[1]

He didn't teach down to pupils: I myself learned with the children. Our whole system was so simple and so natural that I should have had difficulty in finding a master who would not have thought it undignified to learn and teach as I was doing."[2]

He had patience: "I always made the children learn perfectly even the least important things, and I never allowed them to lose ground; a word once learnt, for instance, was never to be forgotten, and a letter once well written never to be written badly again. I was very patient with all who were weak or slow, but very severe with those who did anything less well than they had done it before."[3]

The second theme in the teaching of Pestalozzi deals more directly with the specifics of method. The idea has been stressed that Pestalozzi admitted of no set method. However, this so-called "method" comes from the writings of Pestalozzi and was only used as it built firmly on the base established above. The picture here of Pestalozzi is of a man ignorant of formulas of learning, trying any experiment that comes to mind and then writing thus:

1. Sense-impression is the foundation of instruction.

2. Language must be connected with sense-impression.

---

[1]H. Holman, Pestalozzi (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1908), p. 171.

[2]DeGuimps, op. cit., p. 169.

[3]Ibid., p. 168.

3. The time for learning is not the time for judgment and criticism.

4. In each branch instruction must begin with the simplest elements, and proceed gradually by following the child's developments; that is, by a series of steps which are psychologically connected.

5. A pause must be made at each stage of the instruction sufficiently long for the child to get the new matter thoroughly into his grasp and under his control.

6. Teaching must follow the path of development, and not that of dogmatic exposition.

7. The individuality of the pupil must be sacred for the teacher.

8. The chief aim of elementary instruction is not to furnish the child with knowledge and talents, but to develop and increase the powers of his mind.

9. To knowledge must be joined power; to what is known, the ability to turn it to account.

10. The relations between master and pupil, especially so far as discipline is concerned, must be established and regulated by love.

11. Instruction must be subordinated to the higher end of education.[1]

Pestalozzi had no complete, unified system of education. He followed no plan, or order of lessons. He did not limit himself to any fixed time. Life is the great educator and things should be used in teaching rather than abstractions about things. A person is undivided in facing the great issues of life, and Pestalozzi was already saying that education must develop the whole individual to the limits of his

---

[1]Painter, Great Pedagogical Essays, op. cit., p. 353.

capacities. He stressed the principle of spontaneity, which for him meant that people learn by doing: the impulse to development lies within. Intellectual force is subordinate to imagination and sensibility. A man must be free to express himself and words can have meaning only in terms of one's life. Pestalozzi said, "It is well and good for (children) to learn something, but the really important thing for them is to be something."[1]

But what else, specifically, did Pestalozzi do? His experiments led him naturally to work with all sorts of devices. In teaching words and numbers, Pestalozzi designed and used all manner of pictures, aids, models, and materials. He used color, rime, and rhythm. He also drew lessons from the everyday lives of those whom he taught. He was utterly frank, and he, too, asked questions to continually stimulate more questions. He abhored memory minus meaning, although in his confusion knowledge sometimes preceded meaning. But he attempted to find the interest, or any other motivating force in the lives of pupils. "For it is my opinion that if school teaching does not take into consideration the circumstances of family life, and everything else that bears on a man's general education, it can only lead to an artificial and methodical dwarfing of humanity."[2] The starting point in education is from one's needs, desires, and connexions of actual life. This adds to the stature of Pestalozzi: that he was aware of the social foundations of education.

---

[1]Quick, op. cit., p. 307.

[2]Ibid., p. 321.

It was a more simple matter in the day of Pestalozzi to give pupils a sense of purpose. Men, within the religious framework of the day--and this has been true of all the Great Teachers studied thus far--did not flutter about with a great concern over whether or not a child heard such a thing as a god mentioned but dealt quite frankly with the idea that man's end was to glorify his creator in rising to the heights intended for him by that creator. Thus much detail could be considered in terms of destinies. Real destiny is always a matter of what a man has been, is, and can be--the man having a hand in it. This gave real meaning to the pedagogy that instruction be based on the learner's experience, begin simply, develop at the rate of the pupil, and be an individual matter. "Pestalozzi said that education consists in developing according to the natural law the child's various powers, moral, intellectual, and physical, with such subordination as is necessary to their perfect equilibrium. Thus we see the anticipation of the whole aim and method of modern education. All the influences of the preceding years seem to have led up to it, and all the benefits of succeeding years seem to have radiated from this idea. Standing at the meeting point of the old and the new was the man who gave expression to the idea--Pestalozzi."[1]

One of the concerns of Pestalozzi was to experiment in such a way that mothers and other untrained people could help with the education of the young. As a result of this, he tried some things that are new

---

[1]Charles Oliver Hoyt, History of Modern Education (New York: Silver, Burdett and Co., 1908), p. 74.

to many today. "I put a capable child between two less capable ones; he embraced them with both arms, he told them what he knew, they sat lovingly by each other."[1] This use of the peer group, too, stressed the doing of knowing. Whenever possible, Pestalozzi used the natural forces and desires that surrounded him and pervaded his pupils; and thus also were many matters of control solved. And then he knew that happy pupils are learning pupils. "Laughter is a gift of God; let children laugh; encourage merriment in them."[2]

What is there left to say about Pestalozzi and how he taught? Already in this study the analysis of individuals has of necessity at times gone beyond the specifics of how they taught. But with Pestalozzi this need not be so, even though the price is brevity when there is more to the man than could ever be contained in a few pages of words. But the way he himself taught can be quietly characterized by:

1. Love
2. Simplicity
3. Action.

Roger DeGuimps was a pupil of Pestalozzi and can best speak for him:

> At the same time the work of this man was like no other work of the same sort, because it consisted in putting into practice a new idea, and often necessitated the adoption of methods which

---

[1]H. Pestalozzi, How Gertrude Teaches Her Children, (trans. by Holland & Turner) (Syracuse, New York: C. W. Bardeen, 1898), pp. 44-45.

[2]Gabriel Compayré, Johann Heindrich Pestalozzi (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1907), p. 17.

> were the direct opposite of those hitherto in use. For instance, Pestalozzi worked without any settled plan, without any apparent order, and without dividing his children into classes. He was constantly with them, giving proof of his affection for them in everything he did and watching to take advantage of the slightest manifestation of their faculties, powers, and good impulses, like a gardener who, in tending a young tree, waits for its shoots to appear before deciding how to train them. That is why he had not asked for help, and indeed no one could have been of much use to him, an experienced teacher least of all. At first he had neither books nor school material, nor did he ask for any, wishing nothing for his children, beyond the simple necessaries of life, but contact with himself and with Nature.[1]

Yes, in each succeeding school, in his day, usually due to poor administrative ability or the social vagaries of the times, he failed. When he died, he could not know that he had performed a lifetime experiment upon which would be built the present-day system of education. But one thing is certain: if he were alive today, he would gather in some orphans or outcasts of some kind and continue to experiment. History looks back on him as a friend to man, and his letters are filled with the word "friend," as he writes of his work in his experimental schools.

Although this section on Pestalozzi already seems overly long with quotes, when they come from those who knew him firsthand they are invaluable in building a picture of the man who taught so well that in three months ragged and lonely children were drawing educational representatives as observers from most of the important governments of the world. And then one might study in detail the way Pestalozzi taught these children, repeat the method but without the same success. Whatever can be learned of the personality and spiritual essence of the

---

[1]DeGuimps, op. cit., p. 138.

man will help complete the picture of his success. Standing out in all the written accounts of him, whether from pupils or sons of associates, there is paramount the friendliness despite the failures, the humility despite the human incongruities, the love despite the lack of organization.

> In stature, he was rather slender and small, and, although not free from occasional fits of nervous disease, he possessed great powers of endurance. To a fastidious observer, his stooping figure and wrinkled face, surrounded by stiff, bushy hair, presented but little attraction. But the beauty that springs from a pure, unselfish spirit, and a heart full of love and charity for all mankind, ever shone from his countenance, and made one forget the uncouth form and plain features. These constantly reflected the feelings of the moment, changing with the varying moods of his mind; at one time, expressing the heaven of love and affection, and at another, the sadness of care and despondency. When animated, his eyes seemed to move forward like brilliant stars, and then again to retreat, as if they were gazing into the inward immensity of thought. The fire of youth lighted his countenance and shone even through the wrinkles of age. His voice was variously modulated—equally subservient to the gentle accents of love or to the thundering tones of indignation.
>
> His walk was uneven; hasty when impelled by his lively temper, and slow only when absorbed in thought. His chest was deep and round; his neck stiff and strong. Everything about him indicated an instrument in which all the chords of human nature were intensely vibrating, and from which new strains of truth and love must flow. His temper was quick, and easily excited; his conversation animated, and rich in ideas. When at leisure among his friends, he showed an ever-ready wit and much power of repartee, combined with great originality of thought. His vitality and endurance were such, that, during the period of his greatest activity, he usually arose at two or three o'clock in the morning . . . he was uniformly tender and affectionate. To his associates he was at once adviser, friend, and father.[1]

And then this, from another:

---

[1]H. Krusi, Pestalozzi: His Life, Work, and Influence (New York: American Book Company, 1875), p. 17.

> Poor, strange, great man, at once puerile and sublime, awkward in his manners and gestures, but admirable in his intentions and actions. His contemporaries ridiculed and derided him at times. At Zurich, his school-fellows called him a "queer chap"; his neighbors at Neuhof described him as a "crank"; his friends themselves, grieved at his lack of practical ability, said that he would die in a poorhouse or a lunatic asylum. But insult, derision, misadventure, and adversity, all glanced aside from his intrepid mind, without cooling its ardour or disturbing its valiant serenity. He went on to the end, smiling at privations, asking only to live under a thatched roof, there to pursue his dream, insensible to reverses, indomitable and patient. At the same time he was modest, recognizing that he was only seeking to put into practice "what good sense had taught men for thousands of years," and not hiding from himself the imperfections of his unfinished work. "Examine," said he, "everything in what I have proposed, and retain what is good. If some better conception has ripened in your minds, add it to what I have striven to offer you in a spirit of truth and love; but, I pray you, do not reject the whole work, in its entirety and without examination, as though it were a chimera condemned beforehand. . . ."[1]

The line of great teaching surely runs on and includes Pestalozzi, for of him it might truly be said, "Suffer the little children to go to him," and they did.

FRIEDRICH FROEBEL

"Come, let us live with our children." So goes the motto of the man who emphasized the enlargement of life that is possible when at its center is placed man as a creative being. His conviction was that there is a law of universal development applicable to humans as well as to all the rest of nature. The law is based on the demands of childhood, geared to the development of each unique individual, and made purposeful by conceiving man--created in the image of God--as a creator, and releasing the creativity of man. In this process, the teacher acts as a "gardner."

Friedrich Froebel, born 1782, son of a village parson, the village being Oberweisbach, in the Thuringian Forest, in the small principality of Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt. His mother died soon after his birth, and a stepmother loved him until children of her own assigned Friedrich to the area of neglect. It was to have its affects: his biographers claim his great work with young children sought to make up for his own lack of childhood years. Monumental to his memory today are the gardens for children--kindergartens.

It will be enough to indicate the search for self that tried Froebel's first years to say that he was a forester, a tutor, a soldier, and a minerologist before he blossomed into his own when he set up an institute for young children. On this occasion, he looked about him and afterward

said, "From this time onwards I gave all my thoughts to methods of education. . . ."[1] This he did with untiring patience, self-sacrifice, and a lofty idealism of such quality that he gave himself wholly to the task to within days of his death. It was known in his day, even as it is now, that Friedrich Froebel devoted his whole life completely to humanity.

During his time, he neither joined with the impulsive rebels of the day nor the forces of reaction. Yet he was condemned as a rebel. As one might expect, Froebel was poorly received by the professional teachers: thus, he, too, had his Pharisees. As a young man especially, he had his trials and discouragements, and these years are a record of loneliness during which time the fluid parts of his personality were becoming solid. He was a learner all of his life, and this period helped establish his love and respect for individuals.

"(I saw) a man . . . who danced and played with the village children, and therefore went by the name of 'the old fool.' The loving patience and abandon with which he did this, the whole bearing of the man while the children played various games under his direction, were so moving, that tears came into my companion's eyes as well as into my own, and I said to her, 'This man is called old fool by these people; perhaps he is one of those men who are ridiculed or stoned by his contemporaries, and to whom future generations build monuments."[2] Thus writes a woman

---

[1]E. Michaelis and H. K. Moore, Autobiography of Friedrich Froebel, (Syracuse, New York: C. W. Bardeen, 1908), p. 99.

[2]B. Von Marenholz-Bulow, Reminiscences of Friedrich Froebel, (Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1887), p. 1.

who walked with him many years. Later, when she knew even more of Froebel, this Baroness Von Marenholz-Bulow said in awe, "He looks into the innermost nature of the child as no one else has done."[1] Froebel said, "I see in every child the possibility of a perfect man."[2] He had a short pedagogic pedigree; no college degrees. He had earnestness and a willingness to work. He had a passionate love for childhood. He saw as an essential element in the education of men the release of the dormant creativity in every man. His influence has come down as a unique combination of his ideas, the way he expressed them, the social problems of his times, and his disciples. This one disciple, quoted above, knew him in his strengths and weaknesses: that is, she knew him as a saint, not an angel. This posed no problem of relationships as another characteristic of Froebel was his readiness to confess his own ignorance. The only authority he had--and a great deal of it showed--was that born of a sincere conviction. He was modest but confident that he was the bearer of an idea.

This idea, this sense of purpose, was stated by Froebel with a boldness that would be unpopular today. This idea would result in accusing Froebel of all sorts of isms today, but, though it has been carried by almost all the others included thus far in this study, it has not been written of as central. With Froebel it becomes inescapable. Froebel looked others in the eye, and, when speaking of training the

---

[1]Ibid., p. 23.

[2]Ibid., p. 18.

young, said, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God." This has important implications for the method of Froebel because he acknowledged a realization of a divine spirit in man, and a divine order in society. Thus for Froebel, education meant a duty to inspire each person to rise to his intended fulfillment, in harmony with his peculiar temperament, disposition, talents, and character. He held that education is not an accumulation of knowledge, but a process that deals with a real, inner self: the main product is not application but heart. This was stressed in the actual teaching Froebel himself did: techniques had always to be based on heart--a warm heart that beat for its fellow men.

Froebel had little to recommend him as far as his own formal education was concerned. "What good can come out of Nazareth--or, in this case, Oberweisbach"--might have been said of him.

> Froebel in many ways may be called self-educated, for his school-teaching was most superficial; and his aims, and the view he took of what knowledge was essential for attaining them, were entirely original. Unconscious as yet of his inborn power as an educator, he exercised it on himself, and felt continually the failure of all instruction he received by its want of completeness, its absence of harmony with the outward workings of nature, its inferiority to the ideal he had formed. He early felt that there was a world for him to take possession of, to grow and develop in; and a little bit of grammar, a little mechanical arithmetic and geography and geometry, which made up the sum total of his school instruction, seemed all disjointed and purposeless . . . without root or meaning.[1]

Froebel saw to it that none of this was characteristic of either his own teaching or his school. He banished all the purely mechanical and stressed the power of action. Learn by doing was a sincere belief of

---

[1]Ibid., p. 339.

his. His teaching became the model in a model school and he had full opportunity to let teachers and parents observe the advantage of his method of instruction which consisted of drawing out the pupil's own faculties. "His teaching rested on this fundamental principle, that the starting point of all that we see, know, or are conscious of, is action, and therefore that education or human development must begin in action. Through what a man works out, is his inward being developed. Life, action, and knowledge were to him the three notes of one harmonious chord. Book study is ever in his system postponed to the strengthening and discipline of the mental and physical powers through observation and active work. The young creature must be at home in his surroundings,--learn to live, seek to understand outer and visible things, and to exercise its own creative faculty, before it is introduced to the inner world of thought, to symbols and abstractions, and made to gather up the fruit of other men's labor and experience. The unfolding of the human powers lay at the core of his whole theory of education."[1] Much of his teaching took place out in the fields. "If, for instance, butter was spoken of, by the help of suitable motions the cow was milked, the milk was poured into a pan and skimmed, the cream was churned, the butter was made into pats and finally sent to market. Then came the payment, which required little accounts. When the game was over, a different one followed, perhaps something which rendered the little hands skillful by preparing fine weaving from strips of paper; for Froebel had perceived

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 350-351.

that change brought rest."[1]

As Froebel developed his school his main work became one of teaching young women to teach in kindergarten. Even this was original and branded him a rebel by many. Women were not supposed to teach school or especially live and study with Froebel. But Froebel's love for his subject overcame this, and, coupled with his fervent sense of mission, drove him on with his work. Many of his contemporaries said he spoke like a prophet, and his profound enthusiasm, deep feeling, and great energy carried the conviction of the seer. There was about him the added element of mysticism, abetted by a certain eloquence and sense of showmanship.

> If we consider Froebel himself, we find all the makings of a prophet. Besides the fervour and the personal magnetism, the conviction of righness and the self-confidence needed in a leader, he seems to have had an endearing quality which some prophets lack, and his way with children inspired and greatly moved those who saw it. Then the nature of what he taught would make the strongest possible appeal to very many people. They were invited to contemplate children, and what could be lovelier things to contemplate? The holiness of God, the beauty and grandeur of nature, "the army of unalterable law," the order and symmetry of a living yet mathematical universe, wisdom and service, love and gaiety, all were brought together in one great simple scheme. Moreover, his basic views, the background of his system, were expressed very generally so that each reader or listener could fill them out with his own individual vision, and they remained true for people of very different levels of understanding and imagination. The dull details of his scholastic method were given a rosy halo by reflections from the wider glory; and anyway they were so much better than the kind of things done in the mass-production schools of countries fighting their first great war with illiteracy, that as a stage in educational development we cannot disparage them.[2]

---

[1]P. P. Claxton, Sketches of Froebel's Life and Times (Springfield, Mass.: Milton Bradley Co., 1914), p. 69.

[2]E. Lawrence, Friedrich Froebel and English Education (New York: Philosophical Library, 1953), p. 11.

Froebel did not believe in forcing education. His key word was develop, not inoculate, or ingraft. Each individual must develop in accordance with his uniqueness. Froebel was an experimental psychologist; he observed and studied the relationships between mothers and children. "The human organism responds in kind. Strike a man and he strikes, sneer and he sneers, forget and he forgets. If you wish to convince him that you are right, concede that from his point of view he is right, then move the point and he follows. If you keep your temper in teaching a child, you teach him to keep his temper, and this is more important than his lesson."[1] Or consider the knowledge of human nature in evidence in the following:

> "If you are talking with anyone, and your child comes to ask you about anything which interests him, break off your conversation, no matter what may be the rank of the person who is speaking to you." Froebel directed that the child should receive not only love but also respect. The first postulate shows that he valued the demands of the sould far above social forms. Thus it happened that during the first years of the institute, which he then governed himself, he was reproached with paying too little attention to the outward forms, the "behavior," the manners, of the boys entrusted to his care. His characteristic answer was: "I place no value on these forms unless they depend upon and express the inner self. Where that is thoroughly trained for life and work, externals may be left to themselves, and will supplement the other."[2]

This led naturally to the development of inner controls, self-discipline, and spontaneous loyalty and reliability. Any honest belief in individual differences ends in some form of self-activity.

There is about all this with Froebel that same intense practicality that has been seen in the other Great Teachers. He knew that the real

---

[1]Claxton, op. cit., p. 25.

[2]Ibid., p. 64.

business of the school is to teach people how to live. He never considered the school as a place where everyone could gain a lot of factual knowledge. Facts in isolation are not knowledge: they must be compared, classified, organized, and interrelated. Froebel had an impassioned belief in ideas and the influence of a good man. Several of his pupils attested to this as in his case they felt their lives resulted from the wrestlings of Froebel. He held that meaningful, that is, lasting education dealt with the feelings of people. Thus he couldn't help but encourage self-expression and creativity. He said he educated by beauty, but be that as he saw it, he stressed freedom of thought as basic to learning citizenship, tolerance, appreciation, and happiness by experiencing these things.

Froebel was a sincerely humble man who considered other men too learned for him. He knew of the work of others and he also was aware of what they thought of him and his experiments. But his was a fresh, free, vigorous spirit lacking any self-consciousness and with the quiet but firm conviction of himself as the bearer of his idea. It might thus be considered logical that he develop the set of "playthings" he did. He believed people learn by doing, and children especially learn by manipulating things with their hands. First, for the child there is play itself:

> At the moment when we entered, he stood in the midst of the courtyard surrounded by his pupils and a troop of little children, who had wound themselves round him as their central point in the play "Little thread, little thread, like a little wheel," and were just beginning to unwind their skein again. With glowing face and eyes beaming with happiness, Froebel greeted the company, immediately asking whether they would like to see some of the movement

> plays before going up into the hall. The guests were quite willing. With truly childish delight he again conducted some of those ingenious plays, the first gymnastics of the childish limbs. These he had copied from the traditional plays of children and the people, leaving out their rougher features in order to make them serve his educational idea; partly to make children represent, somewhat dramatically, facts out of the life of nature and man.
>
> Froebel said, while he explained the plays to the bystanders, "All these plays, in their elements, have originated from childish instincts; but they must be consciously understood in their meaning and aim, in order to reach their educational end. People think the child is only seeking amusement when it plays. That is a great error. Play is the first means of development of the human mind, its first effort to make acquaintance with the outward world, to collect original experiences from things and facts, and to exercise the powers of body and mind. The child, indeed, recognizes no purpose in it and knows nothing, in the beginning, of any end which is to be reached when it imitates the play it sees around it, but it expresses its own nature, and that is human nature, in its playful activity. The further its development proceeds the more significant are its various movements which we know as the movements of the human being, from which all human culture has originated. But this is only the case when these movements can express themselves unhindered and unfalsified, and the child's nature has not been perverted and led into false paths. The human instinct needs guidance by free movements, while the brute instinct finds its goal without guidance. This guidance can only be given by one who knows the goal which is to be reached by the manifold activity of the blind, natural feeling of the child. Without rational, conscious guidance, childish activity degenerates into aimless play instead of preparing for those tasks of life for which it is destined.[1]

Thus Froebel encouraged and organized play. Then he designed his celebrated "10 gifts" of boxes, balls, and cubes with which he broke teaching into its simplest elements. The last few devices were sticks and rings adaptable to diverse combinations, and all far in advance of their time in gearing training to the natural development of children.

---

[1]Von Marenholz-Bulow, op. cit., pp. 66-67.

With all of this, there is this caution: Froebel's teaching is based on the principle of a perfect love for children, an understanding of their nature, and the desire to give the understanding sympathy that children need. These energies should not be repressed, tieing up their bodies, shutting their mouths, and considering questions to be an interruption. As stated above, there is often a high meaning in play; it should be studied and acted upon, as hints given by nature. From the viewpoint of the child, nothing is trifling that forms part of his life. It must be kept in mind that certain qualities of mind are necessary in the teacher. No system of education can attain its end apart from the personalities of the persons carrying it out. The teacher must have a liking for children and not teach as though their chatter and play is beneath him. One must become as a child to teach children, and this is no condescension. Unvarying cheerfulness and kindness form a part of the type. Froebel would never have any aspect of the nature of the child developed to the exclusion of any other. Take pains to develop the whole person, was his plea. This also meant that the mind was not to be trained at the expense of the body. Froebel also encouraged song and rhythm as devices to aid in educating the young. These principles led into the development of the ten gifts which he used in his schools.

But in conclusion, what of the most important thing, what of Froebel himself? Evidence is rampant--in many of the above quotations taken from his own pupils--that Froebel used his own devices and followed his own philosophies. And much of the man has already marched between the lines

of this writing. Yet there is more, even though there is no end to the description of a man of this type. It is important to note, however, that the same qualities that made many of the other teachers great endeared Froebel to his pupils; and they are qualities of personality, aside from systems, experiments, and philosophies. They have sounded before in this thesis.

- he talked with fire, deep conviction, and powerful though not learned speech.
- he inspired people, moved them to tears.
- his spirit was compelling, contagious.
- he was vivid, impressive, stimulating.

But better still, let a pupil of his speak:

> His long nose, strong chin, and large ears, behind which the long locks, parted in the middle, were smoothly brushed, would have rendered him positively ugly, had not his "Come, let us live with our children" beamed so invitingly in his clear eyes. People did not think whether he was handsome or not; his features bore the impress of his intellectual power so distinctly that the first glance revealed the presence of a remarkable man. Yet I must confess--and his portrait agrees with my memory--that his face by no means suggested the idealist and man of feeling; it seemed rather expressive of shrewdness, and to have been lined and worn by severe conflicts concerning the most diverse interests. But his voice and his glance were unusually winning, and his power over the heart of a child was limitless. A few words were sufficient to win completely the shyest boy whom he desired to attract; and thus it happened that, even when he had been with us only a few weeks, he was never seen crossing the courtyard without a group of the younger pupils handing to his coat-tails and clasping his hands and arms. Usually they were persuading him to tell stories, and when he did so, older ones flocked around him too, and they were never disappointed. What fire, what animation the old man had retained![1]

---

[1]Claxton, op. cit., p. 71.

It is often the tragedy of the slow tread of time that men such as Froebel are too much advanced to be recognized for their greatness while they live. It remains for other generations and even other lands to resurrect and revere their names and works. Truly the commoness of the kindergarten today tells of this in the case of Friedrich Froebel. Then, too, Froebel is another perfect example of what is often missed today: education may be plotted by a pattern of codes, systems, and techniques--all respectable and contributing something. But a keen observer will consider that in many cases an element is lacking. Techniques alone--as Froebel proves--do not teach. Central to the drama of teaching is the teacher. And the core of the teacher is his personality. Methods alone do not survive minus the life-breath of the dynamic spirit of the person laboring under a conviction, with enthusiasm and in mind of his role as co-creator. This was the essence of Froebel; the man, who, keenly aware of this with all its implications, said, "Come, let us live with our children."

HORACE MANN

Boston June 30th, 1837.

To His Honor George Hull & the
Rev. Emerson Davis.

Gentlemen,

I received your communication last evening, informing me that I had been elected their Secretary by the Board of Education. I accept the Office with gratitude, but, at the same time, with such a consciousness of my inadequacy, as inspires me with the most strenuous desire that the Board will give me their constant guidance & cooperation in the discharge of its duties.

Be pleased, Gentlemen, to make known to the Board, my sincere acknowledgments for this testimonial of their favor, & to accept for them & for yourselves the assurances of my respect & esteem,

Horace Mann

His Honor Geo. Hull & the Rev. Emerson Davis./Com-tee.[1]

The above letter launches a look at one who is often considered the greatest American educator. That same letter launched Horace Mann on a voyage over educational seas that were anything but calm. It climaxed a period of inner turmoil which terminated a brilliant law career and began a life of concern with education that burned and frothed with intensity, allowing no peace even on the deathbed of him who committed his life to the common public school. "Without any question the noblest figure in the history of education in (America)

---

[1]Horace Mann Centennial Issue, Commonwealth of Mass., Department of Education, 1937, No. 5.

is that of Horace Mann."[1]

A few facts of the life of Horace Mann should be wuickly sketched. He was born May 4, 1796, in Franklin, Mass. He came from a poor, rural background, his father dying when Horace was thirteen. His mother raised the family with help from the children. A stern, Calvinist preacher had a decided influence on the life of Horace Mann, as did the death of an older brother. Tragedy kept close to Mann, and while successful at law, two years of married life were allotted to him; a beloved wife, Charlotte, daughter of the president of Brown university which Mann attended, died in his arms, his hair becoming white while he sat the night alone with the breathless body. He brooded for a time but could not repress his interests in matters of humanity, and he devoted much energy to causes involving local prohibition, slaves, and mentally deranged. Then came the letter and Horace Mann made his decision.

Typical of the serious approach to life, Mann shut himself away for weeks studying education. This is important because it indicates a character that can be alone and reflect. When he emerged, he said, "Henceforth I devote myself to the highest welfare of mankind upon earth. May God grant me to subdue my egotism and give me wisdom of mind and kindness of heart."[2] This statement of humility sets the tone of this

---

[1]Gabriel Compayré, Horace Mann and the Public School in the United States (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1907), p. 3.

[2]Horace Mann Centennial Issue, op. cit., p. 64.

portrait in which it is impossible to distinguish the personality of the man from the method of the teacher.

Now to complete the matter of the framework of facts: as the first secretary of the Board of Education of the state of Massachusetts, Horace Mann, issued, during that career, twelve annual reports which stand as monumental in the history of educational thought. Written as reports to the board, they nonetheless inspire awe as a complete and searching statement of a philosophy of education that added stature to America the world over as surely as victory in any war has ever done. Following the time of the 12th Report, Horace Mann was nominated as governor of Massachusetts, lost, and accepted the first presidency of Antioch College in Yellow Springs, Ohio. He died in a room crowded with students, talking of his plans for the college.

"If ever there be a cause, if ever there can be a cause worthy to be upheld by all the toil or sacrifice that the human heart can endure, it is the cause of education."[1] Horace Mann had a devotion to and faith in humanity that patterned everything he did. The tremendous energy with which he championed the cause of the common school--giving lectures all over the country and writing prodigiously--resulted in reforms that have set the pattern of education in America as distinctly American, apart from European. No man ever worked harder than Horace Mann, or with more ardor: he believed in activity as a principle in education and was himself its greatest practitioner. He had an intense will

---

[1]Ibid., p. 63.

power, and with his background as a poetic and eloquent lawyer and statesman, he inspired people while almost singlehandedly molding a school system from the clay of a new nation and living the opposite of his dictum: ignorance is a crime. He had a great power of imagination, and regardless of what is thought today about some of his ideas, only a free, creative, and original spirit could suggest in that day the establishment of Normal schools, or gaining the confidence of people by including the desires of parents and laymen in plans for schools.

"We want no men who will change, like the vanes of our steeples, with the course of the popular wind; but we want men who, like mountains, will change the course of the wind."[1] Small wonder that Horace Mann was unpopular in Boston--he who upset established things of tradition. Given a different time, place, and circumstances, he might have been added to those who march up Golgotha to share, with thieves, the lot of those who speak prophetically of things that ought to be. Mann was reproached for his lack of scholastic experience as society finds what it can to justify crucifixion of those who speak freely and with an authority born of an idea. A society of mediocrity is blinded by one of whom it was said, "his devotion to truth and right, his sense of duty, his unselfishness, his benevolence were very marked. His moral earnestness was something tremendous and constituted the first of the two great motive powers of his life."[2] The results of the work of Horace Mann give mute evidence of him as a great organizer and administrator.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 65.

[2]B. A. Hinsdale, Horace Mann and the Common School Revivial in the United States (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913), p. 268.

> After having sketched the thinker and the citizen statesman united with the pedagogue, it remains to show the practical teacher, who enters into all the details of instruction and of education, who, not content with having been for several years initiator, instigator, counsellor, disseminator of ideas, ends by being himself director, educator, professor, administrator. From this moment, there is no question of methods, or procedure, of courses of study, of books, that he does not study closely and on the spot, and that he does not then treat in his annual reports, a considerable and original work, at once a statistical document, a vehement appeal to public opinion, a series of historical, moral, economical, pedagogical essays. In three months, he himself visited eight hundred schools, and received trustworthy reports from a thousand others. Acting upon this information, he denounces the wretched condition of the schoolhouses, the mediocrity of the masters, the neglect of the committees, the inaction of the inspectors, the bad quality of the books, the indifference of the public. It is by wielding with an untiring hand this arm of publicity that he succeeds in imposing reforms, planned beforehand and to the last detail, with a remarkable mixture of practical precision and high inspiration.[1]

It is far from the point of this thesis to hold any theological brief. Be that as it may, when speaking of the motive power in the man, it is impossible to understand Horace Mann without acknowledging his basic philosophy of Calvinistic morality. Psychologists studying motivation have written of the drive furnished as a concommitant of this philosophy. The drive is one that also determined that Horace Mann was not a theorist, but a man of practical talents, devoted to the practical and useful. "A man of action before all, a nature swayed by inspiration rather than reflection, Mann had not the leisure and lacked, moreover, the power of abstraction necessary for constructing a philosophy of his own. In his agitated and feverish life he found no time to

---

[1]Horace Mann, Lectures and Annual Reports on Education, Cambridge, 1867, pp. 540-541.

condense his thoughts or to write learned treatises. Undoubtedly he wrote a great deal, as he spoke a great deal, but all his writings, whether reports, lectures, or speeches--we were about to say sermons--were primarily action, and bore the stamp of the orator. He had no personal philosophy beyond an ardent faith in progress and the indefinite perfectibility of the human race."[1] Still, he did not love knowledge for its own sake. In his own teaching, slavish memory played little part, while it was an awakened intelligence he was after. "Every day of my life impresses the conviction upon me more and more, how important is the early direction given to the sentiments as well as to the intellect."[2] "Intelligence, strictly so called, the intelligence which reasons, which analyzes, which decides dryly and coldly, is not Mann's affair. He deliberately subordinates the reasoning being to the being of sentiment; and it is precisely here that we must seek the secret of his strength, of the sovereign power which his inspired eloquence exerted over his contemporaries. He was, above all, a man of heart--one who surrendered himself to the instincts of a noble nature, who felt before thinking, and whose sentiments, brimful of the sap of spring, overflowed and brimed with life, youth, and freshness."[3] "Mann's pedagogy consisted chiefly of morality."[4] Now then: a drive to action, a serious purpose, an acknowledgment that in the final

---

[1]Compayré, op. cit., p. 72.

[2]Mann, Lectures and Annual Reports on Education, op. cit., p. 63.

[3]Compayré, op. cit., p. 82.

[4]Ibid., p. 84.

analysis all purpose is empty if not related to a concept of God and a created order, a genuine respect for each individual and an awareness of their differences; and his second wife summarizes him thus: "Love of man was to essentially the impelling power in him, that it cost him no effort to exercise it. . . . Perhaps the most remarkable trait in his character was his modest estimate of himself. . . . Principles were more to him than even friends. . . . He was earnest . . . (he had) a tenderness of character equalled by a moral force. . . ."[1]

A knowledge of life such as that possessed by Horace Mann can only come from intimate contact with life. Biographers intent on his greatness often neglect his humanness. Some have followed him and picture him in the boardinghouses where he lived as witty, full of stories and anecdotes, contributing his own money to his causes, a man genial and kind with a rich, nervous temperament. In more official language, Felix Pecaut has a summary statement on the life and methods of Horace Mann:

> He knows his people and his times; he has seen moral and social forces, voluntary or official, in action under his eyes; he has observed men and things close at hand, mingling actively with them himself; he has especially measured the power of that sovereign force called public opinion; he knows of what diverse elements it is formed; that it is far from infallible, but that without it nothing fruitful or durable is accomplished. But parlimentary tumult and heated party strife do not deceive him; he discerns the true conditions of public order and of society; he sees clearly that the old foundations are shaken, that the state is threatened with ruin, if steps are not taken at once to

---

[1]Mrs. Horace Mann, Life of Horace Mann (Boston: Lee and Shepard Publishers, 1891), p. v.

> establish new foundations, proof against all shocks. It is, then, the highest political and social interest, it is patriotism and anxiety for the future that urge him on to occupy himself with education. In both careers he remains faithful to himself, pursuing a single end by like means. A statesman, a man of action, he does not administer educational affairs, he does not teach like a schoolmaster, bent to the routine of his trade; he aims at positive results, he seeks to reach the soul of the people, of all the children of the people; he seeks to call intelligences into the light, to reach consciences, to form of every citizen, a man, to act in an appreciable and immediate manner on life. What more is there to say? He treats education seriously, as the noblest, the most important, the most difficult of public affairs, but one which must for this very reason be conducted as politicians conduct serious affairs. And in order to succeed, he begins with the necessary preliminaries of every ideal undertaking in a democratic state; he undertakes a vast and incessant propaganda; he multiplies lectures and reports, he organizes everywhere committees and associations of committees, creating thus a public spirit capable of giving life and permanence to his projects.[1]

Horace Mann believed strongly in the power of a great and good influence. And he in turn was able to communicate his enthusiasm to other men. He, like Jesus, used extreme language. "If one should bring you word tomorrow that he had found a coal mine which would bring in ten percent, would you not hasten to invest in it? And yet here are men who might bring you in forty or fifty percent, and you leave them grovelling in ignorance. You know how to make use of plants and animals, you can produce food from herd's-grass and turn the jackel into a dog; . . . and you have children of whom you can make nothing! You build hospitals, you establish law-courts. Why? To punish people for the ignorance which has made them criminals; to harbor poor wretches who have failed here below for lack of instruction. But are you not

---

[1]Mann, Lectures and Annual Reports on Education, op. cit., pp. 530-531.

yourselves the unconscious authors and accomplices of these evils which you vainly seek to prevent or to cure? Build schools then; you will thus abolish ignorance, crime, and misery. You will quench hatred and make the happiness and greatness of the nation through the prosperity and morality of each of its citizens."[1] This is vigorous language. This is the lucid talk of a prophet--not a forecaster, but a seer. This is the authority born of conviction of a man of vision with a strain of mysticism. Teaching, and writing, like this utilizes just the right amount of showmanship. This is only a small example of the aptness and modernity of the ideas of Horace Mann. Consider the degree of modernity of enlisting the help of parents in the school, of determining the desires of children--indicating a genuine love for children--of stressing rewards rather than punishments, of adjusting teaching to individual differences, of building inner controls and stimulating self-activity, of having pupils help one another--and then know that this is but a partial list gleaned from the treasure of the twelve annual reports. And then add the testimony of two others:

> Mann did not wish to make himself feared, but loved; and to obtain good work and order, he counted upon the affection which a kind and competent master inspires in his pupils, as well as upon the charms of learning and the interest aroused by well-taught lessons.
>
> Without knowing Herbart he agreed with him when he says, "One hour a day spent by the professor in preparing an attractive lesson will dispense with many severities on his part." And elsewhere: "For a teacher to succeed he must have won the affection of his pupils. The child will learn nothing, not

---

[1]Compayré, op. cit., p. 26.

> even mathematics, from a teacher he does not like." To express the depressing effects which a system of terror has on the mind, he says: "You cannot fail to have seen the trunk of an old tree bearing the scars of a wound it has received in its youth: all the wounded side has remained twisted and gnarled, whereas on the other side of the tree, nourished by a superabundant sap, has attained a disproportionate size. This is the exact image of a man whose youth has been distorted by an excess of severity."[1]

And,

> He condemned the traditional method of teaching reading as artificial, wasteful of time, and partly ineffectual. He saw that children in schools needed reading matter to supplement their school readers. He believed in teaching science, and advocated objective, illustrative, and oral teaching in the elementary schools. He pleaded for more rational and humane methods of disciplining and governing children. He understood the relation of mental cultivation to physical health and vigor. He laid hold of the spirit of the inductive method; he knew that the child's knowledge is made up of bits, and not of large generalizations.[2]

Beyond the tenets and terms of techniques, Horace Mann did not neglect a little point that is often glossed over: As is the teacher, so is the school. "Teaching is the most difficult of all the arts, and the profoundest of all the sciences."[3] "The ability to acquire and to impart are wholly different," appears in the Fourth Annual Report. How then, did Horace Mann himself fare as a teacher? His teaching must be looked at in his role as the teacher of several courses he reserved for himself at Antioch College. ". . . he was, according to the testimony of his pupils, an accomplished teacher. His teaching was

---

[1]Compayré, op. cit., p. 109.

[2]Hinsdale, op. cit., p. 272.

[3]Mann, The Republic and the School, (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1957), p. 235.

stimulating and suggestive."[1] Just as with Socrates, his aim was to stimulate reflection and to awaken an interest, a mental activity. He was incomparable at kindling a flame of enthusiasm. "A man might as well hope to dwell near the sun unmoved as not to glow when brought to feel his fervid love of truth and heartfelt zeal in its quest."[2] His eyes were radiant, and his cheerful spirit was so contagious that indifference was dispelled and replaced with a hearty enthusiasm. He was conscientious and candid and never tread on the sanctity of individuals but respected them and their opinions which added to his ability to inspire. He had a pleasant expression, a lithe form, an elastic and resilient step with a dignified bearing that spoke of a strength of self-conquest and virtue. He was known as a kind and solicitous adviser and a man whose tenderness built such a feeling of remorse in rowdy pupils that the attainment of self-discipline was coveted by students. He had a lively curiousity himself which he followed with an animation that struck sparks in others. He encouraged, was sympathetic, intelligent and loved by his pupils. This concern with people shows in his saying, "If I can discover by what appliance of means a non-thinking, non-reflecting, non-speaking child can be most easily trained into a noble citizen ready to contend for the right to die for the right--may I not flatter myself that my ministry may not be wholly in vain?"[3]

---

[1]Compayré, op. cit., p. 107.

[2]Mann, Lectures and Annual Reports on Education, op. cit., p. 546.

[3]Horace Mann Centennial Issue, op. cit., p. 63.

Accounts of the death of Horace Mann in a room at Antioch College emphasize to the last moment the personality of the Great Teacher. A few weeks before, in an address at the college, he had said, "Be ashamed to die until you have won some victory for humanity."[1] The victories for humanity won by Horace Man were legion. But even so, such is not the most important consideration in this thesis. The thing is: why was he a great teacher? And, as suggested earlier, Horace Mann gives positive proof to the premise that the personality of the man is the sleeping giant in the teacher. Awaken it, stimulate it, and a teacher is born. Not just any personality will do, but woven through all that has been written about Horace Mann is the strength and power of the man who said, "God grant me an annihilation of selfishness, a mind of wisdom, a heart of benevolence."[2] The life and works of Horace Mann show the result of a man committed to a course of action. A course of action growing out of the purpose pledged when Horace Mann made his decision and said, "Let the next generation, then, be my client."[3]

---

[1]Ibid., p. 65.
[2]Ibid., p. 64.
[3]Ibid.

MARK HOPKINS

It is a refreshing thing to sit in the presence of Mark Hopkins. There is much about him that is so unlike the others. Yet, he is known solely for that which is the subject of this study: great teaching. Although he was an administrator it is not that for which he is known. He wrote but is not best known as an author. He seemed to pride himself on not being a scholar so he is not secure in history because of his scholarship. His students and colleagues often claimed that he was not an original thinker in terms of new knowledge, which eliminates originality as a criterion with which to gage the greatness of Hopkins. He did not seem to have much practical ability and he never founded any system of thought or formulated any philosophy. He didn't seem to have been much concerned with the science, or system of education. It is thus a testimony to the power and wisdom of his manhood that he had any influence, in view of what might be expected of such a man. "Mark Hopkins became the classic figure as which he stands forth in the field of American education simply through the direct personal instruction of his pupils."[1]

It is not in the least bit an over-statement to say that Mark Hopkins launched a legend. "When the United States government issued a series of postage stamps honoring American educators in 1940, it

---

[1]M. A. Howe, Classic Shades (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1928), p. 85.

singled out Hopkins to represent the small liberal arts college. In the company of the great Eliot of Harvard, of a pioneer like Booker T. Washington of Tuskegee, or of a friend of the common schools like Horace Mann, Mark Hopkins was not out of place. His name long since had become synonymous with an American educational ideal."[1] This brings up his connection with Williams College and the few basic dates necessary in considering him.

Mark Hopkins was born in Stockbridge, Massachusetts, on February 4, the year 1802. Noticeable in him is the strong Puritan strain he inherited from those who conceived him, resulting in a belief he didn't try to force on anyone else, but simply setting himself as an example of a way of life. This belief had implications for his pedagogy, as a religious end, purpose, and meaning undergirded his teaching. He frankly made an appeal to the moral in man. He went on record as saying that instruction merely formed the intellect while influence molded the moral character. He went to medical school and graduated which accounts for the Dr. Hopkins of his biographers. But fate had it that he was called to teach at Williams College in 1830, where, four years before, he had tutored. This Williams College, dating from 1793, had an interesting parentage in Colonel Williams, an Indian fighter who was killed in ambush. It was not his fault that the free-school he endowed with his will was later changed to Williams College by an act of the Massachusetts legislature. The end result of these events for the purpose

---

[1]Frederick Rudolph, Mark Hopkins and the Log (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1956), p. vii.

of this study is that Mark Hopkins spent sixty years at Williams, thirty-six of them as its president. When, in 1836, Williams College was looking for a president, the entire senior class petitioned for the thirty-four-year-old Hopkins. This was a fortunate combination of circumstances because Williams had trouble getting presidents due to its extreme isolation. It was severed from civilization by two mountain ranges and communication with the outside world was weekly by horsecart. As an aside here--and as this study deals with teaching method--Emerson was quite sure of the subtle influence of the mountains as teachers. This study surely does not say the last word about the training of the thinking of man when it deals exclusively with human personalities. But as regards Mark Hopkins, his name became synonymous with that of Williams College. The oft-misquoted statement of President of the United States James Garfield was that for a college he defined it as a student at one end of a log and Mark Hopkins at the other. During the times in question, Mark Hopkins <u>was</u> Williams College.

The fact that Hopkins gave up his medical plans and returned to Williams College indicates his sense of dedication, purpose, or mission in life. In line with what has been said about the times of other Great Teachers, Mark Hopkins fulfilled a deep-felt need of his day. The surge of freedom was suggesting new ideas and modes in many areas. Characteristic of the age was lack of much to tie to, or on which to base a philosophy. The fact that a man as human, common, and serene as Mark Hopkins could stand as he did gave a sense of direction to many.

It is true that his scope is less in history than many of the other great men included in this study. This is part of the purpose of his appearance here: to indicate to the student of great teaching that one need not be a savior of the world in order to make a contribution. The key to Mark Hopkins is a matter of character; there is about him a largeness, a nobility that is based on his courage to have stood--willy-nilly--for a point of view, a way of life. He has been characterized as a man stalwart and elevated like the mountains among which he lived and mused. It was this stable, calm look at life that caused many people to comment on his greatness as a teacher. "The following letter is from a pupil in the ministry, Rev. Dr. Addison P. Foster, of Roxbury:--'I shall never cease to be thankful that God in his goodness permitted me to receive training at your hand. Next to my sainted father, whose influence on me to the day of his death was constant and most helpful, I owe more to you than to any other man. Not long since a gentleman remarked to me, All Williams men have a family resemblance. They all bear the mark of the same master mind. I have heard this remark more than once. I am thankful that I can call you my mental father. . . .'"[1]

There is not much more to include as to matters of dates and places. He had ten children and it is expected that this had something to do with his knowledge of people, his indulgence of student antics, and his being loved by them as a father, teacher, counselor, and guide.

---

[1]Franklin Carter, Mark Hopkins (New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1892), p. 128.

He would not have fared well today with the patterns of conformity prescribed for college professors as he enjoyed eating chestnuts and drinking root beer with the undergraduates. Garfield, when first approaching Williams as a student and meeting Mark Hopkins, wrote, "I feel that he is a good man. He certainly is a great thinker, though I should say not a very original one. . . . On the whole I think he is a good man."[1] There were a number of imperfections about Hopkins that made him all the more human. He was a triumphant example of what Emerson meant when he said it matters little what a man learns--the question is with whom one learns.

And even so Mark Hopkins labored at Williams College for the sixty years and acquired greatness in teaching and a place in history because of it. "In the classroom he displayed his greatest talents, teaching with a freshness and charm that were not ordinary at the time. His students, too, caught some of the enthusiasm which he held. . . ."[2] This marks another appearance of that important ingredient of great teaching: enthusiasm. Mark Hopkins made his classes more than meanderings of memory. He was a great teacher, not an encyclopedia of great books. Occasionally his power was based on impressive oration, but more often it was simply a matter of vigor. Someone said of him that he even sat with energy. Photographs seldom caught him leaning back in a chair; he seemed poised for flight on its edge. Descriptions of him

---

[1]Howe, op. cit., p. 103.

[2]Rudolph, op. cit., p. 21.

by his pupils are almost unanimous in acclaiming the force and power of his personality.

> Hopkins' won enthusiasm for his work, the all-encompassing nature of the subject he taught, and even his magnificent physical frame created a classroom atmosphere from which student tributes might come. Yet it was his method of teaching which led students like Whitney, Garfield, and Armstrong to the conclusion that their own mental powers were being magnificently expanded under the president's tutelage. 'What do you think?' was the disarming and at that time unique question with which he frequently punctuated his classes. Students, unaccustomed to being asked what they thought, experienced a sense of growth merely in the presence of the question. Furthermore, Hopkins did not insist that students agree with him. He did not care whether they had paid much attention to the textbook or whether they had committed any of it to memory. He did not push abstruse points to their furthest refinement, preferring to deal in generalities which would leave his students free to explore for the refinements themselves. He introduced a bit of novelty into his teaching by pioneering in the use of visual classroom aids: in 1841 he enlivened his discussion with a lifesize model of a man made by the French physician, Louis Auzoux. In 1845 he added a skeleton to his classroom equipment, and in the 1870's he bagan to make extensive use of the blackboard to illustrate the main outlines of his "moral system."
>
> He never took attendance and would have preferred that the dullards in the class stayed away; since they generally attended, he chose instead to ignore them. The students themselves he knew as intimately as possible, calling upon them in their rooms, conversing with them freely about their problems in his study and on the college walks. "Your instruction . . . appears to have been a turning point for me" was the verdict of E. P. Roe. . . . Hopkins carried this fatherly concern into the classroom; the questions which he asked did not follow an alphabetized class list but were directed wherever he thought they might do the most personal good. He turned his classes into friendly disputations, in which his students were his fellow companions in the search for truth. His criticism, although sometimes sarcastic, was friendly and frequently touched with humor.[1]

Following, for purposes of clarification, is a short list culled of the components of the personality of Mark Hopkins:

---

[1]*Ibid.*, pp. 49-50.

- magnetic
- sincere
- honest
- friendly
- lofty
- dignity
- tact
- common wisdom
- good judgment
- solidity of character

One of the most important things about him is that he was a friend. He had a sincere respect for individuals and treated students respectfully and as equals. He was humble and did not take himself too seriously or let the seriousness of his position interfere with his humanity. Extremely important also was his ability to keep a youthful outlook. His humorous and witty comebacks in his classes had no little to do with his fame.

Mark Hopkins was not greatly original. He made the best of the existing order and has been labelled conservative. He did give a fresh force to old ideas. He inherited the wisdom of Socrates in this and even used the Socratic question-and-answer repartee to induce independent thinking. His own thinking was clear and discriminating. But with all this, Mark Hopkins was not a great scholar. "What he did possess--and this cannot be emphasized too strongly--was the native quality of a memorably great teacher. Through all the ages there have been men of

natural wisdom and authority, of powers that sprang from within. It is these men, of whom Mark Hopkins appears to have been one, whose teaching bears fruit most abundantly in the direction and strengthening of character."[1] He was aware of the universality of knowledge which established him as being undogmatic. He enriched his teaching with his own thinking, but: "The cultivation of individuality, the drawing forth of views opposed to his own, were what he professed to desire, and doubtless he did, for the resources of his mind and his skill in dialectics gave him an advantage over undergraduate disputants which he must have enjoyed exercising--to the real enlargement of the minds of his pupils. As he grew older his weapon of irony, once freely employed, fell into disuse. Congratulated one day on having cornered several men in a single recitation hour, he replied, with a touch of indignation, 'I never do that; I never corner men.' The reported incidents of his dealings with students suggest a happy relationship with them."[2] His skill at this deals directly with his method:

> He gave out a lesson in advance, more, it seems, to bring his pupils together in an appropriate frame of mind than with any expectation that it would be closely studied before the hour of meeting. The topics, in all his books, often supplemented by the use of blackboard diagrams which he had employed successfully in his Lowell Lectures, had generally to do with the fundamental moral ideas on which life as he saw it was based. He did not much care whether certain indifferent students came to the classroom or not, though, as a matter of college discipline, they were required to attend.
>
> The hour was devoted ostensibly to a discussion of the assigned topics, but often it ranged far beyond them. 'What do <u>you</u>

---

[1]Howe, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 113.

[2]<u>Ibid.</u>, p. 107.

> think about it?' was his favorite and hominem question. Many of the propositions in his books seem capable of eliciting wide divergencies of opinion.[1]

And,

> His skill in answering questions was not inferior to his skill in asking them. His own enjoyment of the sallies and of the effect which they produced on the class was perfectly unrestrained and natural, and seemed to bring him into closer sympathy with his students. But there was never the slightest sacrifice of dignity, or loss of control. He would sometimes tell an old story, but however old it was, it always had a sharp application. Very few of his reminiscences of his quick perception or ready wit have been preserved.[2]

He was able to stimulate students to learn by these methods. This is, of course, the essence of learning by doing, or learning based on self-activity. Garfield once wrote that he had done as much in a day or two as he otherwise did in four, but Dr. Hopkins was so infinitely suggestive. "By his admirable method of educing the powers of his students, by treating them, in a sense, as his equals in the field of discussion, he evoked the consciousness of an independent and vigorous intellectual life, of more worth then the most perfect system of philosophy."[3] Relating all of this back to his scholarship it is apparent that the greatest scholars are not necessarily the greatest teachers.

The mystery of the personality of a man has its measure of tragedy: so little of it can "transmigrate," as it were, to another. Component

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 106-107.

[2]Carter, op. cit., p. 111.

[3]Ibid., p. 130.

parts of a personality can be considered but the magical total measure is elusive. Mark Hopkins had a keen, kind eye; a persuasive voice. He claimed he was a mystic. He was sometimes despondent and gloomy but not with students. His strength was in his sincerity, fairness, and optimism. He aimed consciously at destroying the confusing walls of narrow thought. There is this physical description of him:

> . . . he possessed the dignity of a tall, spare, awkward man, of aquiline and intellectual aspect, with a pronounced chin,--a feature, as he taught his pupils, belonging to man alone and serving as an index of individual capacity,--with deepset, bright eyes, so shaded with long, thick lashes that it was hard to tell their color. 'Seasoning his words with a gracious voice,' wrote one of his admirers, and surely this essential element of personality must have enhanced his power as a lecturer and preacher.[1]

He emphasized creating a sense of purpose in what he did and then communicating this purpose to others. In his own words:

> It is far easier for a teacher to generalize a class, and give it a lesson to get by rote, and hear it said, and let it pass, than it is to watch the progress of individual mind, and awaken interest, and answer objections, and explore tendencies, and, beginning with the elements, to construct together with his pupils, so that they shall feel that they aid in it, the fair fabric of a science with which they shall be familiar from the foundation to the topstone . . . Every man who is educated at all, is, and must be, self-educated . . . It is for the want of understanding this properly, that extravagent expectations are entertained of instructors . . . Young men will not set themselves efficiently at work until they feel that there is an all-important part which they must perform for themselves, and which no one can do for them . . . It is easy to see what it is that constitutes the first excellence of an instructor. It is not his amount of knowledge, nor yet his facility of communication, important as these may be; but it is his power to give an impulse to the minds of his pupils, and to induce them to labor. For this purpose, nothing is so necessary as a disinterested devotion to the work, and a certain enthusiasm which may act by sympathy on the minds of the young.[2]

---

[1]Howe, op. cit., p. 101.

[2]Rudolph, op. cit., pp. 48-49.

Aiding him was his magnetic appearance, his contagious enthusiasm about life, teaching, and his message. There was an emotional, heart-felt element in his beliefs. He lived his teaching and he was concerned with basic matters, not trivia. His art was natural and unstudied. He stressed the unity and simplicity of knowledge. Love was a prime characteristic of Mark Hopkins and his work.

On the morning of June 17, 1887, the sun had just hoisted one leg over the horizon and paused for a moment. The mist ran up the sides of the brooding Berkshires and fanned the face of the great golden globe. Nestled in a valley, Williams College stirred with life to link this day to all those previous in time. Cocks crowed and pigs grunted, rooting in the ground grateful for the renewed warmth it began to receive. Mark Hopkins had not slept too well, having had a slight difficulty with his breathing. But the beauty of his spot in the sun he loved and the challenge of the day combined to get him up. He caught his breath sharply, turned to his wife Mary, and said gently, "This is a new sensation; I think it must be death." The sun pulled itself up over the mountains, warming the life--and death--below.

MOHANDAS KARAMCHAND GANDHI

Slowly and in silence the throng commenced the half-mile march to the salt deposits. A few carried ropes for lassoing the barbed-wire stockage around the salt pans. About a score who were assigned to act as stretcher-bearers wore crude, hand-painted crosses pinned to their breasts; their stretchers consisted of blankets. Manilal Gandhi, second son of Gandhi, walked among the foremost of the marchers. As the throng drew near the salt pans they commenced chanting the revolutionary slogan, "Inquilab zindabad," intoning the two words over and over.

The salt deposits were surrounded by ditches filled with water and guarded by four hundred native Surat police in khaki shorts and brown turbans. Half a dozen British officials commanded them. The police carried lathis--five-foot clubs tipped with steel. Inside the stockade twenty-five native riflemen were drawn up.

In complete silence the Gandhi men drew up and halted a hundred yards from the stockade. A picked column advanced from the crowd, waded the ditches, and approached the barbed-wire stockade, which the Surat police surrounded, holding their clubs at the ready. Police officials ordered the marchers to disperse under a recently imposed regulation which prohibited gatherings of more than five persons in any one place. The column silently ignored the warning and slowly walked forward.

Suddenly, at a word of command, scores of native police rushed upon the advancing marchers and rained blows on their heads with their steel-shod lathis. Not one of the marchers even raised an arm to fend off the blows. They went down like ten-pins. From where I stood I heard the sickening whacks of the clubs on unprotected skulls. The waiting crowd of watchers groaned and sucked in their breaths in sympathetic pain at every blow.

Those struck down fell sprawling, unconscious or writhing in pain with fractured skulls or broken shoulders. In two or three minutes the ground was quilted with bodies. Great patches of blood widened on their white clothes. The survivors without breaking ranks silently and doggedly marched on until struck down. When every one of the first column had been knocked down stretcher-bearers rushed up unmolested by the police and carried off the injured to a thatched hut which had been arranged as a temporary hospital.

> Then another column formed while the leaders pleaded with them to retain their self-control. They marched slowly toward the police. Although everyone knew that within a few minutes he would be beaten down, perhaps killed, there were no signs of wavering or fear. They marched steadily with heads up, without the encouragement of music or cheering or any possibility that they might escape serious injury or death. The police rushed out and methodically and mechanically beat down the second column. There was no fight, no struggle; the marchers simply walked forward until struck down. There were no outcries, only groans after they fell. There were not enough stretcher-bearers to carry off the wounded. The blankets used as stretchers were sodden with blood.
>
> Bodies toppled over in threes and fours, bleeding from great gashes on their scalps. Group after group walked forward, sat down, and submitted to being beaten into insensibility without raising an arm to fend off the blows. Finally the police became enraged by the nonresistance. They commenced savagely kicking the seated men in the abdomen and testicles. The injured men writhed and squealed in agony, which seemed to inflame the fury of the police, and the crowd again almost broke away from their leaders. The police then began dragging the sitting men by the arms and feet, sometimes for a hundred yards, and throwing them into ditches.[1]

So the little man in the loin-cloth strode across the stage of history. The world had never yet hosted anyone quite like him. He and his followers have been considered fanatics in the same way as was Jesus and his followers. Others of approximate power have wielded the sword and this kind of naked power is understandable, feared, and most often tragic for some. But this man of ninety pounds wrote the British lion, saying, "I beg of you, on bended knee. . . ." and pledged resistance by nonviolence. He was a "scrawney, almost eccentric, saint-like man whose actions and words rocked India, the British Empire, and the world. . . . He was the central dynamo of India's struggle for

---

[1]Webb Miller, I Found No Peace (New York: The Literary Guild, Inc., 1936), pp. 192-194.

nationhood. He WAS power: his ideas, emotions, and beliefs were what concentrated power and made it work. His hold upon the imagination of millions of people throughout the world has diminished little since his death. . . . When he was unable to sleep, millions did not sleep; when he fasted, millions fasted; (the) myth arose and was a true myth, changing the behavior of whole populations, altering the course of history and the fate of empire. There is no other case known . . . in which every fact is known and yet their sum amounts to an unknown. . . . It is beyond dispute that his personality commanded even when he least desired to command. An identity of opposites haunts his entire story: it is just when he was most humble that he was most powerful . . . at last (there is) the mystical explanation as the only one that fits the case. It fits because it presupposes the unknown and beyond that the unknowable. . . . There must have been in his discrete genius a general component, a pulse from the common pulse, a force both vertical and horizontal in its thrust, so that he could communicate more than others and hear a voice that others do not hear. He did actually hear an 'inner voice' throughout the greater part of his life (just as Socrates did), and though he was an exceedingly practical man who never discussed mysteries if he could help it, there is no doubt . . . that the essence of his effective being, effective, that is, upon mankind, was and always will be a mystery."[1]

---

[1]Vincent Sheean, Mahatma Gandhi (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955) pp. 3-5.

This section on Gandhi begins with such an extensive and dramatic quote to attempt some indication of the power of Gandhi over people. This power defies the Western mind. Gandhi has been likened to Lincoln but he was not a Lincoln. He is written of in a book alongside Lenin, but he is not a Lenin. He is in the tradition of Buddha but he is not a Buddha. He is placed with Jesus, but he is not a Jesus--although it is ironic that he who never became a Christian obviously was taught by Jesus as Gandhi lived in detail the Sermon on the Mount.

This is the key to Gandhi: his personality as revealed in his life. If any of these Great Teachers studied thus far have exemplified the power of a personality, the greatest of these is Gandhi.

There are two approaches that can be used in trying to record here some of the greatness that was Gandhi. One is to mention again all the baffling details of his life, to trace him from India to England, and then to South Africa and back to India. As with Lincoln, seldom has any modern man been so minutely traced. But these tracings are for all to see and read, be the interest historical, political, or social. The other approach to Gandhi is to strip away all ambiguity of events and to probe for the essential simplicity of the man so simply-garbed in the loin cloth. The focus in this study must be on simplicity because of the stated specificity of dealing with teaching method.

"Nothing is more simple than greatness; indeed, to be simple is to be great."[1] Gandhi is baffling mainly to Western minds, and this

---

[1]Emerson.

because he lived the life taught by the Western God. This bears some explanation.

No one would seriously attempt to explain completely the power of Gandhi aside from the social forces of his time. Much has been written in the first part of this thesis about the great man theory of leadership and social change. Gandhi stands as an example of the essential logic of that position, and yet he stands as an example also of the person who becomes a leader by manipulating elements existing in society. Gandhi is considered most often as a social reformer and the title itself indicates some interplay between the man and his times.

It will only be mentioned in passing here that the India of Gandhi was restless under long years of domination and discrimination. And lest this seems too abstract one can read instead of the personal trials of young Gandhi in meeting with the color and class codes of the white man. "Thou shalt neither vex a stranger, nor oppress him: for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt."[1] There is the well-known story of Gandhi being ordered out of his first class train compartment while traveling to South Africa. Incidents such as this one added fuel to a social consciousness of one who would eventually call on the king of England clad in his native Indian loin cloth. In addition to the prime matter of the independence of India there were all the internal matters of confusion, over-population, decline in culture, and, mainly, a lack of sense of direction. This is certainly a cursory treatment of these tremendous forces here to merely mention that Gandhi stepped to

---

[1]Exodus, Chap. 23:9.

greatness in grouping these into a political platform and then providing the leadership needed to work toward the solution of those problems. But the main thing here is the method of Gandhi in doing this. Others were trying to do the same thing. Jinnah, the Moslem leader, was attaining stature. Various Britishers claimed to be assigned to the problems of India. But Gandhi alone, not only went a long way toward the solution of many of the problems and even achieved Indian independence, but practically became canonized by a considerable number of people the world over. In contrast, then, to many of the recent portraits presented here, this section on Gandhi is going to focus as nearly as possible on the personality of the man.

Buddha had implications for social reform and his method was strongly religious. Confucius dabbled in social reform and he is now credited with a moral system. Socrates in no way meant to separate politics from the rest of life and he is remembered for the cleanness and clarity of his logic and intellect. Jesus certainly had social influences and approached it through the spiritual. And now there is Gandhi who in a sense traces all the way back to that Buddha of long ago. Gandhi, too, turned inward to the soul in dealing with practical problems. He said, "The idea-tight division of human activity into religious, social, and political compartments is the prime fallacy of the modern world." But beyond the matter of the compartmentalization of life, Gandhi had the long vision of the saint in that he wedded Western attainment with Eastern culture.

The Western trend has been one of building an outward and material power. Personality and the individual is important. Eastern culture--as exemplified by the fact that there is no Chinese word for person--has a long history of the subtleties of men in communion--alone and as a group. The self-accepted training of ascetics strives for mastery over the self and thus of the environment, also. Western man has thus been unable to understand how the policies of a Gandhi could achieve anything in an essentially materialistic world. But the point lies at a greater depth: it was not mainly because of the Eastern emphasis but in spite of it that Gandhi achieved the leadership. And in just this area it becomes important to determine just what Gandhi did in influencing the millions he did.

The key to Gandhi is love. The following familiar statements all apply to Gandhi:

- If any man would be first among you, let him be servant of all.
- He first loved us and then we loved him.
- Greater love hath no man than that he lay down his life for a friend.

There is no better or more complete characterization of Gandhi than a reading of the Sermon on the Mount. He himself said he tried to practice a combination of that sermon and the teachings of the Hindu Bhagavad Gita.

Gandhi lived his method: a method attainable only by an individual. He urged his countrymen to be completely dedicated to the emergence of India, and himself had a tremendous dedication. He preached simplicity

and lived simply. When he wrote that he disagreed with the caste system, he immediately went out and associated with the various classes and groups with different beliefs. He was meek and the only leader in modern history, who, in his doctrine of nonviolence, really turned the other cheek. He has been called an artist of life due to the strange magnetism of his incalculable personality. This can be seen in his unruffled serenity, inexhaustible patience in hearing others out, readiness to see their diverse viewpoints, meeting the same objection again and again, and his incredible tolerance for the views of his bitterest opponents. Some of these opponents, when later trying to explain Gandhi, could only do so by referring to the "touch of his magic personality."

It goes almost without saying that a dominant strain in Gandhi was his humility. And there could be no doubt of the sincerity of his humility when one considers the many times he showed himself to be utterly unpretentious, and forgiving. He refused to prosecute attackers or condemn those who used him wrongly, even in cases of physical violence. Despite what some of his own more radical countrymen advocated and the unbelief of Western eyes witnessing such scenes as the one with which this section began the power of a sincerity that did so much with the principle of non-violence was never in question.

Gandhi was meek--he even looked meek. He had an inward gentleness and calm coupled with a basic wisdom. He had an outward appearance of resolution and command but based on an inner conviction and greatness

of spirit. His physical appearance was a source of laughter in the fashionable newspapers of the world but there was about his frame and walk a feeling of endurance, power, and enthusiasm that related itself to the larger purpose he gave to the millions who followed him. His voice, gentle and clear, carried the authority of a prophet. He said, "I represent the semi-starved millions of India," and when millions were unable to wear or own anything, Gandhi wore and owned nothing. There was about him an easy grace, naturalness, spontaneity, innocence, and charm. There was no pose or pride apparent in the man.

> As Gandhi entered, attention was focused at once upon this extraordinary man. . . . To an intruder, or careless observer, who knew nothing of the Mahatma, nor of the momentous character of the occasion, there might have appeared something almost ridiculous in this picture. Here was this Indian striding into the auditorium with his feet and legs bare, his middle bound by the loincloth, his torso wrapped and rewrapped against the chilling weather, in the ample folds of the cotton shawl. With utter dignity he crossed the platform and took his seat, and serenely surveyed the audience. As he sat there, calm and motionless as a Buddha, the ridiculous, if ever it appeared in such a presence, straightway diffused and dissolved itself into the sublime. I shall never forget the sense of awe that settled like an atmosphere upon that auditorium. For the first time I understood the mystic secret of Gandhi's influence over the millions of his fellow countrymen. Had a king been present, we could not have felt more reverence. Suddenly I found myself remembering the testimony of Mr. Bernay, an English journalist, who said, 'The moment you see Gandhi, you catch the atmosphere of royalty.' But it was more than royalty which we saw that day. Not a king but a Mahatma, a 'Great Soul,' was with us. This man needed nothing of the personality and pageantry of a king to exercise his power. For it was the spirit, not the flesh, which clothed this man in more than majesty.[1]

To add a note to this, when the British official spoke his introductory remarks, he said, "You are so sincere that you make some of us

---

[1]John Haynes Holmes, My Gandhi (New York: Harper and Brothers Publications, 1953), pp. 41-42.

suspicious, and you are so simple that you bewilder some of us."[1] There was to Gandhi this unconditional straightforwardness.

Yes, the social chaos and restlessness of India helped make Gandhi great, but analysis must consider, too, the powerful influence he had on millions the world over. Perhaps the secret yearning of the hearts of men is to be able to live according to the principle of love. A saying of Buddha has it, "Man shall conquer anger by love, evil by good, avarice by generosity, and the liar by truth." Consider, then, the mystical appeal of the man who sets out to do just that. Gandhi was a modern prophet of the gospel of love. There seemed to be no limit to his ability to forgive: His dying gesture was one of forgiveness for the assassin who murdered him. He practiced fair play, as when he held the forces at his command in check in a South Africa struggling with other political problems. Gandhi stands on a spiritual base so strong that storms of criticism have done no more than refresh his countenance. Goodness is the key to the power of Gandhi. It was impossible for men--for whatever their stake was in the game--to reject the power of such an utterly simple and sincere example. He said, "Everything I say is as old as the hills." He had a transparent honesty. Part of his genius was often to speak without words through a symbolic act. His diet and clothing were often made more of then his ideas. He treated everyone as an equal and most often for him, in the supreme political circles in which he moved, this meant expecting to be accepted as an equal--with his millions of "outcasts ranged alongside him."

---

[1]Ibid.

Gandhi did not approach others with force, but, as he himself wrote of it, "on bended knee." He was friendly to all men and insisted on the dignity of all men. These are the things that caused the incredulity of the 20th Century over Gandhi's methods of non-violence. This came to him as a result of his intense human sympathy. He lived among the people and shared their lives with them. He worked to satisfy their physical needs while he offered himself as an example of the potency of satisfying spiritual needs. He had a humble simplicity and said he had learned to listen to other people, and counted this important.

Gandhi never lost a keen sense of humor. Others considered his appearance humorous but this didn't bother one whose life was built on principles of sacrifice, abnegation, and love. Gandhi was devoted to his task and worked with an unflagging energy. He never bore any man ill-will or enmity. His personal philosophy was based on truth, love, and inner purity.

He wrote about pedagogy. Here, too, simplicity is the key. He held that knowledge is not enough: there must be the power to apply. He firmly believed in learning by doing and had no use for rote memory work. He encouraged pupils to make things in schools but wanted them to be useful things. He was a great experimenter himself and in teaching he favored the personal method of imparting knowledge. But the focus always returns to the personality of the man:

> Add to the strange fascinations of his character the sheer story-book quality of his personality--diverting yet purposefully earnest; divinely maddening yet humanly contradictory; uplifting as a standard but inimitable and, therefore,

> repelling; charming and kind and joyous but severe at the center; so momentous and yet unassuming . . . Gandhi is a man of almost incredible contrasts. Gaunt, ascetic and self-denying, Gandhi is nevertheless the picture of health and agility. Nearing seventy-eight, Gandhi still retains a schoolboy complexion and radiance. He outwalks most youngsters during his daily strolls. His diet, although frugal, is scientifically planned and weighed, and his habits of living are dependable. . . .[1]

Gandhi defined the perfect teacher thus:

> He is a devotee who is jealous of none, who is a fount of mercy, who is without egotism, who is selfless, who treats alike cold and heat, hapiness and misery, who is ever forgiving, who is always contented, whose resolutions are firm, who has dedicated mind and sould to God, who causes no dread, who is not afraid of others, who is free from exultation, sorrow and fear, who is pure, who is versed in action yet remains unaffected by it, who treats friend and foe alike, who is untouched by respect or disrespect, who is not puffed up by praise, who does not go under when people speak ill of him, who loves silence and solitude, who has a disciplined reason.[2]

There is confusion as to the role of Gandhi and passivity. In the presence of evil he had to act. Mere headshaking and handwringing never satisfied him. Passivity riled him. There was not a single passive fiber in his character, and all his resistance was active. Yet, speaking of the way in which he did this, Senator Arthur H. Vandenburg said, "He made humility and truth more powerful than empires."

Gandhi's beginnings were anything but auspicious. History is forever pledged to his greatness nonetheless. When he died it was said the world over that the light had gone out of many lives. His death brought about a psychological condition that did more than he had achieved while alive. During the times he had fasted, the whole British

---

[1]Krishnalal Shridharani, The Mahatma and the World (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1946), p. xiii.

[2]Louis Fischer, Gandhi and Stalin (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1947), p.

Empire, and India, figuratively held their breath. His followers, like those of Jesus, were lesser men, and soon after his death his cause was dealt with in the age-old terms of power and violence. It is seldom that the vision of a great man is shared by the lesser men that surround him.

It would hardly be meaningful to draw up here a list of phrases descriptive of the man Gandhi and his power. He shines in and between each sentence. This account is necessarily brief and scattered but it is also simple in an attempt to apprehend the simplicity of Gandhi. There was no simplicity to the social affairs of men at that time, just the method of Gandhi--simple and effective: he loved all men.

> To recall Gandhi to mind is to think of Matthew Arnold's familiar phrase, "sweetness and light." That is what he was--all sweetness of temper and radiation of soul. I suppose that gentleness, as I would call it, was his supreme characteristic--a gentleness which knew no weakness, but rather clothed with authority an innate strength of purpose. With force and violence banished from his life, there needed gentleness, firm and brave, to take their place. Along with this came humility, which was manifest in every quality and action of his life. I used to sit and marvel at Gandhi's wholly unconscious display, to all persons and under all circumstances, of the humble heart. Here was unquestionably the first among the world's great figures--a man who walked with kings and viceroys, who ruled and led the hundreds of millions of his fellow men in India, whose name echoed from the far horizons of the world, who was daily pondering policies which determined the destinies of nations, who influenced the whole range of modern life, who singlehandedly was defying the greatest empire of our time, and triumphantly, without violence or hate or killing, was wresting the freedom of his people from its clutch. And here he was ready to meet and talk, in the spirit of infinite kindliness and good will, with the myriads of common folk who came knocking on his door and begging to see him--a group of students perhaps, a delegation of patriots, a troubled mother and her sick child, a passing priest or pilgrim, a chance traveler from America. All of them wanted to kneel before this spring of living water, and drink, if only a few drops, of its crystal stream. If there was any impatience or weariness in

> Gandhi's heart, any pride, he did not show it. There was only the inexhaustible humility of one who had dedicated himself to God and his high purposes for men.[1]
>
> It was this humility which explained Gandhi's courtesy, as his gentleness explained his charm. Gandhi assumed not the slightest pretansion of greatness. He played not at all upon the vast influence which was his. He surrounded himself with no barriers of authority and circumstance. He was as accessible as a mother to her children, or a friend to a dear friend. Gandhi had tamed his spirit to absolute obedience. Amid every temptation to pose and pomp he remained simple, unspoiled, and utterly sincere.
>
> Here was a man who strode the countryside clad only in a loin cloth, barefooted or sandal-shod, and leaning on a pilgrim's staff. A man who lived by choice among the poorest of the poor of the common people of his land. A man who actually taught, in naive sincerity, the crazy doctrine of nonviolence . . . Patience, unconquerable good will, and resolve not to inflict suffering but to endure it, these were Gandhi's only weapons. . . . It was not so much Gandhi's greatness as it was his personality which won the world. Everyone who came into his presence felt and caught the contagion of his spirit. Then, as they left him and went their way, they carried with them, to be caught by other men, this inspiration to which no man was immune. . . . Mingled with this magnetism, if I may call it such, was the irresistible gaiety which swept with laughter over the ironies and innocencies of life. Basic was his simplicity and complete sincerity--the same to all, whether king or peasant, rajah or beggar, Hindu, Moslen, or Englishman. Instinctively men knew that they could trust Gandhi as their very own. In the case of multitudes the world around, in India and elsewhere, Gandhi became an intimate part of their lives. To think of him was a delight, to love him was an exaltation, to obey him was a privilege. So he moved everywhere among friends.[2]

Friday, January 30th, 1948, was another busy day in the life of Gandhi. He had been much concerned with the internal bloodshed in his country. Prayer meetings were held regularly to pray for an end to the violence. Gandhi attended the meeting on this day and devoted

---

[1]Holmes, My Gandhi, op. cit., pp. 99-100.

[2]Ibid., pp. 131-133.

people flocked around him to catch the gentle words from his smiling lips. A man approached Gandhi and raised his hands and eyes in prayer. In one hand he held a gun, raised it, and shot "just an old man in a loin cloth in distant India."

His influence--mystical and spiritual--has never been fully reckoned, for he was a Great Teacher; and the teaching of such as Gandhi continues from age to age and forms a part of eternity.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS OF DATA

And so the tale of the twelve is told. They leave one a bit breathless--these brief portraits of twelve men who influenced the world in varying degrees. It is foolishness to consider that they have been contained here: none of them accepted the limitations of their time or place, and surely their spirits transcend the titillation of this telling. They are great beyond any power of men to measure, and just as it would betray ignorance to break a harp to prove it is capable of music, so would it be to subject the spirit of these men to tabular analysis.

But some analysis must be done to emphasize the characteristics possessed by these people to quality them as great men. It would be foolish to say they are twelve cuts of the same pattern. Their differences are the variations of any twelve men. But even a hasty look at the twelve sketches contained in this study reveals a startling agreement of characteristics. It is for this reason that the symbol was used of a lamp that is passed from time to time and man to man. The central idea of this: these twelve great teachers share in their attitude towards life. They evidence different reasons and they possess various of the characteristics noted to different degrees. But their way of looking at themselves, others, the world about them and beyond their reach, and their work, is similar.

It would be possible in this analysis to draw up a master list of all the characteristics mentioned in connection with the twelve men studied. The task then would be to tell these and to indicate to what degree each of the twelve possessed them. The result would also be cumbersome and unwieldy and these things are already detailed in the sketches.

It is more important to look at such a master list and do two things with it. The first thing would be to bring subtle but similar characteristics into categories; the second would be to use as final categories those which apply in great measure to all twelve of the men studied. This is the avenue of analysis that will be used here, employing in each case brief referral back to the larger and complete character sketches as an emphasis.

A master list was developed from the individual lists accompanying the sketches. Their subtle differences were brought together and those retained which applied in large measure to all twelve of the men studied. The following five categories resulted:

1. Enthusiasm
2. Simplicity
3. Dedication
4. Purpose
5. Humility

Something should be said about the counter themes woven into these five major categories.

1. Enthusiasm

True enthusiasm comes from a naive sincerity. Naive--used as meaning unsophisticated, simple--belief in the work to be done means one in unabashed by hedging considerations. In the case of the great teachers this gave an unusual vigor to their teaching. Words like dynamic, magnetic, and dramatic come to be applied to the teachers and their teaching. These concepts describe both the personalities of the men and the things they taught. The point need not be labored here that two men can say the exact words in such a way that apathy applies to one and magnetism to the other. The great teachers, not confused by pseudo-semantic substitutions as to the nature of scientific objectivity, were not afraid to recognize the emotional side of men. It has been said of old that "Out of the heart are the issues of men." The direct appeal of this statement has assured it of neglect in an age that dotes on a cacophony of complexity. But the great teachers knew of and applied the principle that to learn is to make subtle adjustments in the emotions. Thus, too, is the term mystical included in this category of enthusiasm. These exact processes remain unknown; only results are a matter of record, parts of the record contained in these twelve sketches.

2. Simplicity

Simplicity as a term was never meant to apply to the personalities of these twelve men studied here. It means that an element of greatness is the ability to control it and couch it in simple terms. A fool may sound profound until he is found out to be parroting what he doesn't

comprehend; but a great man steps outside of his vast knowledge and speaks simply of towering truths. And added to this is the understanding that results from being able to relate abstractions to daily experiences. Thus woven into this simplicity is the warp of an awareness of people and the daily lives of people. This is born of contact with all kinds of people in all kinds of situations. The hap and circumstances of the beauty and tragedy of life are the only final assurance of empathy with the people. This, in turn, gives real meaning to teaching individuals based on their uniquenesses. Each man is peculiar and the great teacher accept and work within that framework.

One further point on simplicity: it is revealed by the way a man probes for the proportions of truth. None of the twelve held it to depend upon titles, ranks, systems, equipment, special favors, or constituted positions. The key, germinal idea is a willingness to ask why of the universe. These twelve great teachers did not rebel against all authority and traditions as a matter or principle--and there is not always a reason to rebel--but as a matter of being able to unmask the formal and ritual if it sat as a facade before true knowledge. Pomp and circumstance cause men to neglect issues at stake and blind acceptance often results. Thus it comes about that simplicity amounts to the continual attempt to see truth in its nakedness.

3. Dedication

Dedication in the case of the twelve means something akin to feeling a call to the work. It is apparent here that while each of these

categories can stand alone, so are they related. Genuine enthusiasm must be based on dedication, and this, in turn, suggests simplicity or an approach to accomplishing purposes. Dedication gives one a sense of conviction, and conviction gradually breeds authority. A man can speak from out of his own sense of authority if he has a conviction about his message. And his conviction grows with an awareness that comes of a dedication to a work.

The other part of this dedication comes from identification with those whom one teaches. The great teachers were loyal to their pupils beyond a casual concern with them. The people were their cause and concern, and their twofold obligation was to the people and the pursuit of truth. Nothing else interfered, even leading--as it often has--to death in defense of this dedication.

4. Purpose

There is psychological evidence to support the idea that men need security. This need not be--and probably should not be the false security of dogma--but it must be the degree of security that comes from having a purpose and then working towards that purpose. Often a purpose is singular to an individual, may become a fanaticism, or a matter of persecution of those not sharing the group purpose. This might be worthy of further research to determine the differences in purpose between those history reveres and those it condemns. But for this study, willy-nilly the purpose, the great teachers presented a steadfast, constant aiming at a goal. This often meant they stood for

something when many drifted with the currents of confused opinion. In this was rooted their intense practicality. Knowledge must be for something. Thus, again, there was an air of authority and conviction about their work. With all of the twelve men studied the final purpose was one rooted somewhere outside of the temporal, and logic supports this as the only possible purpose in a creation that creaks and groans with constant flux.

The sense of purpose also gave stature and dignity to the work of learning. It would almost be redundant to say that learning without riviting it to a reason is useless. Added to this is the sense of individual importance generated in people when they feel caught up in the part of a cause. The implications here as a dynamic of teaching stagger the imagination.

Some of the twelve great teachers were considered highly original and others were not. Most of them went on record as saying they taught nothing new: only that they looked at old things in a new way. This, then, can be said: when a majority of mankind is accepting much because it parades as ritual or authority, or is teamed with tradition or convention, any teacher who comes along and dares probe into this might be considered original, and he draws on a vast popular sympathy for his courage in tampering with the tenets of the times. Thus the originality is one of method, while often recalling old truths extant but almost extinguished. There is a purposefulness about all this, and an importance to people and the process. And basic is the involvement of the individual, or the activity of learning.

5. Humility

There is so much that can be said about true humility and the pseudo-humility of the proud who pride themselves on not being like other arrogant men. Even so, the twelve sketches contain clues that confirm most of these men as honestly humble. As already mentioned in another connection, they were able to step outside of the power they possessed as true scholars and seers and to pursue their aims in a rather quiet, confident way. To put it bluntly: they didn't employ brass bands, dress in special robes, possess outstanding pedigrees, or even claim to know much. They identified with mankind and learned together. A key word is with, rather than to, or about. They learned with others--even from their pupils. They accepted all classes, kinds, and types of people and taught all who were willint to work with them. They did not consider their knowledge final or sacred. They could be questioned or disagreed with just as they questioned or disagreed with others. In most cases, while other men in positions of authority were entrusted with the official act of teaching, these twelve men studied here stood alone somewhere and did what they saw as right, winning the eventual approbation of history but not of their contemporary times. Others--the ones vested with robes and badges--did not think them learned or scholarly, and, as part of their true humility, the twelve, also, claimed to know only that they knew nothing. Each generation had its Pharisees, its 500, its official department of education, but these twelve went about their business claiming little and accomplishing much in due season.

Now it remains to say something about these five principles in the case of each of the twelve men studied.

Enthusiasm

Enthusiasm contained such things as vigor, sincerity, the dynamic, magnetic, dramatic, and mystical. The central idea to Buddha is his mysticism. Reckoned in his appeal today must be the legendary accounts of his birth and life. But more than that, he served to sway opinions by his mere presence, and this would have to be more than the presence suggested by the brooding idol so often depicted suggests. The sketches in this study relate his ability to overcome those approaching him with opposition, human derelicts, and even thoughtful men in places of high authority. Disciples record a walk, pose, and gesture of vigor, speak of his dynamic talking and his magnetic countenance. He spoke in a dramatic fashion, as the quotation in the section on him in this study indicate. They also indicate sincerity.

Confucius dealt with heads of government and men of low estate. And it was said of him in his section that he founded a moral order leasting yet after eighty generations. The sketch on Confucius shows him traveling and working with a vigor continuing in old age, covering many miles and influencing many men. He wept and laughed. He drew men to him by seeming to be so much a part of them. His words are recorded as having fire, and being "pleasant to the ear."

Socrates had it said of him that it was impossible to be in the same location with him and not be aware of his presence. Contemporaries

of his write of his "tough, ugly little figure," his physical endurance, his ability to influence, sway, and "corrupt the youth." He scurried when he walked. His face was animated when he talked, and his words vibrated and hung in the air.

The section on Jesus has quotations that speak for themselves. No one can read his recorded words without feeling their power. And then at twelve he is teaching learned elders in the temple--to their amazement. He strides, whip in hand, and drives those with permission to trade out of the temple. His eyes flash at Pharisees; kindle with kindness at an adulteress; probe into Zacheus; and condemn the rich man. He gestures to heaven, stills the waters, talks back to the authorities on the Sabbeth, heals the sick, raises the dead, washes his disciples feet, and prays about his mission all night.

Quintilian is the most popular teacher in his day. He throws memory work and rote learning out the door, and welcomes students who walk up and down the courtyard with him while he gestures, pronounces, smiles, and gives confidence. He impresses emperors, is honored by leading authorities, works long hours during his own time on his Institutio, and weeps over his tragedies. Those who studied under him call him vibrant, "fiery, and with a power" to his personality.

Erasmus shines all around when the stars of Luther and Melancthelon are shooting across the heavens. His success calls him to other countries and there he convinces rulers of his point of view on teaching. His vigor is revealed in his 18-hour days of work, resulting in writing that sways popes and reformers. His name is on everyone's lips and he

manages to charm opposing forces. He is recorded as something of a showman, and seems consciously to pursure the dramatic. His written works are enlivened with wit, sarcasim, and caustic comments. Born sickly, in his eagerness he forces himself year after long year to do the work of many men.

Comenius--sad bishop of the Unitas Fratrum--strides from country to country, eyes deep and blazing. His strides over the havoc wreaked by the thirty years' War, himself a victim of the fight for peace. He is called upon by heads of governments and they change their school systems because of his powers of persuasion. His vigor and enthusiasm know no bounds, as when he writes his Great Didactio to be a compendium of all the knowledge in the world, to solve all problems, and to present the means of doing this. Books pour from him, yet he finds time to travel--mostly on foot--reform the school systems of entire countries, and pilot the church of the United Brethern thru its final period.

Pestalozzi--most always pictured with hordes of children clambering over him, clamoring for him--gathers infant rejects whenever he can and builds them a life. Wars close his orphanages, fire burns him out, and he bounces back, lives with his children, "is all things to them," and, unlearned as he is, generates a gleam of hope in that which was a bundle of rags. He, too, tells his message in various countries and places stifling from the stranglehold of system and convention. He writes by candlelight in the wee hours when wee people are in bed. His vigor and enthusiasm is contagious, so that in three months,

"children who had been near death for lack of love, run and jump with glee, their voices swelling with laughter."

Froebel, acting like "an old fool," long locks flowing, frock coat trailing behind, laughs and dances with kindergartners so that tears come to eyes of observers. When alone with adults from all over the world who came to consult with him, after long hours of play with his children, his eyes flash and he speaks of things skeptics are certain is a matter of speculation. But he proves himself and his work in school after school, pupils and associates writing years after that the most dynamic thing in their lives was Froebel. He upsets many conventions of his day; yet, such is his contagion that today many of his suggestions are commonplace, and he convinced many of influence of them in his day. Is it not indicative of vigor that at an advanced age he danced with children?

Horace Mann virtually exploded on Massachusetts and the world when once he decided on his life work. He toured, talked, and innovated. Then he wrote twelve volumes of school reports, woven in with his regular work. Foreigners claim him as the greatest American educator. Hs is recorded as "commanding and majestic, with this high forehead, long white hair, and flashing eyes." He molded a college of a free-way for farm animals, and died in a roomful of students planning the future of that college. He worked all the time, spoke often, swayed legislatures, and so impressed the people they ran him for governor. On a small scale, giving a peek into the human view of the man, while living in a boarding-house, he held everyone there--including the proprietess--in his hand.

Back at Antioch College, "students swarmed over one another to get into those classes he reserved to teach himself."

Mark Hopkins, with a medical degree in his hand, was a unanimous choice as the president of Williams College at an age that ordinarily would have shocked the regents. But such was his popularity that there was no other choice. Then for thirty-six years, as a teaching president, he worked, lived with, and taught so as to earn the undying honor of a future president of the United States, and the statement, "all men from Williams College bear the same stamp, that of Mark Hopkins." Garfield and others said his dynamic vigor made them volunteer to do "as much in a day as they had in four before." Others said Hopkins and a favorite father were the two main influences in their lives. His staff respected him and couldn't quite keep up with him. His eloquence took him on speeches to high places, and audiences nearly always commented on the remarkable contagion of the magnetism of the man.

Gandhi, preacher of non-violence, so influenced men that they sat on the ground by thousands and allowed themselves to be beaten to death. He caught the imagination of millions of his countrymen, and people from all over the world caught a personal fire from contact with him. Such was the magnetism of Gandhi that Englishmen and Americans, singly and in groups, joined not only his cause, but some begged--from across the seas--to be allowed to live in his ashram. He had to raise people from their knees where he walked, and beg them not to worship him. Huge throngs, milling about, hushed at his presence and became prayer meetings. Dynamic? When his ninety pound body fasted, millions fasted. Magnetic?

He overthrew traditions and governmental structures that had existed for centuries, even thousands of years. Vigor? He practically covered India on foot, after a fast and in areas of terrible bloodshed. Dramatic? He walked in front of the British lion in London in a loincloth. Mystical? He cannot be explained; he lived the Sermon on the Mount. Sincere? He died for his teaching.

Simplicity

As a category, simplicity had to do with the way in which the twelve men dealt with knowledge. They related abstractions to the concrete experience of everyday life. They had only one formula, one process, and that was a continual searching for truth. They probed, and their concern was beyong the what, when, and how much of the why. By standards of system they were unsystematic; their work was minus the formal, ritual, or definition into schools of thought. To add life to their approach they approached life and knew men and what they were about. Thus they apprehended life thru the individual, and it was the individual they taught.

Much of the teaching of Buddha begins: "There was a man--" and proceeds to some story that often a child could understand. His whole life is an example of one who will not accept the dogmas of generations of priests and searches instead for the bare outlines of meaning beyond any facades erected to screen truth from prying eyes. There is simple beauty in the legends telling how, after years of a useless life of luxury he met in turn with sickness, poverty, death, and happiness and

the results in Buddha of these. He taught most often with a story and the stories are there to be read, dealing, as they do, with bread, and work, fathers, children, and any of the happenstance of daily life. His continual search lead him to periods of contemplation. Between these periods of meditation he walked with all manner of men but spoke to them in a way and of things they understood. He had one thing to say to one and something else to another because he knew men differed.

Confucius has been recorded by others as a master of the pithy phrase. Popular jokes begin with "Confucius say," and they are not so far from being in like manner to those recorded of him in his time. Record has it of the duke who insisted on having his son sent to Confucius "because he will talk so the boy understands him." Disciples said the Master is friendly and can be understood by all. He wrestled with some pupils who, for a time, did not share the continual search upon which he was engaged. He said man can never cease knowing. He traveled the provinces of China and associated with all kinds of men. Once a disciple asked him why he told one pupil one thing and another the opposite. Confucius answered that they were two different people and while the one needed confidence the other was too rash. Pictures and legend shows him stopping on the road anddrawing a lesson from a dead animal, from a flower, a bird, a stream. There were several levels of meaning in most of his stories but always one which could be understood by all.

Socrates walked in the marketplace, called out to Glaucon, and drew a lesson from the stonecutting on the Acropolis. He began his questions with something taken from everyday life and lead into the

philosophical, continually parrying and reinforcing by returning to common considerations involving his hearers. His family complained that he didn't set himself up as did the sophists. He himself scorned bitterly the clever manipulations of those same sophists who used superior wit and false logic to confuse slower minds--and then took pay for it. Is there any more simple political philosophy than his answer to Pericles that, "when you are better the state will be better"? Socrates is popular with the youth of his day because he talks in their terms and albeit influences them. His question and answer probing lead always back to the real meaning of a thing and away from philosophical abstraction. He is not complicated, as a Plato, or Aristotle. Anyone may walk barefooted with him in the marketplace and parry words with him. He is never satisfied and keeps probing to the exasperation of some. He knows people and was for a time a social lion. Also, he lives through a number of military campaigns and he talks with each man in his own terms, involving his work, his goods, or his present troubles.

Jesus was called a winebibber and gluttonous man by some. He associated with kings, Pharisees, sadducers, public officials, highborn, thieves, murders, adulterers, outcasts, fishermen, farmers, herdsmen. He searched until he died, saying, "I know not what it is all about, but let it be done as it will." He upset the ritual of his day which milked the people to poverty and enmeshed them in a fantastic web of rules and counter-rules. He called the upholders of these rules vipers and whited seplechures. He said only, "Ye shall know the Truth, and the Truth shall

make you free." He said, "Ye have heard it said of old, but I am the way, the Truth, and the life, and I say unto you--." He spoke of a sower of mustard seeds, fig trees, herdsmen, rich and poor men, vineyards, fathers, mothers, children, servants, masters, and everything common to the life of the people with whom he lived. Then he told his stories with different meanings buried in them so each hearer could apply as he saw fit. Then he said, "He that hath ears, let him hear." There was plainness and power in the speech of him who talked of a log in a brother's eye, a mountain jumping into the sea, the dead burying the dead. He often meditated and wove what he discovered into a rich tapestry of meaning that applied to all the types of people he taught. He, like Buddha, Confucius, and Socrates mentioned before him, even lived a simple life, in manner of dress, walking about, eating, possessions, and speech.

Quintilian wrote his Institutes of Oratory as a reaction against what he considered the extreme formalism of the training of orators in his day. He decried the fact that orators were trained with emphasis on the method with little on the meaning. He wrote of and used in his own teaching, simple declaration, repetition as often as needed, and grounded the whole thing in the meaning it had for the pupil. He said all learning should be approached as one would approach a child. He continued his search for answers all his life, writing that he would finish his Institutio because it might have some value--having lost its original goal with the death of Quintilian's family. He was able to eke out a measure of acceptance from emperors, freeborn, and slaves and he wrote in his Institutio of the necessity of patterning instruction to each pupil.

Erasmus affected some degree of sophistication but his written works and accomplishments give him away. Seldom it is that the name of a pedant would be a household word if he didn't have the ability to make himself known and understood by the people. And the books--especially In Praise of Folly--of Erasmus are delightful, and mostly so because of their simple, declarative style. His search took him over much of the world and he dealt with all manner of men. He had scorn for those of his day that took simple truths and dressed them up so as to destroy the meaning they held. He writes of this, and selections may be read in his sketch in this study. He complained of making truth abstract, of trying to fit everyone into similar form, and of rote learning denounced from meaning.

Comenius wrote much of what he did and in the way he did for an interesting reason. He stood erect upon the land at a time when the church he headed was disappearing, and even his country was being quartered among the spoilers. He felt it necessary to write of profound matters in a way that not only laymen and mothers could understand but also that they could in turn pass that knowledge onto those for whom it was intended. His little sayings in Latin are a matter of delight and anticipates some hundreds of years the popular readers of the same type used in America. His searching was never ended: how could it for one that assumed to handle all the knowledge in the world? He himself was an outcast and associated with all kinds of people. He substituted simplicity and meaning for form and tradition in his work and writing. He wrote in

his books about how children differ and thus require different methods whereby to teach them.

Pestalozzi had to be simple and direct. Children don't climb all over and pull the hands of a man that can't communicate with them. He spoke their language, and taught so on their level that "others despaired of him and thought him at times a little unbalanced in his unconcern with any system, formality, and even dress and manners." He, too, wrote and appealed to laymen and mothers to take a greater part in the education of their children. His written work, quoted in his sketch included in this study, reveals a concern until his death with bettering the world and life by reaching children. In his orphanages he looks and acts like a Santa Claus, taking this child on his knee, patting the head of that one, adopting a severe tone here, and encouraging and sympathizing with another.

Froebel founded the gardens of children: kindergartens. That should be enough to indicate his basic simple approach. But then when he taught the adults who were in turn to teach the kindergartens he sat before a fireplace and spoke from his heart about how he worked with children. He said, "I have no time to be a scholar." Then he developed his system of cubes, balls, and boxes with which to teach abstract principles. He said, "Come, let us live with our children;" and, "if you are engaged in conversation and your child asks a question, no matter the rank of the visitor, answer his question." He was still dancing with his children when he was an old man and seeking better ways

of reaching them. He said, "I walk gravely with this one, scold that one, and catch a ball from this one." Children forgot his age, his gray hair, and loved him and learned from him. Adults the world over saw him as a child, laughing with glee, romping, and they learned from him and stood in awe of his knowledge of people.

Horace Mann deplored the dull, pointless routine that characterized much of the teaching in his day. His twelve annual reports are filled with specific suggestions on appealing to the nature of children in teaching them. "They have forgotten what it is to be boys," he cries in one report and insists that learning can be made interesting. Horace Mann is noted for his speaking ability and part of the reason is to be found in the fact that he talks of things in the daily lives of his hearers. In the quotes in his sketch, he is talking in terms of business--buying, selling, profit, and investment--to interest people in pedagogical problems. He has no difficulty talking with all kinds of people; he sways public figures and then sits down with college students and becomes a favorite of theirs by talking like one of them. His search leads him around all his life and he is sometimes moody as he contemplates what he knows of mankind and their needs. He writes in his works and says in his speeches that things must be geared to the grasp of each individual.

Mark Hopkins held a reputation for being one of the most learned men alive. He seemed to be able to stimulate students to great lengths as they together searched out the reasons that lay behind routines. Yet they said he was not original but that he could bring out more

ramifications of meaning in things than anyone knew existed in them. He sat easily with his classes and was quick on the repartee. He ate chestnuts and drank root beer with his students around a fire. He was adored by his large family of children. He seemed to preserve that which was unique in each individual and yet it was said they all have his stamp: the mark of one who asked that a pupil probe and push towards truth. He was not the most profound man on his staff at Williams College yet none resented his direction as he didn't take things too seriously and maintained his simple, direct approach.

Gandhi said, "Everything I say is as old as the hills." He carried his simple exposition over into his life and lived mostly in tents while walking about the country encouraging people to make their own cloth. He taught in the most simple and direct way known to man: by example. He ate sparingly and fasted when others had so little. He dressed simply when others were naked. He encouraged non-resistance and himself turned the other cheek all his life, forgiving his assassin thru the death rattle in his throat. He never considered his work done and drew strength from periods of meditation. He knew all kinds of people and associated with them all. He lived with untouchables to demonstrate a point to Brahmins, and he brought understanding of Brahmin, or Hindu, principles to those low on the social scale. His stories and statements as recorded in his sketch, always relate back to the daily struggles of the people with whom he worked. His kindly eyes and simple manner accomplished what pomp and authority had not been able to approach.

Dedication

Dedication often results from some sort of a call. This may be sudden or otherwise but it amounts to an acceptance of what a man considers a cause. It gives him a conviction and this in turn results in a voice of authority, the teacher being aware of the fact that he has a message--he believes in it--and has something to offer. It is not so much that he feels he is doing something for his pupils, but that he remains loyal to them in pursuing the truth he has persuaded them to pledge themselves to.

Legend has it that Buddha's vision came to him under the Ro tree, following a long period of meditation. Whatever the circumstances, he was dedicated because he gave up his princely estate, his family, and luxury and became a wandering teacher of all men. He taught wherever he went and presented his pupils with a consistency of performance. True, he had no formula but neither did he deviate from this dedication to learning. He taught and probed consistently and insistently until he laid himself down by a river and died. His cause was to smash the incantations of the priests of his day, remove the false emphasis on foolish asceticism, and return simple truths to all who would apprehend it.

Confucius decided at age twenty-three that he wanted to be a teacher. He looked about him at the human misery and knew there was something better. He went on to teach the rulers and the sons of rulers for in them often lay the first power to change things. So he began his life of wandering and nothing deterred him from that which he conceived

to be his cause. He may have died saying "alas," but history has rewarded his efforts. Discouragement over lustful rulers who preferred women to reform did not cause him to defect. He did what he could and sought opportunities that seemed to promise something. He, too, had an authority that surpassed that of decadent priests. He often wept but he continued his searching and teaching. He said all he wanted was to improve the lot of man and he certainly could have been a political appointment if he hadn't insisted on his standards for truth. So others were appointed, and others ruled; and Confucius died having taught them all.

Socrates mused for the first part of his life, tried stonemasonry, padded to the marketplace, observed the ignorance, and began to think seriously about the wisdom of knowing one's ignorance. Legend has it that the oracle pronounced him the wisest of men because of this. But in addition, a crucial decision was made when Socrates stood for a day and a night barefooted in the snow during a military campaign. He emerged with fire in his eye and from that day on there was an authority and a conviction to him that impressed all he met. He dismissed with contempt the public orators feeding on the people's ignorance. He said government is to serve the people. Regardless of what the Family Service Agency will say about it, he neglected his friends, wife and children for his free discourse in the public places. He said what he had to say to officials, when asked. And his final speech, his Apology, is excellent proof of his dedication--as is his death. He could not renege on his

cause even when to do so meant life, and after taking his portion of poison he discussed the true implications of his death with his visitors. During his life he could have used his connections to gain fame and power, but this was inconsistent with his cause. He remained loyal to those he taught by remaining true to what he taught them.

Jesus said, at age twelve, "Know ye not I must be about my Father's business?" Then he spent forty days and forty nights alone in the wilderness, had a chance thrice to bargain for wealth, power, and fame, but emerged to shake the world with his consistent insistence on Truth. He could have become a Pharisee rather than an enemy of them. He could have sold his influence with people to those in power. He could have escaped death by returning to carpentry. But he struggles up the Hill of the Skull with his own cross. He said, "I am come that ye may have life." Or, "I am the way." Or, "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." Or, "Feed my sheep." Or, "Go into all the world and teach." Dedication? Jesus burns with it. A cause? Jesus is a cause. A call? Legend lands the dove on his head and he says, "You must believe me; I am come to establish a kingdom of the Spirit." Conviction? Fishermen left nets, thieves thieving, rich men their riches, adulteresses their men, authorities their positions, children their parents. Authority? Pharisees said, "Never man spoke like this before. Saducees were confounded, rabbis listened in amazement, and there is the whole record--untouched in this thesis--of the casting out of disease, devils, and sin. Loyalty? He died in sight of his family and disciples forgiving

those who despitefully used him. Identification with his pupils? He lived with them, like them, fed them, comforted them, and had nowhere to sleep when foxes had holes for their heads.

Quintilian walked from Spain to Rome and there took up his abode teaching the sons of the rulers and the wealthy and any who would learn. A man doesn't work long hours unless he believes in what he is doing. Then there is the matter of the record--in his own written words--wherein he says he will stick to his task even though his original purposes are buried with his children. His work takes him in the face of many in his day who do not agree with him. But he is convinced he is right, talks to an emperor to tell him so, and receives that emperor's son in return as a pupil. His cause is the training of public orators; his conviction is that training in his day is empty; his authority is that of seeing evidence that he is right; his loyalty is to the boys he teaches and the truth he pursues. These sound general but they are not; they are specific. They are touched on in the sketch of him and are all expanded in his Institutes.

Erasmus shows his dedication to his work and to his principle of moderation by successfully walking the tightrope between the wars of ideas in his day. He even writes things derogatory to both sides but survives. He is convinced that men need not slay one another in their pursuit of the truth. He is more dedicated to this truth than they, and he does something constructive about it. He said his cause was moderation and clear analysis and he lived this all his life. He wanted a

better world for men and he wrote and taught about this all his life. Without seeming too cynical here, it might be said that his times being what they were, neglect of him is proof of his dedication. He was on good terms with the pope but refused to expand that relationship for what it could become and remained loyal and consistent to his teaching. He corresponded with Luther and they wanted to use him. But his name was on the lips of the mass who would gladly accept what he had to offer: a better life by being moderate in all things.

Comenius worked sixteen hours a day, walked miles, overcame tragedy after heartrending tragedy but continued to toy with his dream of a better world by reaching the young with better methods. His church dissolved and his country disappeared but he ground out by candlelight his books for children. Any man who could toil through the wreckage of the Thirty Years War and continue to work as Comenius did was possessed of a dedication that towers above that of the little men turning to their various opiates in lesser crises. Comenius churned out books and writings in great number and then attempted his Great Didactic. The sketch of him gives a brief example of a determined man who believes in what he does and is not deterred. He said he was too busy to give up. He felt the education of his day to be largely useless and his life is an amazing record of what he did about it.

Pestalozzi loved people. He loved children. He dedicated himself to them and tried to be all things to them. He saw what was lacking in his day and tried to do something about it. Authorities said he lacked training and made trouble for him. He went elsewhere and persuaded

others to believe in him. He lacked facilities and when he finally got them men playing at war took them away. But he went elsewhere: to Neuhof, Stanz, Bungdorf, and Yverdon. In each place he did the same thing: tried to be all things to his pupils. And he wrote. He could not administer but he wrote. He wrote for parents and other teachers. His loyalty to these, his pupils, and his principles is shown by the fact that his outstanding characteristic is love. Friends thought him a little lunatic and little ones loved him.

Froebel, after working at a number of things, looked in on a school and said, "From this time onwards I gave all my thoughts to methods of education. . . ." Posterity said, "he devoted his whole life to humanity." He had no scholarly background but he said, "I see in every child the possibility of a perfect man." He said, "I am the bearer of an idea." He disregarded many social conventions in attempting to better education in his day. Others said, "He has the conviction of rightness and the self-confidence needed in a leader . . . and what he teaches has the strongest possible appeal." His whole life and the body of his works, along with his learning devices, speaks his dedication to children.

Horace Mann was a successful man. Trained in law, on the way to becoming a political favorite, admired and respected by those in power, he says, "Let the next generation be my client." From this moment on he drops everything and devotes himself to education. He reforms what he can in Massachusetts; then writes the voluminous Reports that influence education all over America and even abroad. Not satisfied with the training of teachers, he sets up the system of county Normal schools

to carve a college out of a wilderness and moves stumps and farm animals aside to do so. He directs Antioch College, teaches, and dies discussing plans, with students, for the college.

Mark Hopkins stands with a medical degree in his hand. He could be a doctor in the populous and wealthy east. He gets a call from rural and poor Williams College, isolated in the Berkshire mountains. He goes there for sixty years, thirty-six as president of Williams. His dedication to his task had results in his teaching as he presented his pupils with an example of the vibrancy of the dedicated man. He brought in several innovations and remained active at his skillful teaching for the eight-five years of his life, dying while preparing for another day of classes.

Gandhi dedicated himself to mankind. There was much to teach as a result of this kind of a dedication. He was also dedicated to non-violence. He took beatings for insisting on his rights as a member of the human family. He went to great lengths to teach what he believed to be true. He fasted almost 'til death, endured the discouraging disagreement of many of his countrymen, and the curiosity of the foreign powers. He never wavered. The manner of his life is testimony to his dedication. He could have no family and do what he did. British curses were heaped on his head, while classes of his own people took issue with his tampering with caste. But he persisted. He said he heard an inner voice most of his life. He won little victory after little victory. Patiently he bargained and compromised until he had the independence of India. His utter

sincerity and dedication to his cause bewildered men. He said the devoted teacher is one, "who is selfless, whose resolutions are firm, and who has a dedicated mind." He was willing to die for his cause, and as he walked through places of fearful bloodshed to halt hatred, he did die for his cause.

Purpose

Purpose in this study related to the extreme practicality of what the twelve men studied in this thesis taught. At first glance they are often condemned as visionaries, but men aware of the deeper dynamics of life know that the first questions to be dealt with are those of self and one's relationship to his world and whatever lies beyond. This is practical because it gives security. It need not be dogma if the teachers allow men to come to their own conclusions, having honestly investigated the pattern of Truth. This sense of purpose also carries conviction, and undergirds authority. There is a consistency; a constant aiming at the goal as defined by the purpose. In having a purpose, people feel important and the stature and dignity resulting dissolve many problems of control, interest, and maturation. The real purpose depends on involvement of the learner so the principle of self-activity is applied.

Buddha said his purpose was to learn the meaning of life. He said, "One thing only do I teach, suffering and escape from suffering." As he went about doing this, he rescued people from despair, gave a meaning to

the wandering monks of his day, and pointed to the essential good that could be done in life. He stood for something when the constituted priests but added to confusion. He said there was no value in asceticism for its own sake; one could better busy himself. Others said of him that compared to the suggested life of asceticism, the teaching of Buddha was "social, practical, human, businesslike and clear." Buddha's basic premise was that man is to glorify that which created him.

Confucius said he "found the world full of misery and wanted to exchange it for happiness." "He conceived education as being largely directed toward the cultivation of character." Confucius taught that man had a responsibility to reflect something outside himself. Each person was important and men of all rank were still men. Speaking of activity, he said, "To study, and when the occasion arises to put what one has learned into practice--is this not deeply satisfying?" Security? Confucius said, "If looking within his own heart, one finds no cause of self-reproach, why should he worry, what shall he fear?" Confucius demanded hard work from his pupils, in return for which they could reach an understanding of the universe, a self-concept, and peace of mind.

Socrates had one purpose: to know. Relentless questioning of all things, he said, "The substance of my inquiry is human affairs." He sought to make Athens what he knew it could be; he tried to help men become what he knew they could become. For him there was importance to everything; all kinds of people mattered. His purpose was to learn: he did it along with other people and this was his teaching. He stressed activity as a necessary condition to learning. Again, consider the

implications of, "when you are better the state will be better." He was practical and deplored the false logic and generalities of the sophists. For him, learning aimed at something. He used experiments and dealt in terms of the everyday affairs of men.

Jesus said, "I am come that ye might have life." His stated purpose was to prepare men for a life beyond. But this did not amount to empty abstractions or asceticism. Jesus claimed the best preparation for heaven to be a good life on earth. He talked about feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, caring for widows and the sick. He said he came to establish a spiritual kingdom, and if men would love God and one another there would be no problems. He made everyone feel important: Mary Magdelene knew she could be more than she was. So did the fishermen—and went on to prove it. He refused to condemn the adulterer, and pardoned the thief. He stressed activity. He said, "Follow me," and "Go ye into all the world." He often did things rather than talk. His teaching was practical, both in its use of daily experiences and its application to problems of life. Curious it is, that today men consider "Love one another," as hopelessly impractical while it is the only final practical answer to world problems.

Quintilian said his purpose was to "improve the training of orators" in his day. In doing this, his purpose became that of improving all of teaching. His purpose was to recall men to a practice of some of the commonsense psychology of learning. One of these principles was to stress that learning involves activity rather rote learning divourced

from meaning. Another was to recognize that each pupil must feel a sense of his being, of destiny. Quintilian gave this to those he taught and taught it to the world in his Institutio. He is on record as saying that "oratory must not be divorced from public service." He says, "the main purpose of education is to foster mental activity," and the mental activity Quintilian fosters deals with all the larger concerns of man by implication.

Erasmus held to moderation in all of his life as his purpose. He talked about glorifying God and had a "fervent desire for freedom, clearness, purity, and simplicity." He desired a world ruled by common sense. He tried to reconcile conflicting viewpoints on the common ground of humanity. He said, "Men must think first and then act." He wrote that men learn things by doing things. All the efforts of Erasmus were in the direction of getting men to live happily with each other.

Comenius actually only wanted to improve education in his native Bohemia. But he reformed education in many countries and wrote books dealing with all the problems of the world. His specific aim was narrow, but his educational breadth was amazing. He had a vision, and it had to do with rectifying the education of his day which was largely worthless. He wrote, "there is no more effective way of learning than by arousing alertness." He put his theories into practice in the classroom and reached all manner of men. It is written of him, "Comenius was a noble priest of humanity, whose single end and aim in life was the welfare of all mankind." This, and his life speak for themselves of the practical aim of his teaching and its importance for all people.

Pestalozzi wanted to improve the childhood training of children unhappy taught as they were. He said education was to glorify God. He said, "Man must learn to express himself in love." He also said, "It is well and good for children to learn something, but the really important thing for them is to be something." He didn't teach about things: he walked with his children around the school and the grounds and did things. His teaching of youth aimed mostly at molding character and he gave them the preparation for life they would need.

Froebel said, "I see in every child the possibility of a perfect man." Then everything he did went into the development of that perfect man. He took children at a young age and surrounded them with love and happiness. He said the first things was "to seek the kingdom of God." He, too, did things rather than talk about them. The sketch on him contains his account of how children, asking about butter, acted out milking, skimming, churning, and selling. His main application was "to the heart." "His teaching rested on this fundamental principle, that the starting point of all that we see, know, or are conscious of, is action, and, therefore, that education or human development must begin in action." His games with children speak of how he alerted each one to a sense of his being.

Horace Mann claimed man "is here to glorify his Maker." In line with this, he implemented his purpose by proposing new ways of teaching in the schools of America and abroad. The purpose of all these men studied, and of Horace Mann, also, is to get men to think for themselves.

He stressed that this "must be done by becoming actively caught up in a cause." "Be ashamed to die until you have won some cause for humanity," he says, and this speaks enough of his own purpose in his work and life. The things he wrote and in turn stressed at Antioch show his first concern was with the questions cited often before in this thesis. "A man must know what he is and to whom he is responsible," he said. These things were not handled as abstractions but in terms of the lives of the students at Antioch.

Mark Hopkins had as his purpose the thinking man. He said, "Only a man who thinks is a credit to his God." His teaching was all encompassing and he was famous for asking, "What do you think?" He "strengthened character, and stressed the cultivation of individuality." By his admirable method of educing the powers of his students he evoked a sense of importance in pupils." He wrote, "Every man who is educated at all, is, and must be, self-educated. Young men will not set themselves to work until they feel the importance of the part they are to perform." He wanted no rote or philosophical abstraction, but knowledge was rooted in daily use in his classroom.

Gandhi wanted independence for India. But eventually his teaching held larger considerations. His purpose was for men to live together and to accept one another. "He turned inward to the soul to tackle practical problems." But not as an ascetic. He meditated but the passive non-violence that resulted was a practical method; and in the end it worked wonders in the world. He preached simplicity and lived simply, but it all related to his purpose. He gave importance to all

men, from Untouchables to Brahmins, and strangers in other lands. He said, "I represent the semi-starved millions of India." They were his purpose, and each man's life was that man's purpose. Gandhi's purpose was to teach love as a principle of operation in the lives of all men. Again, the practicality of this can hardly be stressed too much. His purpose? The acceptance of all man by all men. His practical method? Love. He, too, did little talking about things. Rather, he set people doing things. His ashram was a hive of activity. People came out of curiosity and stayed to work. He did what he could about problems of food and clothing, for he knew the primary needs of his people.

Humility

Humility has to do with the ability to accept all men for what they are; then to teach all manner of men. It also means being able to learn from others, even from one's pupils. It means a teacher does not regard himself as a final authority, or his word sacred and not to be challenged. It often means having to accept a certain amount of condemnation from those who set themselves up as being more scholarly while the humble teacher probes for knowledge, knowing that he knows nothing. The great teachers talked with authority because they were convinced they had a message, but this was not an authority that trampled the opinions and rights of others.

Buddha is known for his ability to persuade men minus force or violence of any kind. The writings about him stress incidents in which he approached hostile groups and won them to his cause with his geniality,

benigness and kindness. The parables in the Pali Canon show his humble prodding and his sympathetic approach in seeking Truth with those that listened to him. There is a humility in setting an example before asking others to accept a thing, and this is characteristic of Buddha. The writings about him stress the point that he associated with all castes and had no special airs as a learned man. What he had to say was said modestly.

Confucius was almost too introverted to be anything but humble. He said himself that he had no rank and was from humble circumstances. It is recorded by his disciples that "Our Master learns through his gentleness, his humility, his restraint, his complaisance." His frequent answer of "I don't know" is significant of his humility. In many of his own words stress is placed on his role as a learner, rather than as a teacher. The disciples of Confucius noted that contrary to being afraid of being challenged he welcomed the opportunity to parry questions and form his own in turn. The humility of Confucius is a natural facet of his intellectual honesty.

Socrates endured scandal and curses from much lesser men when he could have shown them to be what they were. He chose instead to do what he could to raise the criticism and discussion to a level where it was above personal bias. His connections with high figures in the power structure of Athens could have won him position of a different sort, but he preferred his role in the crowds in the marketplace where he was subject to much more personal questioning and disagreement. Socrates stands as a prime example of a teacher who is not afraid to be challenged,

cross-examined, or questioned. He endured the outright insults of brash young men, and then smiled and in a patient and genial manner continued to parry questions and answers with these men. He was called a fool outright and said he probably agreed to that if a definition of a fool could be arrived at. He drank his poison and was friendly to his jailer when a show of vanity might have won his freedom.

Jesus spoke with the authority and force based on his messianic mission as he saw it. But his evidences of humility lie in his relationships with people and the things he did. He said, "Be ye not proud," and had scorn for the Pharisees. He told the story of the praying publican and Pharisee. And most of all he is seen as humble as he goes about the country often in the company of what were considered social outcasts. He refuses to judge the harlot, even when he himself said, "Whoever is without sin, cast the first stone." He had compassion on lepers, the blind, maimed, and sick. Any man could question him on his teachings and his own parables emphasize that his words were there to be accepted or rejected--no one need accept them as a result of force. In the few years during which he was popular he never accepted any advantage this might offer. Then in the end he refused to compromise to save his life. All through the accounts of his life and works his compassion for people stands out.

Quintilian was called a "whetstone rather than a knife." His popular connections with leaders in Rome didn't keep him from his daily work with students of all kinds. His writings in his Institutio show his humble regard for his pupils and his concern with all men. He actively

sought cross-examination from his pupils and wrote that if they were treated as equals they would grow in maturity. It is recorded of him that he was always accessible and to all men. He wrote that good could be found in all men, and when he had difficulty with a pupil he sought some lack in his operations as a teacher. One of his pupils wrote that "His success as a teacher was mainly due to his untiring devotion to the welfare of his pupils." This went on to conclude by saying he affected no vanity.

It may be more difficult to find humility in the case of Erasmus but it is there. One must look beyond the white, silk handkerchief held daintily to the nose at the real man. A glance at several of his statements, especially in his In Praise of Folly show a nature that emphasized the real man in each individual case and not reliance on position, rank, or scarlet tinselry. Erasmus had an interest in what lay in a man's heart more than his outward manifestations. There is much evidence in any study of the personality of Erasmus to build the case that his success with idealogies in violent conflict was due to his attitude of not taking himself or his position too somberly. This is not to suggest a lack of confidence but rather a real ability to recognize one man as an equal of any other. His affected distaste for the masses seems to have been a role he played imperfectly, for those same masses valued his words and his expression of them. This much is, then, to the point: willy-nilly his affected role, it is written of him that he was large in human sympathy, and the cry of a fellow human always moved him. And,

as with the others, he was willing to learn, to share some new experience with all men.

Comenius is outstanding in his display of humility. Seldom is it possible for a man to be able to bear the responsibility he had and to partake of as large a cup of personal tragedy as was his minus the total effect of a bowed head. It is written of him--and contained in his sketch--that he was to an extraordinary degree possessed of a "friendly, conciliatory, and humble" attitude in his approach to others. He made himself available for service, and to a great degree sacrificed himself. But in terms of concrete example, he walked, dealt, and studied with the common inhabitants of the earth. He was constantly thrown in contact with the great, but he preferred to live with and make his contribution to the common humanity he had elected to serve. He was asked to help serve the affairs of ministers of state, but he preferred to return to his task of salvaging a glimmer of hope out of the ruins of the world peopled by the dispossessed United Brethern and Bohemians. So his work and writings was for the parents and children wherein lay his task as he saw it.

Pestalozzi said, "I have neither family nor friends," but he went on to live with, weep with, and learn with those who in their youth had been abandoned by the world and--rags and all--gathered into the arms of Pestalozzi. The authorities thundered that he was not in possession of the necessary degrees; but the children whimpered to be tucked in bed. Issued bulletins of regulations regarded him as incompetent, but he substituted a gleam of purpose and endeavor for the rags. He knew no

pedagogy beyond love for each individual, whom he regarded as but an extension of himself. He did not despise authority and regulation but he despaired of improvement if someone with love in his heart didn't chart a course of betterment with the young. He respected position but was needed this morning by a child. He envied rank but held the boy on his lap that with a throughtful frown pursued questions of his universe.

Froebel endured. He endured the glances cast askance by the authorities entrusted with the definitions of life and learning. So he learned what he could from his children, romping in the kindergartens: a new breath he had brought to the face of the land. He learned what he could from the people the world over who came to watch him romp and dance with his children. He respected the constituted authorities and tried to comply with their arbitrary demands, but he kept the welfare and happiness of his pupils at heart. He is on record, by his pupils, as having loving patience, and no airs of superiority. When he said, "I see in every child the possibility of a perfect man," he devoted his knack, or genius, to that child, and considered that child as all important. The tendency is to welcome and give ear to the pompous official of state and to ignore the "mere child." Not so with Froebel. Check his directive dealing with the answering of the child's question despite an array of adults. And, too, Froebel knew what he was and what he was not, and such self-analysis kept him receptive, and his only confidence came in the belief in his message.

Horace Mann was a popular figure of state, but he volunteered for a role of controversy and service. Tragedy turned his thoughts of

service toward his fellow men, and while he added to a situation, he took from it measures of knowledge of fellow men. He could have had ambitions political, but he devoted himself to the "next generation." Instead of governor, and state senator, he pushed pigs and the wilderness aside to build Antioch, in Ohio. His classes at this college were noted and filled because rumor had it that the instructor could be questioned, disagreed with, and inveigled into a gleeful search involving instructor and student on an equal basis. His students recorded that "no one need fear him, for he was willing to listen and to search the matter more."

The character study of Mark Hopkins in this thesis is filled with a spirit of humility. One might almost say that Hopkins deprecated himself at times, if looked at out of context. But the whole spirit and approach of Hopkins is one of not seriously considering himself the most important figure in the lives of students or of Williams College. It took humility for him to continually ask students what they thought, and then to listen respectfully while they answered. It was a humility and a willingness to learn from students that moved him to join student's groups, in song, laughter, and fellowship. It was humility that lead him to play a democratic role with the faculty he headed. A pupil writes, Hopkins "did not insist that students agree with him." Above all, students knew Hopkins to be a sincere respecter of men. Another student comments on his manner of "treating students as an equal in discussions."

It is almost redundant in this study to comment on the humility of Gandhi. "On bended knee," he wrote, approaching the British Empire.

His spirit is one of humility more than any other man included in this study. He lived the Sermon on the Mount: so said men who knew him and walked with him in his life. He turned the other cheek; his whole philosophy of non-violence is one of humility. He insisted on rights but refused to prosecute those who beat him, as the fault was one of principle, not persons. He raised people from their knees who wanted to worship him. He lived with the Untouchable caste to demonstrate his acceptance of all men. Some of his most interesting letters were to missionaries—not agreeing with them in principle but recognizing their right to present their views for examination. Germane to Gandhi's greatness is his simplicity, and humility. People approached him with violence, to have him bow his head, sympathize, and then having the person join his cause. He ate, dressed, and travelled as did his countrymen, for he said, and indicated by his actions, that he represented these starving millions of India. He lived his belief that love conquers anger. He wrote of not being puffed with praise, and those who knew him comment with amazement on his "inexhaustible humility."

A. Nature and Extent of Common Elements

This study began with a kind of hypothesis. The assumption was that a number of great teachers would have some things in common, so that, simply conceived, anyone interested in good teaching could consider these characteristics and perhaps employ them. It was also assumed that any list of great men selected almost at random would exhibit variations, as all individuals differ. Thus the intent of the study was to focus on

the characteristics most noticeable as they kept appearing in each of the men studied. These characteristics were to be called the elements of teaching common to the men studied.

1. Summary Description of Technique

One of the knottiest problems in this study has to do with the word technique. To use the word technique today is to raise preconceived ideas in the minds of men. Aside from the meanings the word has in industry and the vocabulary of the layman, in education it usually refers to anything objective, from using a unit plan to evaluating with parent-teacher conferences. It is seldom thought of--or at any rate, it is glossed over--as having to do with the spirit of a man, or, more commonly, his personality and manner of expressing his beliefs. There are several interesting things that lead one logically to a consideration of the mysteries of personality as a matter of teaching technique.

It is not uncommon to see a person in a leadership position employing all the rules of standard technique he has been taught. In the case of the teacher this usually means following some planned form of organization, exercising certain traditional controls of behavior, making allowance for the contributions of students, and some rather objective evaluation. The teacher, or leader, in question may even make a conscious and sincere attempt to stimulate, to interest, to motivate the pupils. Still, it may and does come about that the situation is not a very good learning situation. Students may be confused or bored. Some pupils may be learning and others not. In general, the section of the formal

education process mentioned here may be no better or worse than any other. Perhaps students and teacher have already planned a unit of work to cover a span of time and material. Objectives have been listed, methods of achieving these objectives democratically decided upon, and a system set up for evaluation. Yet the above apathy is apparent. One wonders how many will later say, like Norman Cousins, that it became apparent after they got out of school that they were not educated; that their formal schooling had done little to educate them. It is precisely at this point that the serious student of teaching technique asks whether or not something isn't still missing in the measurement of that teaching method. What more can be studied with the student? Why, around the corner, is there another teacher succeeding admirably with apparently the same devices?

It is popular at this point to begin to investigate such things as degree of competence with subject matter, number of courses and/or previous years of experience contrasted teachers may have. Sometimes fashionableness of dress, youth, and even marital status are eyed. But no serious and respectable study to date has shown any significant correlation between these items and good teaching that can demonstrate that these items alone underlie good teaching. It does not take a brilliant or an especially perceptive person to become aware of the part played by the personality of the individual teacher. Thus it was said in the first part of this study that the personality and ability of the teacher is a factor which conditions all statements made concerning the organization of instruction. This, then, opens the door to a

consideration of all the variations of personality possible in people plus the means of expressing these characteristics as belonging to the proper study of methods of teaching.

This should not be cause for despair. It has long been held by some that the sciences dealing with the infinitely-variable subject matter of man will never admit of the same precision found in the natural sciences. But the true conception of science has to do with a projection into the unknown and thus the science of pedagogy does not suffer. Those mechanics that are discovered to be effective can be used and such constitute the stereotyped notinn of what is included in teaching technique. But the inability to probe and plot all the particular nuances of personality does not remove that mystical matter as a consideration in teaching technique. It is merely to return to Kahil Gibran's statement of the idea that any man can illustrate how he does a thing but cannot give exactly his ability to do that thing to another. In other words, it is true that the biggest percentage of the training of a teacher can deal with concrete items that almost anyone with intelligence can learn to adopt. But there remains a gap--like the gap between electrical contact points which can only be bridged by a thing of mystery. This is the thing that can be talked about, or even shown in action; but not given to another person. One can only watch closely, or study carefully, and then attempt within the limits of his own personality. This is the subject of this thesis and qualifies here as a study of teaching technique. It is for this reason that it emphasizes the characteristics of some great teachers.

2. Extent of Use

The next section of this study mentions briefly some of the ways in which the twelve men studied here differed. The main consideration is with characteristics that apply to all twelve of the men. The brevity, simplicity, and clarity of Gilbert Highet's three principles of good teaching is commendable, and, it will be recalled, served as an inspiration to this study. But in this thesis it is important to list in greater detail some of the traits of personality possessed by these great teachers that seem to relate to their great influence on students. The detail will not be too great, however, and only those characteristics are included that can be organized into general categories--covering a number of points that may have overlapped in the individual portraits, and that apply to at least eight of the twelve men. This extent of use qualifies an item as a characteristic common to the great teachers studied, and thus, perhaps, great teaching.

B. Nature and Extent of Divergencies

The essence of individuality is difference. It is interesting at times to speculate over whether educators could cope with the end product if the cult of individual differences were to achieve its aims. The point need not be belabored that as it is with grains of sand, snowflakes, and everything else of awe in this world so is it with men. It would be remarkable indeed if any group of twelve men were to be found of one pattern--be they gathered from the dregs or saints of society. The twelve men included in this study present no exception to that basic

law of nature. Add to the natural, or biological difference, the variations of time, locale, culture and beliefs and the spirit of individuality is enchanced. Thus while there is a commonality there is also a consistency of difference: each man differs in a way that gives meaning to the word unique.

1. Acknowledgment of Differences in Techniques Employed by Selected Men

Whatever differences exist among the Great Teachers in this study are variations of basic beliefs more than they are of ways of working with people. In matters of feeling a call to their work, attitudes towards people, and even degree of acceptance by society the twelve present many interesting parallels. The differences that exist can be attributed to the why of each man's work. It takes little imagination to surmise that Socrates' raison d'etre differed from that of Jesus. Truly there are striking parallels between these men but honesty must make account of differing motives in dealing with people.

But coming closer to home and the matter of method, it has been pointed out in the body of this study that Erasmus had little use for people--he even seemed offended by their proximity,--Quintillian seemed to plot his moves so as to be able to work in socially advantageous positions, while men like Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Gandhi seemed to revel among the poor and social outcasts. In all the reading and investigation involving these men differences of this type were the most noticeable. Then there were what might be called the more technical differences, say, between a Pestalozzi focusing on the early years of youth

in the schools, and Froebel insisting that grave importance be attached to pre-school years. There were some slight differences in the matter of the importance of memory work. There were some differences over the idea of reform from within an existing order or shattering the crucible of society from without. Some chose to limit the scope of their operations, as did Mark Hopkins, while others, like Confucius and Horace Mann spread themselves wherever possible. These seem small considerations and they are. If a basic difference were to be postualated it would have to be this: great teachers free the minds of men from codes and dogmas imposed upon them--the differences in the perception of what dogma is is the basic difference between any group of great men. And even this, to repeat, has to do with the age and location.

2. Extent of Differences

The extent of differences among the twelve men studied is slight--and then most often imposed by men who interpret them at a later date. It is said of this one that he meant thus-and-so, and of that one that his goal can be described thusly. The conception of ultimate authority differed among the twelve, but with little effect on the relationship they experienced with people. On the contrary, the similarities were such that the last few of the twelve began to sound like the first being repeated. It is difficult and largely impossible at this date to fix degrees of difference between the amount of discreet showmanship each of these men used, or the amount of poetry in their teaching. As no day-by-day accounts with any reliability exist of the extent of each

man's patience, or good humor, little can be known in this area. Writers including physical descriptions of these men and suggesting that part of their power lay in their appearance create an awareness of the difference between a Gandhi and a Horace Mann. There is, in the final analysis, less difference among the twelve than there is between them and much of contemporary teaching. They all had the ability to be both profound and simple, whereas the modern emphasis seems to result in a barrage of words, many of them obscure and bizarre. It is the conclusion of this study that whtin the framework applied to each of the men here dealt with differences are slight and related to any normal expectation of variation to be found amongst any group of men.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A compilation of the lists of descriptive words and phrases applying to the twelve men in this study could be justified as a fitting summary. A backward glance at these phrases will reveal again a startlingly similarity. This will be done in a condensed form as a part of this chapter. But to clarify the mass of data some general statements can be made as an aid to focus.

In the beginning pages of this study mention was made of a lamp of knowledge, being passed on to, or transcending the temporal. This simply refers to the fact that man as a culture builder selects aspects of that culture to be passed on to posterity. The twelve men in this study selected certain aspects of their respective cultures to preserve for future generations of men. The striking similarity of those aspects is one of the things that has welded them together and made it possible to refer to them all as Great Teachers. Those elements of culture--certainly not dealt with by them exclusively--have to do with man and what he is, his relationship to his society, his time, and to whatever is beyond.

> . . . for that is how the highest Truth has made its way in this world from age to age. Solitary individuals who reached the founts of Truth stood out all alone like peaks, like beacons for their personal-impersonal realizations; each one of them said: "Whether ye hearken unto me or not, the Truth which I have

> realized still remains the Truth: the Truth that never had a beginning and will never have an end--whose watchword is Love." The voices of these roused thousands and thus did the contagion of the Awakening spread.[1]

But also common to all of these men is the fact that, "as soon as their followers organized themselves into sects and parties they betrayed the saviour Truth they professed. The result has been pollution."

Still, these twelve are remarkable for something else basic in their unity of uniqueness:

> In every land of every clime, a few men have crystallized into a nucleus of light, men who have made bold to proclaim, that, though isolated, they fear none. You may deride them, persecute them, even kill them, but never will they return blow for blow. For they are pledged in everlasting loyalty and love, to the voice of the Lord seated in the Heart.[2]

Even the basic questions, or truths, with which these twelve dealt--though phrased in different ways--indicate that each is in the direct line of descent. "No one with a spark of spirit in him can help raising those central questions of life and thought which have engaged the attention of the great thinkers of the past. Who am I? From what causes do I derive my existence and to what conditions do I return? What beings surround me and what is my relation to them?"[3] To mention another great thinker just to stress the point, Kant asked them this way: What can I know? What ought I to do? What may I hope for?

---

[1]Dilip Kumor Roy, Among the Great (Bombay: Jaica Publishing House, 1950), p. 195.

[2]Ibid., p. vii.

[3]Ibid., p. ix.

This is essentially why these matters are considered spiritual, and their protagonists somewhat mystical. Regardless of what one believes as to matters of this life or any other, it does not take any great intelligence to realize that as everything dies, decays, disappears or changes only things of a "spiritual" nature can transcend ages. It matters little whether inherited knowledge is referred to as "the spirit of the ages," "the predominant philosophy of the times," or "culture that has been passed on." The fact that contemporary society shares in thoughts dating back thousands of years indicates a "something" that cannot be bound by time, place, or death. This is the real and simple meaning of the word spiritual. Christians variously interpret "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." Outward formality is mere organization, and Socrates, in ever seeking after Truth worshipped without ceasing. The twelve men of this study all based what they did and how they did it on a spiritual essence that enhances their commonality.

The spiritual emphasis was not at the neglect of the human and social. In fact, the mystical mean of these men determined their attitude towards man and his society. Surviving societies tend to mold the social character of man close to his human character. Periods in history have produced a gap between these two. The great teachers, perceiving the essential in humanity and defining mankind as they did, sought to close this gap between social and human role. It is odd but nonetheless true that society, which is an abstraction made up of men, sometimes produces a set of circumstances that enslave men. It is at these times that man's

humanity is called into question. Contemporary society is a prime example of this. Mankind can be enslaved by what he produces or he can collectively rise above and control his productions--including the society he identifies. The great teachers have all called men back to their basic humanity. (Interesting ideas here are those of what it might mean for man to be created--a creator, also--in the image of God; and, all of these great teachers disclaimed any new knowledge--only a return to old things, which often, in each respective era, amounted to a "new" way of looking at things.) Thus it is that few, if any, of these men is noted for teaching "specialities." None of them disclaimed the importance of special knowledge--after all, Quintillian as a teacher of rhetoric, was a teacher of a speciality in that part of his teaching which dealt only with rhetoric. But these men never thought that a school, or a teacher, could be all things to all people. Perceiving the needs of their day as they did, they thought it important and chose to pursue the basic truths as suggested above. They were not of those who sell their heads in the marketplace to the highest bidder.

The so-called basic truths, or as they each in turn perceived the "crying needs of their age," make it possible to consider each of these men--as has been mentioned in the individual studies--as being intensely practical. They considered it impractical and dishonest to keep toying with daily trivia when neglect of fundamental attitudes and values was hastening a day of reckoning, or even destruction. Each considered of what value a fact would be if both the fact and the man learning it

tumbled into the dust as a result of knowing nothing about purpose and the sense of life. The great teachers knew that the astronomical number of situations possible resulting from individual uniqueness and a limitless variety of environmental factors made it absolutely necessary that each man base his actions and attitudes on a well-developed knowledge of life and man as he lives it. This urgent practicality they chose to deal with in their teaching. Once again, modern society with its aimlessness is an example of the impracticality of proceeding with specialized knowledge freed from any basic sense of purpose: a philosophical matter.

Another summary statement that applies to the twelve men studied here relates to their use of personality as a teaching tool. Evidence is undisputed in the case of each that he was an outstanding and unique personality--and that it was this personality that made him succeed in situations where others attempted similar things but with different results because of the different personality. Psychology has yet to define all the nuances of meaning that can result, in even a formal classroom situation, as a product of the personality of the teacher. Holding the beliefs toward man that each of the twelve did, each set an atmosphere that was conducive to learning. Not the least of this--by far--was the amount of showmanship used by these great teachers. They did not regard themselves as entertainers but they were not adverse to taking a cue from those brothers who may have barked at fairs and attracted people to look in on what they had to offer. Great Teachers sense a rhythm and poetry in their work. They know that learning involves emotions and thus are not afraid of emotion in their teaching.

"The teacher has a 'captive' audience. That fact only increases the obligation upon him truly to captivate his students by his total effective appeal in which a discreet showmanship has its justifiable value."[1] When Mark Van Dorn says that the teacher is central to the drama of teaching, it is significant that he uses the word drama in referring to teaching. These twelve men made no apologies for being psychologically astute in the matter of arousing curiosity, holding interest, delivering, and rewarding. If pupils came for no other reason than curiosity at least they stayed to learn and this is all any teacher can really do. The adage about leading a horse to water is what is paraphrased in Gibran's you can lead a man to the threshold of your own knowledge and bid him enter, but you cannot give him your knowledge. In summary of the above it can be said that these twelve teachers were wise in the ways of men and their knowledge of human nature made them effective teachers.

There are many other matters in which these twelve great teachers are similar. Paramount among them is the simplicity and humility that pervades them all. Each wore his mantle of greatness lightly and this sincerity and a sympathy for the socially downtrodden came naturally. These things will be listed under another section in the concluding pages of this study.

This study is not to point up any specific religious beliefs or practices. The fact that all twelve men included here based their work,

---

[1]Ordway Tead, The Educational Forum, Vol. 21, No. 1, Nov., 1956.

direction, dedication, and sense of purpose on some religious conception is a thing that should at least be mentioned. The God or gods may have differed but unanimous was the characteristic in all of these men of acknowledging a power outside of themselves and of this revealed world. They did not seem to be embarrassed by this fact and beyond that took it for granted as a given assumption in their working with people. They neither seemed compelled to explain away anything mystical nor to ignore this common phenomenon as an aspect of man's culture. This belief had implications for their attitudes towards authority and the conviction with which they taught.

The attitude towards authority held by these men--with the possible exception of Quintilian--is a basic characteristic of them all. Infused as they were with the idea of a continual search for truth and the logic of the emphasis on self-motivation and self-interest, they insisted upon the freedom of the mind to rove, and probe where it would. This is not the point at which to discuss the pros and cons of conformity. But it was the honest and sincere right of the mind to soar which was sacrosanct with these men. They accepted no limitations of secular, state authority, tenets of traditionalism, dogmas of doctrine, schools of thought, or the imposed opinions of "teachers." There is not the space available here to go into the way they treated cooperation with the state to prevent chaos, but that was not their most important concern in the matter of freedom of belief. They were concerned more with process than with product. It is enough to say on this matter that they had little regard for constituted authority per se, as this authority

rested often on blind acceptance, and these twelve men rejected blind acceptance in any form. "Let the dead bury the dead," is the statement of one of them that applies here.

1. Organization of Data for All Persons Studied

The attempt was made in this study to weave the knowledge about these twelve men into some sort of informal pattern. This means that while the raw data on hand related to the lives, times, works, and work of the men they were not presented in any structured way. In fact, it was preferable to flit about in such a way that, while focus should be kept on how these men went about teaching, the spirit of the man would pervade these pages as it had the author while reading about these men. Temptatinn vacillated between writing what might be considered a rather dull reduction of the personalities of these men to lifeless protagonists of education and writing freely with the possibility of soaring to heights of hero worship resulting mostly in the reinforcement of legends. It is hoped that somewhere between these two extremes, asking the indulgence of the reader and his attempt to catch the spirit of these men stalking between the lines.

In general, facts and knowledge about these men were gathered in the following areas:

- life (biographical data)
- times (historical data)
- influence (analytical data)
- beliefs (philosophical data)
- methods (practical data)

Intentionally so, data on the lives was kept at a minimum. It is there to read, in numberless excellent sources, for all who care to pursue it. Brief mention was made of the facts of birth, wanderings, and death merely to locate the twelve men temporally. The data on the times is understandably more important and thus each section contains some information on this--but still held subservient to the main theme. The impact of influence was brought in at various points to bolster the claim of each of these men to a place in this study, and also because descriptions of influence often contained clues as to the reasons for that influence. And then, even as action cannot be divourced from committments, so basic beliefs of these men gave excellent testimony to the way in which they acted. There is no good reason to suspect that an Erasmus, for example, who writes of the necessity of adjusting one's teaching to the ability level of the pupils did not do so himself. Be that as it may, additional information was always present to indicate that beliefs bolstered action.

The matter of methods was hardest to come by, for, in despair, it soon became apparent that there was very little that could be called pure method--especially once it was established that the real seeds of method in every case germinated within the warmth of the man's personality. With this floodgate, as it were, opened, many things were coded as method that would not be handled thus by most contemporary class texts on educational method. For example, and this is not to be taken as derogatory, no technique such as a lesson plan or unit plan was uncovered in the work of these men. But it should be added hastily that the use made

of said lesson plan would have succeeded or failed as a function of the personality of the person using this device. And this, after all, is true of every device, technique, method, or what have you in the teaching of people. So while method as such began to lose its narrow and definite shape it also began to assume a much more exciting and meaningful context—one fitting the search for the good, the true, and the beautiful enshrined by these twelve men.

2. Condensation and Unity

At some point in the study it is necessary to glance back over the characteristics of the twelve men studied. In reading each of the twelve portraits, it is apparent that much similarity is present. At the extremes—as with all things--differences exist, but the main themes in each case are startlingly alike. Thus it is possible to gather these together and organize a body of descriptive phrases that characterize all of the twelve men contained in this study. This would amount to a list of characteristics, paralleling those included with a number of the twelve portraits, that would then apply to all twelve of these men. This is the point, the whole emphasis of this study. Such a list says this, "Look, no one can tell you how to be a great teacher. People take courses and read books and go to conventions, but totaled, these don't tally a great teacher. Greatness cannot be imparted like a radish, or a loan, or a lesson from memory. But here are some characteristics of the great. If you can, go and do likewise."

a. Creation of a hypothetical model teacher based on the common elements of teaching techniques employed by the twelve selected men.

Compiling a list of the descriptive phrases that have been applied to the twelve men would be one way of handling this matter. It would add zest to the thing if an imaginary teacher were described who possessed all of the characteristics to be included in denoting great teaching. This will be done in this section. It should not be taken lightly as a mere summary: it--while emphasizing nothing new--is the heart of this study. The hypothetical teacher embodying the characteristics of great teaching could be considered "modal teacher personality" for this thing of great teaching.

The name and dates applicable to the great teacher are not important: He does not exist. The birth and times of each of the twelve men was important, but whatever influences to great teaching were contained therein is assumed in the case of this teacher. One of the first considerations deals with the sense of authority the teacher feels. . .

. . . the basis from which he works--the philosophical . . .

For this teacher, ritualism, the conventional, traditional, and formal is merely mechanical and has no intrinsic value. His teaching is based on his degree of vision, and this results in a self-confidence born of a knowledge that he has something to say. Thus his teaching defies boundaries and raises the practical to the level of the universal. In this manner, his teaching reflects the needs of men, all men.

Truth has nothing to fear from any authority. The great teacher does not seek to do away with all constituted authority but simply to think through the bases on which authority rests. He is contemptuous of the idea that to affiliate with a group means much beyond affiliation; he probes for an inner awareness. Unpopularity often goes along with baring the inner motives of men, but the great teacher does not fear the authority he scrutinizes.

. . . this is related to attitudes . . .

There is a humility in the teaching of the great teacher. This is not a humility of condescension but one based on a sense of common humanity. His teaching is based on brotherly love, a sense of service, sincerity, and a loyalty that adds up to action. The Great Teacher makes himself accessible, not only to his students, but to all men. Thus he creates confidence in himself as a person, and he follows up by never closing minds with an affectation of superior, or final, knowledge. He is tolerant and frank at the same time. In this he indicates the sacredness in which he holds all of human life. He accepts all men and asks only for an alertness of mind; so he regards teaching as a means, not an end.

. . . this is reflected in the Great Teacher's attitude towards students . . .

The Great Teacher regards learning as a process of gradual growth and not a spectacular reformation. He adjusts his teaching to the various individual differences of his students. Slow learners are handled with especial patience and kindness. He himself studies the

patterns of human growth and development. He adapts his procedures to the moods of his pupils. He uses his knowledge of and insight into people. Knowledge that is obscure he makes plain. He is sincerely interested in people and tries to be aware of the state of mind of his pupils. He centers the will of each man in the learning process. And then, all men can qualify as his students. He does not base his acceptance of people on rank or respectability.

. . . these considerations undergird the process used . . .

The process of teaching is a complicated thing, yet the Great Teacher goes about it seemingly unaware of this complexity and in a relaxed manner stressing those things that result in good teaching. He knows that concentrated attention is important. Questions and answers--which provoke original thinking--emphasize constructive thinking as a positive force in his teaching. Thus his teaching is concrete and goes to the heart of the matter. Doubt often leads to conviction, and problem-solving begins in uncertainty. Knowledge, the end product, is too often, in other teaching situations, kept obscure and esoteric due to the learned and abstract way some present it. The Great Teacher is sincere, simple, and a permissive, non-threatening atmosphere is encouraged with questions and interruptions. The Great Teacher is magnetic, filled with force and vitality; he is dynamic and not afraid of a discreet showmanship, or mystical element in his personality.

Learning involves activity, and the Great Teacher stresses that thoughts must lead to words and thence to actions. Emphasis is placed on the involvement of the pupil, his self-direction, self-interest, and

self-motivation. Knowledge roots best in awe and wonderment: the Great Teacher catches the interest, gives something that can be understood, and then retains curiosity by suggesting something new. He emphasizes that both the intellect and the feelings must be encouraged to vigorous action.

With the Great Teacher, spontaneity adds vigor to his own teaching. This teaching is simple, direct, effective, and charming. His teaching is plain, not pretentious. It appeals to thought, then emotion, then decision. He kindles the spirit of man, and appeals to the imagination. The Great Teacher appeals to a sense of service, altruism, and cooperation rather than to rivalry, or selfish interest. He stresses proper mental attitudes. His onw teaching is characterized by genuineness, simplicity, and fervor. The Great Teacher is pragmatic: his pedagogy of commonsense begins with the experience of his listeners--going from the easy to the difficult, the known to the unknown, and in each case adhering to the principles of individualized instruction. All his teaching relates things specific to the total realm of knowledge in its broadest sense. Description of natural elements is hieghtened to human significance, and reality raised to moral vision. The words and examples used in teaching can be interpreted in many ways, leading to a broad applicability.

The Great Teacher excludes the use of external force, penalties, or compulsion. He uses such devices as role-playing rather than relying mainly on memory; he plays on the natural inquisitive nature of man. He adapts his teaching to the type of group situation in which he works, and he can and does teach anywhere. He condenses what he does, often

creating desire, arousing interest, and putting over a point in one sentence. He anticipates counter arguments and is skillful at throwing the burden of proof back to his pupils. He is never trite and has no rote routine. He deals with things that have common appeal, or couches his material in a way to align it with things of everyday life. He uses things close at hand as illustrations. He strives for originality as he probes. He denounces ignorance and skillfully handles the truths he juggles. He is not partisan or provincial; he emphasizes the objective. He sets men to thinking, sometimes speaking a truth a bit above his pupils and bringing them up to it with questions and answers. The Great Teacher does the extra bit required to be great rather than a good teacher. He has mastered the existing modes of teaching and improved on them.

In his relationships, the Great Teacher stresses giving rather than receiving. He is skillful at choosing and organizing men for the furtherance of ideas which seem to smack of truth. Occasionally he thinks aloud, and at all times his language is vivid, rigorous, concise, and even extreme.

. . . the process is embedded in considerations of personality . . .

The Great Teacher has discovered the value of being able to spend some time alone; he finds that it often adds depth to his knowledge. This sometimes means that he presents his teaching as a matter of personal belief, but in any event, never as a measurment of creed, or dogmatic assertion. He forgets himself in his consideration for others which means he exercises self-control in all things. He is patient, and has

faith in people. He is kind and does not judge others: he attacks ideas, not men. He is dedicated to his task of teaching and he goes out, if need be, to where the people can be found. He is above pettiness and personal resentments. This is based on his quiet knowledge of men and society. He is inspired by love and not afraid to associate with all manner of men. It is interesting to note that tied in with his knowledge of men and society, and what constitutes authority, he is aligned with the progressive forces in that society.

. . . resulting in the product . . .

Facts, not propaganda, are important. The Great Teacher constantly emphasizes truth, and the search for the same. All that might be called method is determined by this aim. There is no room for dogma in his teaching--whether his own or someone else's. His teaching transcends time and place as it strives always to associate with basic truths. There is a place for both this basic and specialized knowledge. All the teaching of the Great Teacher has its points where it ties items of knowledge in to that which is universal in the existence of man. Thus is his teaching related to a real sense of purpose in life. Learning is not a completed circle of ideas, or lessons that may be mastered by repetition and conformed to by habit. It is rather related to the development of principles. "The truth shall make you free," is the plea and point of this teaching. It is charged with this sense of reality. It has little to do with enthroned skeletons of old: new things are necessary when old prove inadequate. "The quiet dogmas of the past are not sufficient for the stormy present."

All knowledge, according to the Great Teachers, is not demonstrable; some is a matter of belief. The character resulting should transform the environment, not be enslaved by it. True knowledge relates to the underlying relationships of its various parts. Pupils have the right to study anything they believe worth study, and to hold and to announce whatever their investigation reveals. This investigation should deepen spiritual powers as well as broaden the intellect, and as such undergirds an ability to critically make decisions. Such a handling of content--employing the methods of the Great Teachers--increases ones understanding of the world about him, elevates man, and enables him to develop a sense of ethical values, moral responsibility, and individual integrity. One of the most important functions of the Great Teacher is to give a purpose and meaning to life. In doing so he imparts knowledge imaginatively and considers seriously the significant problems of the age; he impresses upon the student the worth of a rigorous intellectual approach which seeks rational answers to difficulties; he inspires a sense of dedication to the ideals of integrity and truth; he inculcates high standards of personal behavior and a sense of social responsibility; he instills a respect for the dignity and the rights of the individual; and he implants lasting spiritual values which give the inner resources necessary for a worth-while life.

The Great Teachers do not try to satisfy idle curiosity. Their teaching reflects the lives of people. It emphasizes the nobility of man in preference to his intellectual achievement. The Great Teacher lives this himself and impresses his pupils more by his personality than

by what he says. He is not necessarily the most popular member of society; his probing being a thorn in the flesh to some people with vested interests. But all is done in sincerity, with a real desire to discover truth, and to uncover its underlying relationships. The attitude to approaching this on the part of the Great Teacher embodies sincerity, meekness, humility, and unassuming nature not afraid, however, of the magnetism found in being vigorous, somewhat mystical with a bit of the dramatic, and dedicated to the conviction and authority inherent in a grasp of purpose in life.

And now truly, for emphasis--and this is for emphasis: of primary importance in great teaching is the personality. And paramount, woven into the pattern of that personality is:

1. Enthusiasm. Enthusiasm begets enthusiasm from learners. It insures vigor and dynamic teaching. In the true sense of the word, as attracting, enthusiasm helps make a personality magnetic. This establishes a sense of sincerity. It is dramatic and aware of the part played by the emotions. It openly acknowledges the element of mysticism in great teaching.

2. Simplicity. Simplicity begins in relating knowledge to the common life lived by people. This means a great teacher has a keen awareness of people and life; not an abstracted awareness but an awareness of actual contact with both.

3. Dedication. Dedication insures teaching with authority; teaching from a conviction. This relates to loyalty to people and loyalty to the work of teaching.

4. Purpose. A sense of purpose offers security. It convinces people of their importance, and of the importance of life. It also underlies authority, and conviction.

5. Humility. This is the honest willingness to learn from all men, and to accept all men. This is not contradictory to authority and conviction, but rather bolsters it with a greater depth of meaning.

B. Recommendations

The recommendations for this study were implied in the introductory chapters but can be repeated briefly here. A study of this type has uncovered nothing new. In the spirit of the twelve men studied here, this is a re-emphasis of old truths. This study gathers together in one place a number of the characteristics of great teachers. It claims that information on great teaching can be had from a study of a number of great teachers. The primary recommendation of this study is for anyone interested in great teaching to look carefully at what is written in these pages. By sitting at the feet of the great, as it were, one may indulge in greatness. Certainly one can be stimulated by the magnetism, enthusiasm, work and influence of these great men. And in the interests of any who may attempt to follow, characteristics were defined inasmuch as was possible in a manner to permit of imitation, or adoption.

1. Implications for Teaching

The author of this study has been associated for a time with student teachers. One of the most noticeable things in the work of these people

is that even though a beginning teacher is employing all the worthwhile and necessary techniques that he has been taught he may be ineffective as a teacher. The question naturally arises, what is missing? This study makes the claim that even prior to a knowledge and use of the various devices of planning and classroom control, a knowledge of the social, psychological, and philosophical foundations of education must come an awareness of the principles stressed in this study. An academic knowledge of and ability to use an educational technique succeeds or fails to the degree that it is first based on the personality of the teacher using it—a personality compounded of the characteristics noted in this study. This study does not want "to go out on a limb" and cite as fact unsupported by research anything dogmatic. However, cursory experience does tend to show that a person possessing the characteristics outlined in this study can do an effective job of teaching minus a working knowledge of specific and formal techniques, while the reverse is not always true. This study implies then that the training of future teachers should deal with the characteristics of great teachers as seen here, perhaps coming earlier in the training period than the learning of the formal elements of lesson planning, textbook selection, and the like.

The implications for the teaching of an individual teacher are obvious: these characteristics of great teachers underlie great teaching. To adhere to them does not mean one will rule the world, become a god, or upset empires; but it does mean a greater effectiveness to the work of any teacher practicing these principles.

2. Recommendations for Further Investigation

Investigation of this type has no end. Each man studied here can be defined in much greater detail; or the list of names can run on indefinitely. These are twelve out of a beginning list of forty; the forty were selected from a longer list, and so on. Much more could be done, with the implied shift of emphasis, with the matter of the connection between the times and the men. Sectional studies can be done, sectional meaning to limit consideration of characteristics to a more select section in an effort to set greater specificity. Some studies have been done and more could be done on the contemporary influences of these great teachers, especially of educational reformers like Comenius, Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Horace Mann. Sophisticated experimental studies could be done in an attempt to measure the real effectiveness of the characteristics of personality set forth here. These few suggestions indicate that there are quite a number of possibilities for further investigation.

And now what does one say at the end of a study of this type? That it is not the end. The author indicated in the introduction that it was possible for him to learn by being thus in contact with the great teachers. Of this he is now so thoroughly convinced, and because of the changes already apparent in his own work, that this study has become a beginning--to put an end to it would be impossible. Each of these twelve men speaks as a prophet, a seer, and to this knowledge there is no end--only a greater depth. "If I had known He was a prophet, I would have begged him to speak . . . for I would learn."

And He taught them, saying . . .

BIBLIOGRAPHY

General References

Abelson, Harold H. The Art of Educational Research. Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Co., 1933.

Adams, E. W. A Qualitative Analysis of Certain Teaching Traits. Philadelphia, Pa.: Temple University, 1928.

Avent, Joseph E. Excellencies and Errors in Teaching Methods. Knoxville, Tenn.: Jos. E. Avent, Publishers, 1931.

Bagley, William C., and Keith, John A. H. An Introduction to Teaching. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1927.

Bagley, William C., and MacDonald, Marion E. Standard Practices in Teaching. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1938.

Baltzell, E. D. "Who's Who in America" and "The Social Register": Elite and Upper Class Indexes in Metropolitan America," Class, Status, and Power, R. Bendix, S. M. Lipset, eds., Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1953.

Barnard, H. C. An Introduction to Teaching. London: University of London Press, Ltd., 1952.

Barr, A. S., et al. "A Symposium on the Classification of Educational Research," Journal of Educational Research, XXIII, May 1931.

Borgatta, E. F., Bales, R. F., and Couch, A. S. "Some Findings Relevant to the Great Man Theory of Leadership," American Sociological Review, Vol. 19, 1954.

Bossing, N. L. Progressive Methods of Teaching in Secondary Schools. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1942.

Boutraux, Emile. Natural Law in Science and Philosophy. London: David Nutt, 1914.

Burton, William H. The Guidance of Learning Activities. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1944.

Busch, H. M. Leadership in Group Work. New York: Association Press, 1934.

Cantor, Nathaniel, The Dynamics of Learning. Buffalo, New York: Foster & Stewart, 1946.

_____. The Teaching-Learning Process. New York: The Dryden Press, 1955.

Chinoy, Ely. Sociological Perspective. New York: Random House, 1954.

Compayré, Gabriel. The History of Pedagogy. Boston, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Co., 1890.

Cooley, C. H. "Leadership or Personal Ascendency," Sociological Theory. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956.

David, Kingsley. Human Society. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1940.

Douglass, Harl R. and Hubert, H. Teaching in High School. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1948.

Durkheim, Emile. Education and Sociology. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1956.

Gibb, C. "Leadership," Handbook of Social Psychology, Gardner Lindzey, ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1954.

Gibran, Kahlil. The Prophet. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1942.

Good, Carter V., Barr, A. S., and Scates, D. E. The Methodology of Educational Research. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1938.

Hamilton, Edith. "The Lessons of the Past," Saturday Evening Post, September 27, 1958.

Hay, Florence. "Apparent Reflections of Comenius's Philosophy in Contemporary Education," unpublished doctoral thesis, 1955.

Hayaka. Language in Thought and Action. Harcourt Brace.

Henry, Nelson B. Learning and Instruction. The 49th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Highet, Gilbert. The Art of Teaching. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1954.

Hilgard, E. R. Theories of Learning. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1956.

Historical Scholarship in America. A Report by the Committee on the Planning of Research. A. M. Schleslinger, Chm. New York: Ray Long and Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1932.

Hoffer, Eric. The True Believer. The New American Library, 1951.

Holley, Charles E. The Teacher's Technique. New York: The Century Co., 1925.

Hook, Sidney. The Hero in History. New York: The John Day Co., 1943.

Johnson, Earl S. Theory and Practice of the Social Studies. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1956.

Kingsley, H. L. The Nature and Conditions of Learning. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1946.

Kriner, Harry L. Pre-Training Factors Predictive of Teacher Success. State College, Pa., 1931.

Lancelot, W. H., Barr, A. S., Lyon, V.E., et al. The Measurement of Teaching Efficiency.

Lippitt, R. and White, R. K. "The 'Social Climate' of Children's Groups," Child Behavior and Development. Barker, Kounin, and Wright, eds. New York: McGraw Hill, 1943.

McConnell, T. R., Scates, D. E., and Freeman, F. N. The Conceptual Structure of Educational Research, No. 55. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press, May 1942.

Melton, A. W. "Learning," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, W. S. Monroe, ed. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1941.

Mercer, Blaine. The American Community. New York: Random House, 1956.

Methods for Measuring Teacher's Efficiency. The Fourteenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. A. B. Boyce, ed. Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Co., 1915.

Muller, Hermann J. The World View of Moderns. 50th Anniversary Lecture Series, University of Illinois Graduate College. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1958.

Newer Instructional Practices of Promise. 12th Yearbook, NEA. Washington, D. C., 1940.

Oeser, O. A. Teacher, Pupil & Task. London: Tavistock Publications, Ltd., 1955.

Peterson, A. D. C. A Hundred Years of Education. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., 1952.

Roy, Dilip Kumor. Among the Great. Bombay: Jaica Publishing House, 1950.

Russell, Charles. Teaching for Tomorrow. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1937.

Schlesinger, Jr., Arthur. "The Decline of Greatness," Saturday Evening Post, Nov. 1, 1958.

Schulter, W. C. How to Do Research Work. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1927.

Tead, Ordway. The Educational Forum. Vol. 21, No. 1, Nov., 1956.

Thelen, H. A. Dynamics of Groups at Work. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Thwing, Charles F. Guides, Philosophers, and Friends. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1927.

Titus, Charles H. The Processes of Leadership. Dubuque, Iowa: W. C. Brown Co.

Ulich, Robert. Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.

VanDorn, Mark. The University of Illinois in Retrospect. 50th Anniversary Lecture Series, University of Illinois Graduate College. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1958.

Waley, Arthur. The Analects of Confucius. London: G. Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1938.

Washburne, Norman F. Interpreting Social Change in America. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1954.

Webster's Dictionary.

Whitney, Frederick L. The Elements of Research. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950.

Williams, Robin. American Society. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.

Wilson, Woodrow. Leaders of Men. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1952.

References Pertaining to the Great Teachers
Listed in This Study

Buddama Buddha

Brewster, E. H. The Life of Gotama the Buddha. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1926. The author quotes the translation by Rhys Davids of "Digha-Nikaya, IV."

Burtt, E. A. The Teachings of the Compassionate Buddha. New York: Mentor Book, 1955.

Coomaraswamy, Ananda K. Hinduism and Buddhism. New York: The Philosophical Library, Inc.

_____. Myths of the Hindus and Buddhists. London: George G. Harrop and Co., Ltd. 1920.

Davids, Rhys. The History and Literature of Buddhism. Calcutta: Susil Gupta (India) Ltd., 1952.

Eliot, Sir Charles. Hinduism and Buddhism. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1954.

Fitch, Florence Mary. Their Search for God. New York: Lathrop, Lee and Shepard, 1948.

Goddard, D. Buddha, Truth, and Brotherhood. Santa Barbara, Cal.: J. F. Rowney Press, 1934.

Herald, A. F. The Life of Buddha. Toyko: Charles E. Tuttle Co., 1954.

Hilliard, F. H. The Buddha, The Prophet, and the Christ. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956.

Lillie, Arthur. Buddha and Buddhism. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900.

Macmunn, Sir George. The Religions and Hidden Cults of India. London: Sampson Low, Marsten and Co., Ltd.

Mills, Charles D. B. The Indian Saint. Northampton, Mass.: Journal and Free Press Co., 1876.

Morgan, K. W. The Path of the Buddha. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1956.

Mosani, Saokantant. Gautama. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1956.

Confucius

Analects, The (book of sayings ascribed to Confucius)

Collis, Maurice. The First Holy One. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948.

Creel, H. G. Confucius, The Man and the Myth. New York: The John Day Co., 1949.

DuBose, Hampden C. The Dragon, Image, and Demon. Richmond, Va.: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1899.

Giles, Lionel. The Sayings of Confucius. London: John Murray, 1907.

Kaizuka, Shigeki. Confucius. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1956.

Koehn, Alfred. Confucius. Peking, China: At the Lotus Court, 1944.

Ware, James R. The Sayings of Confucius. New York: Mentor Book, The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1955.

Weber, Max. The Religion of China. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1951.

Socrates

Anderson, Maxwell. Barefoot in Athens. New York: William Sloane Associates, Inc., 1951.

Burnham, W. H. Great Teachers and Mental Health. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1926.

Courtney, W. L. Studies at Leisure. London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1892.

Doherty, F. C. The Martyrdon of Socrates: The Apologia and Crito with Selections from Phaedo. London: Oxford University Press, Amen House, 1923.

Forbes, J. T. Socrates. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1913.

Hamilton, Edith. Witness to the Truth. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1948.

Highet, Gilbert. The Art of Teaching. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1954.

Kraus, René. The Private and Public Life of Socrates. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Co., Inc., 1940.

Leonard, W. E. Socrates Master of Life. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1915.

Mason, Cora. Socrates. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1953.

Stawell, F. M. The Euthyphro, Apology, and Crito. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906.

Taylor, A. E. Socrates, Peter Davies Ltd., 1935.

Ulich, Robert. Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Xenophon, Anabasis, Books IV-VII, and Symposium and Apology. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1923.

Zeller, E. Socrates and the Socratic Schools. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1885.

Jesus

Akhilananda, Swami. Hindu View of Christ. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949.

Barton, Bruce. The Man Nobody Knows. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1924.

Beardslee, C. S. Teacher-Training with the Master Teacher. Philadelphia: The Sunday School Times, 1903.

Bruce, W. F. Jesus and Youth: His Words, Their Ways. New York: Exposition Press, 1953.

Burnham, W. H. Great Teachers and Mental Health. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1926.

Bushnell, Horace. The Character of Jesus. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900.

Colwell, E. C. An Approach to the Teaching of Jesus. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1947.

Courtney, W. L. Studies at Leisure. London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd. 1892.

Daniel-Rops. Jesus and His Times. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1954.

Douglass, Harl. Teaching in High School. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1948.

Ellis, G. H. "The Pedagogy of Jesus," Pedagogical Seminary. Vol. 9, 1902.

Gibran, Kahlil. Jesus. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1928.

Guignebert, CH. Jesus. Lonson: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd., 1935.

Hinsdale, B. A. Jesus as a Teacher. St. Louis, Missouri: Christian Board of Publication, 1917.

Ingalls, Jeremy. The Galilean Way. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1953.

Mozoomdar, P. C. The Oriental Christ. Boston: Geo. H. Ellis, 1883.

Murry, J. Middleton. Jesus, Man of Genius. New York: Harper and Bros., 1926.

Quick, R. H. Essays on Educational Reformers. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1890.

Rhees, Rush. The Life of Jesus of Nazareth. New York: Charles Scribners and Sons, 1922.

Seeley, Sir John R. Ecce homo. New York: Macmillan Co., 1913.

Stevens, George B. The Teaching of Jesus. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1929.

The Holy Bible. New York: The World Publishing Co. (King James Version).

Withall, John, and Brown, Mina Press. "The Potential of Group Process for the Church," Religious Education, Vol. 50, 1955.

Quintilian

Dobson, J. F. Ancient Education and Its Meaning to Us. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1932.

Frieze, Henry S. The Tenth and Twelfth Books of the Institutions of Quintilian. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1870.

Gwynn, Aubrey. Roman Education. Oxford at the Claredon Press, 1926.

Horne, Herman H. Quintilian on Education. New York: University Bookstore, 1936.

Monroe, Paul. Source Book of the History of Education. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1948.

Quintilianus, Marcus Fabius. The Institutio Oratoria, (trans. by H. E. Butler) New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1921.

Smail, William M. Quintillian on Education. Oxford at the Claredon Press, 1938.

Warner, Charles D. (ed.) Library of the World's Best Literature. New York: The International Society, 1896.

Watson, John Selby. Quintilian's Institutes of Oratory. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1902.

Williams, Samuel G. The History of Ancient Education. New York: C. W. Bardeen, 1903.

Erasmus

Campbell, W. E. Erasmus, Tyndale, and More. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1949.

Emerton, Ephraim. Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1899.

Erasmus, D. Ciceronianus. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, 1908.

Erasmus, D. The Praise of Folly, (trans. by Hoyt Hopewell Hudson) Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1941.

Erasmus, D. The Praise of Folly, (trans by Hendrik Willem Van Loon) New York: Classics Club, Walter Black, 1942.

Froude, J. A. Life and Letters of Erasmus. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912.

Huizinga, J. Erasmus of Rotterdam. New York: Phaidon Publishers Inc., 1952.

Hyma, Albert. The Youth of Erasmus. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1930.

Phillimore, J. S. "Dublin Review," July, 1913.

Smith, Preserved. Erasmus. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1923.

Woodward, W. H. Desiderius Erasmus. Cambridge: The University Press, 1904.

Comenius

Adamson, J. W. Pioneers of Modern Education. Cambridge: The University Press, 1921.

Comenius, John Amos. The Great Didactic, (trans. by M. W. Keatinge) London: A. & C. Black, Ltd., 1921.

Comenius, John Amos. The School of Infancy. (Ernest M. Eller, editor) Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1956.

Hoyt, Charles O. Studies in the History of Modern Education. New York: Silver, Burdett and Co., 1908.

Jelinek, Vladimer. The Analytical Didactic of Comenius. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Keatinge, M. W. Comenius. New York: McGraw-Hill Cook Co., Inc., 1931.

Misawa, Tadasu. Modern Educators and Their Ideals. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1909.

Monroe, W. S. Comenius. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912.

Painter, F. V. N. A History of Education. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1912.

Quick, Robert H. Essays on Educational Reformers. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1912.

Spinka, Matthew. John Amos Comenius, That Incomparable Moravian. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press, 1943.

Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi

Anderson, Lewis F. Pestalozzi. New York: McGraw-Hill Cook Co., Inc., 1931.

Compayré, Gabriel. Johann Heindrich Pestalozzi. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1907.

DeGuimps, Roger. Pestalozzi, His Life and Work. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1909.

Graves, Frank P. A History of Education. New York: The Macmillan Co., New York, 1917.

Green, J. A. Pestalozzi's Educational Writings. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1912.

Holman, H. Pestalozzi. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1908.

Hoyt, Charles Oliver. History of Modern Education. New York: Silver, Burdett and Co., 1908.

Krusi, H. Pestalozzi: His Life, Work, and Influence. New York: American Book Company, 1875.

Monroe, W. S. History of the Pestalozzian Movement in the United States. Syracuse, New York: C. W. Bardeen, 1907.

Painter, F. V. N. Great Pedagogical Essays. New York: American Book Company, 1905.

Pestalozzi, H. How Gertrude Teaches Her Children, (trans. by Holland and Turner) New York: C. W. Bardeen, 1898.

_____. Leonard and Gertrude, (trans. by E. Channing) Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1908.

Froebel

Bowen, H. C. Froebel and Education by Self-Activity. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893.

_____. Froebel, and Education Through Self-Activity. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.

Claxton, P. P. Sketches of Froebel's Life and Times. Springfield, Mass.: Milton Bradley Co., 1914.

Eliot, H. R. and Blow, S. E. The Mottoes and Commentaries of Friedrich Froebel's Mother Play. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1898.

Fletcher, S. S. F. and Welton, J. Froebel's Chief Writings on Education. London: Edward Arnold, 1912.

Froebel, Friedrich. The Education of Man, (trans. by W. N. Hailmann). New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1898.

Hubbard, E. Little Journeys to the Homes of Great Teachers. New York: The Roycrafters, 1908.

Lawrence, E. Friedrich Froebel and English Education. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953.

Michaelis, E., Moore, H. K. Autobiography of Friedrich Froebel. Syracuse, New York: C. W. Bardeen, 1908.

Von Marenholz-Bulow, B., Reminiscences of Friedrich Froebel. Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1887.

Horace Mann

Barnard, Henry. "Biographical Sketch of Horace Mann, LL.D." Barnard's American Journal of Education, December, 1958.

Compayré, Gabriel. Horace Mann and the Public School in the United States. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1907.

Hinsdale, B. A. Horace Mann and the Common School Revivial in the United States. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.

Horace Mann Centennial Issue. Commonwealth of Mass., Department of Education, No. 5, 1937.

Life and Works of Horace Mann. (Author is given as Horace Mann, no editor cited, but the volumes contain articles on Mann--frontispiece has this title: Annual Reports of the Secretary of the Board of Education of Massachusetts for the Years 1837-1938, Lee and Shepard Publishers, Boston, 1866.)

Mann, Horace. Lectures and Annual Reports on Education. Cambridge, 1867.

_____. The Republic and the School. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1957.

Mann, Mrs. Horace. Life of Horace Mann. Boston: Lee and Shepard Publishers, 1891.

Tharp, Louise Hall. Until Victory: Horace Mann and Mary Peabody. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1953.

Mark Hopkins

Carter, Franklin. Mark Hopkins. New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1892.

Hopkins, Mark. "On Originality," The Biblical Repository and Quarterly Observer, Vol. 6, No. 2, Oct., 1835.

_____. "The Moral Problem," International Review, Vol. 5, Nos. 3 and 4, May and July, 1878.

_____. "Optism," Andover Review, Vol. 3, No. 15, Mar. 1885.

Howe, M. A. Classic Shades. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1928.

Peterson, Houston. Great Teachers. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1946.

Rudolph, Frederick. Mark Hopkins and the Log. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1956.

Spring, L. W. Mark Hopkins, Teacher. New York: John Day, 1929.

Gandhi

Diwakar, R. R. Satyagraha: The Power of Truth. Hinsdale, Ill.: Henry Regnery Co., 1948.

Edib, Halidé, Inside India. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1938.

Fischer, Louis. Gandhi and Stalin. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1947.

_____. Gandhi, New York: G. . Putnam's Sons, 1954.

Fulop, Miller, René, Lenin and Gandhi. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1927.

Hall, Josef Washington. Eminent Asians. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1929.

Holmes, J. H. Gandhi's Letters to a Disciple. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1950.

_____. My Gandhi. New York: Harper and Brothers Publications, 1953.

Manshardt, Clifford. The Mahatma and the Missionary. Chicago, Ill.: Henry Regnery Co., 1949.

Miller, Webb. I Found No Peace. New York: The Liberary Guild, Inc., 1936.

Mukerji, Dhan Gopal. My Brother's Face. London: Thornton Butterworth, Ltd., 1925.

Narayan, R. K. Waiting for the Mahatma. Michigan State University Press, 1955.

Oxnam, G. Bromley. Personalities in Social Reform. New York: Agingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950.

Roy, Dilip Kumor. Among the Great. Bombay: Jaica Publishing House, 1950.

Sheean, Vincent. Mahatma Gandhi. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.

Shridharani, Krishnalal. The Mahatma and the World, New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1946.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

This appendix contains a copy of the letter that was sent to twenty-five contemporary figures prominent in education in an attempt to select the twelve men for study.

Dear Sir:

I am engaged in research in which an attempt is being made to identify basic characteristics common to the great leaders, especially teachers, of all time. The plan is to draw some conclusions based on the thoughts which appear common to the thinking of these men. The ideas pointed up would have some bearing on teaching.

Thus far, I have selected twenty names at random. I have tried to cover the span of history from Buddha to the present. It can be readily seen that such a list could include hundreds of names. I would like to bolster my selection by determining how much agreement there is on the names of these men. With that in mind, I enclose a list of names. They need not all be educators, nor need they be the greatest men, as long as they have something to say for education.

It would be a great help to me if you could take a moment to make a mark before each name on the enclosed list that you would include on a list of twenty names. Allow me to thank you in advance for any time and effort that this entails.

Respectfully yours,

Neil Lamper

APPENDIX B

Following is the list of names to whom the letter in Appendix A was sent:

Mortimer Adler
W. A. Brownell
Ernest Horn
Harl Douglass
Ernest Melby
Earl Johnson
Harlan Koch
Cole Brembeck
Earl Kelly
Lawrence Haskew
T. V. Smith
William Kilpatrick
Benjamin Fine
Hugh McGrath
Harold Benjamin
Carson McGuire
John Bartky
Robert Hutchins
Walter Cocking
Robert Ulich
Sydney Hook
Glen Austin
Harold Shane
Gene Wahlquist
W. C. Saucier

APPENDIX C

Following is the list that was sent to the twenty-five names in Appendix A, from which they were to select twenty whom they considered most important:

Zoroaster
Lao-Tzu
Gautama Buddha
Confucius
Socrates
Plato
Aristotle
Jesus
Quintilianus
Augustine
Mohammed
Roger Bacon
Vittorino Da Feltre
Erasmus
Trotzendorf
Roger Ascham
Montaigne
Francis Bacon
Comenius
Descartes
Ezekiel Cheever
John Looke
Kant
Rousseau
Thomas Jefferson
Pestalozzi
Herbart
Froebel
Horace Mann
John Avery Cardinal Newman
Mark Hopkins
Ralph Waldo Emerson
Jean Agassiz
Herbert Spencer
Matthew Arnold
Booker T. Washington
John Dewey
Mohandas Gandhi
William James Durant
Adolph Hitler