PEDAGOGIC THEMES IN THE MAJOR NOVELS OF BROOKE, DAY, AND INCHBALD

P. ROBERT O'DRISCOLL

13676

ABSTRACT

The novels of Brooke, Day, and Inchbald were natural developments of the late eighteenth-century climate of ideas and taste. Three circumstances combined to produce these novels: first, the widespread belief that the society of the day was corrupt; second, the primitivistic notion that man should act according to his natural impulses and instincts rather than the accepted rules of society; and third, the educational ideas of Rousseau, which were currently being acclaimed. Like Rousseau, these novelists exemplified their educational doctrines through the medium of the novel.

Brooke, Day, and Inchbald believed that environment is largely responsible for the type of character produced. The conventional patterns of society can stultify the impressionable minds of children; therefore, these novelists condemned the fashionable environment which thwarted the natural virtues of the child. They maintained that a child must be placed in a natural environment which would permit the natural virtues to develop uncontaminated. Their conception of education accepted the child as a child; promoted the natural development of his faculties; aided him to recognize the dangerous habits of mind which a blind adherence to the conventions of society can develop; guided him in the formation of good habits; instilled qualities into his mind and heart which would cultivate a humane disposition and a sympathetic feeling for his fellow-

man; and aimed at producing a useful and virtuous member of society. This education was to be conducted far from the vices of fashionable life. But the pedagogical novelists did not want to destroy society; they only wished to alter its sense of values so that a child's faculties could develop without constraint.

PEDAGOGIC THEMES IN THE MAJOR NOVELS OF BROOKE, DAY, AND INCHBALD

by

P. ROBERT O'DRISCOLL, B.A. (Ed.), B.A. (Hons.)

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 28 September 1960.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

This work is a study of the educational ideas expressed in the novels of Brooke, Day, and Inchbald, and not a critical appraisal of the novels as works of art. They are not great works of art, but are still worthy of consideration. In the first place, they reflect many of the prevalent ideas and practices of the eighteenth century: the idea that the society of the day was corrupt, the common desire to improve this society, the belief in the power of education to reform society, the proposal of a system of education based on the natural goodness of man and on his natural desires and impulses, the sublimation of the 'natural state', and the use of the novel as a medium of reform. And secondly, these novels form a compact and unique group bound together by a common aim - the improvement of society through education. The pedagogical novels cannot be neglected in a comprehensive study of the thought of the eighteenth century: they constitute a chapter in themselves.

To make a proper examination of these educational ideas, I found it imperative to consider, though not in detail, the artistic and philosophical background of the age which produced them. In other words, I have not merely painted the portrait, but I have also built a frame for the picture: the portrait in this case is valueless without the frame. Chapter 1 traces the formulation of naturalistic philosophy, Rousseau's application

of this philosophy to education, his influence on subsequent educational thought and practice, and more specifically his influence on Brooke, Day, and Inchbald; Chapter 2 provides the philosophical basis of Brooke's education of the heart and an examination of the educational ideas occurring in his novels; and Chapter 3 an analysis of Day's educational convictions. In Chapter 4 I depart from my objective approach and attempt to prove two things: first, that Elizabeth Inchbald was an educational novelist; and second, that she believed a 'natural education' was superior to a 'fashionable' one. I was unable to discuss Brooke's Juliet Grenville and Day's History of Little Jack, as these novels were inaccessible to me.

I am especially indebted to several secondary sources for the citation of material unavailable to me: G. W. Gignilliat's The Author of 'Sandford and Merton': A Life of Thomas Day, Esq., and Mckee's Elizabeth Inchbald, Novelist, in which passages from Boaden's Memoirs of Mrs. Inchbald are frequently quoted. I have the deepest sense of obligation to Dr. D. G. Pitt, who suggested the topic of research, supervised the work, and offered many valuable criticisms and suggestions. I am grateful to Dr. E. R. Seary for his helpful suggestions and interest. I thank the Librarian, Miss Ada M. Green, for her co-operation and help. I thank the Inter-Library Loan department of the Library of the Memorial University of Newfoundland.

R. O'D.
28 September 1960.

CHAPTER 1

AN INTRODUCTION

Henry Brooke, Thomas Day, and Elizabeth Inchbald were a group of novelists in the latter part of the eighteenth century who used the novel as a means of educational reform.[1] They were strongly impressed by the educational principles which Rousseau expounded in Emile, and by the manner he used to express these principles. Apart from advancing his naturalistic theory of education, Rousseau had demonstrated in his work that the novel could be a very effective medium for the dissemination of ideas.[2] These three novelists followed his example and, through novels, proposed their solution to the ills of society - a 'natural education'.

The basic theme underlying the novels of Brooke, Day, and Inchbald was their belief in the superiority of a 'natural' education to a 'fashionable' one. By a 'fashionable' education they meant the popular education of the day, the education which they thought suppressed the natural instincts and feelings, attached the mind to trifles, and developed a weak and effeminate body. They claimed that this education resulted in a skepticism in religion, a cynical formalism and polished immorality in conduct, and an aristocratic indifference to the rights and needs of the masses. The pedagogic novelists decried the undesirable effects of a 'fashionable education' upon the minds, hearts, and bodies of the children who were subjected to it. Instead, they advocated a system of 'natural education' in which the natural instincts, impulses, and feelings of the child would be given unrestricted opportunity of expression; development

would result from experience, not from positive instruction. To them education should not aim to instruct, but simply to allow natural tendencies to work out their natural results. Education should not repress or mould but should shield from artificial influences. Close contact with nature should furnish the occasion and means of education. This study of the pedagogic themes found in the novels of Brooke, Day, and Inchbald will examine both the novelists' condemnation of the 'fashionable' system of education, and the system of 'natural' education they proposed to replace it. The qualities they wished to instil into the minds and hearts of their imaginary pupils will be discussed in detail.

The pedagogic novelists were not a group of writers isolated from the age in which they wrote. Their idea of the conflict between nature and society as it existed in the eighteenth century was not a phantasmagoric outgrowth of their eccentric minds, but a real and living concern of their age. They believed that the errors of life were not due to original sin, but to the stultifying habits which society imposed upon the individual. They did not stand alone in their belief that society could degrade the character of man, but may be grouped with a larger class of writers, who, realizing the prevalent social evils, posed a solution of their own. Godwin, Holcroft, Bage, Mackenzie, Smith, Wollstonecraft, and many others used the novel to point out the abuses and wrongs of society. All manner of subjects that interested the public

were treated: the state of the prison and the workhouse, the slave trade, rotten boroughs, Parliamentary corruption, the penal code, the Court of Chancery and its dilatory suits, the venality of the servants of the Law, the state of the poor clergy, the press gang, and the superficial customs of conventional society. But these writers were not content merely to outline the prevalent social evils; they examined the structure of society, decided that it was built upon a false foundation, and then proposed a system by which its ills could be rectified, and virtue, justice, and truth be regained.

Without becoming involved in an unnecessary discussion of the social idealism of Holcroft and Bage, the democratic individualism of Godwin, and the cultivation of the understanding by Wollstonecraft, we can at least mention one of the panaceas of the revolutionists and state its important corollary. This almost universally-accepted remedy was based on a belief that natural impulses and feelings were superior to the desires formed by society. This idea was common in English thought long before the popularization of naturalistic philosophy in the works of Rousseau. It can even be traced back to the seventeenth century. But with the publication of Shaftesbury's Characteristicks in 1711, the idea received newer emphases and alignments. The Characteristicks provided an excellent soil for the rich diversity of thought that was to follow. Shaftesbury attempted to establish the moral sense as natural to man, existing in him prior to education and refinement. If a moral sense is natural to man,

then his untutored ideas and reactions are more trustworthy guides to action than those ideas acquired by an artificial education. Shaftesbury's beliefs can be organized into a formula as follows:

> (1) nature, when unhindered, arouses the 'natural', that is, social affections; (2) man thus inspired with a love for his fellow men voluntarily enters into a 'compact' with his associates; (3) the state thus formed is therefore ideal, because it insures the welfare of all its members as a group and also as individuals who find their own happiness in loving and benefiting the group.[3]

Shaftesbury believes that if man follows the innate moral sense which comes from nature he will be inspired with "Love to his Kind, Courage, Gratitude, or Pity."[4] Thus man should harmonize his life with the natural order by destroying the low passions and by exalting the altruistic ones. This idea is especially striking in the novels of Brooke and Mackenzie. They believe that the higher command of the heart should prevail over reason and motivate a generous deed, which is infinitely finer than a just one. Mackenzie says:

> Virtue [i.e. justice] held back his arm; but a milder form, a younger sister of Virtue's, not so severe as Virtue nor so serious as Pity, smiled upon him: his fingers lost their compression; not did Virtue offer to catch the money as it fell.[5]

A benevolent and sympathetic feeling for our fellow man, an idea derived from Shaftesbury, is one of the basic beliefs of the revolutionary novelists. In contrast to Dickens, who hoped to achieve a moral reclamation by social reform, these novelists

thought that social reform would wait on virtue of mind and soul. Luxury and fashionable life will only promote vice and thwart virtue, and, indeed, it is the man-made institutions that have perverted the natural goodness of man. Virtue can only be advanced in the absence of the excesses of society, in the natural state, where thrift, moderation, and simplicity of life will combine to produce a virtuous mind and soul.

The important corollary to this theory was the belief that a 'natural' education can best equip man to rediscover the laws of nature and enable him to live a better life according to these basic principles. It was a commonly-held view that the perfection of man could be wrought through education. Godwin was convinced that human reason could mature and turn its attention to truth and universal love. He thought that the corruption which attends rank, wealth, and baleful political institutions could be eradicated from society through Truth, Reason, and Education. Although Jeremy Bentham discarded the conception of benevolence common at the time, he nevertheless relied on the power of the educator to bring about an identification of private and public interests. Holcroft also believed that the perfectibility of mankind was to be achieved by leading the mind towards perfection. To achieve this goal control of our ruling passions, proper guidance, and education are indispensable. He thought that ignorance and prejudice attempt to tyrannize the world. In order to counteract this, the strongest efforts must always be directed toward the spread of education

and of right ways of thinking.

But many novelists believed that education as it existed in the eighteenth century was not a strong enough force to effect this desired aim. They thought that a 'fashionable education', instead of helping to improve man, really fostered those prejudices of society that stifle any progress toward perfection. In Hugh Trevor Holcroft maintained that the only results of a boarding-school education were formality, affectation, hypocrisy, and pride; and that universities, instead of encouraging the intellect and exalting the feelings, really catered to the lowest passions in man. In Hermsprong Bage also discredited the European education that the hero received.

Bage spoke for the revolutionary novelists when he said that a 'fashionable education' does nothing more than turn the energies of the mind on trifles.[6] The recognition of the ineffectuality of this mode of education gave impetus to the idea of a 'natural education' and the desire to produce a mind uncontaminated by the prejudices of society. These novelists believed that human nature should express itself spontaneously instead of being perverted or suppressed by a 'fashionable education'; that the base passions of envy, malice, and revenge come only with the perversions of a false culture; that virtue and not vice is natural to man in his untainted state; and finally, that in education we should seek to nourish the natural impulses of the human heart: "Convinced that the seeds of virtue are innate, I have only watched to cherish the rising

shoot, and prune, but with a trembling hand, the too luxuriant branches."[7] They thought that the affections of the heart furnish man with all the principles of morality and knowledge of religion that he needs. Education should endeavour to expand and not contract the heart:

> I cannot help observing here, that the great aim of modern education seems to be, to eradicate the best impulses of the human heart, love, friendship, compassion, benevolence; to destroy the social, and encrease the selfish principle . . . . If my ideas of things are right, the human mind is naturally virtuous; the business of education is therefore less to give us good impressions, which we have from nature, than to guard us against bad ones, which are generally acquired.[8]

Education of the heart is one aspect of this natural education; but the mind and body should also be given a chance to develop, the end being to form a feeling heart, and to develop "'a firm mind in a firm body'".[9] It did not make any difference whether the child to be educated was the son of a hangman or of an emperor: ". . . an infant begot on a dunghill, brought forth in a pigsty, and swathed with a rotten remnant of the covering of an ass, may have talents and capacity above the son of an emperor."[10] Modern educational tendencies place their entire emphasis on the combined power of heredity and environment to form the character of the child. But in the eighteenth century almost unqualified emphasis was placed on the power of environment to mould the mind and heart. The idea that the character of a person can be best developed in a natural environment had taken hold of the imagination of theorists of the time. Their belief was great in the power of external influences on

the formation of the mind.

These educational doctrines, very similar to those of Brooke, Day, and Inchbald, were derived in part from Rousseau's philosophical and educational writings. The basic ideas had been formulated long before, but Rousseau crystallized them into a cogent and tangible form. And unlike others, he furnished in defense of his thesis an emotional fervour and a literary style that carried conviction.

The naturalistic theory of Rousseau replaced Locke's disciplinary conception of education. Locke conceived of human nature as essentially evil. He thought that human instincts and inclinations, springing from a nature depraved in its essence, were inclined toward evil. Therefore the secret of all education is to control the natural desires and instincts by thwarting them and forming the habit of their control. He says:

> . . . the great principle and foundation of all virtue and worth is placed in this, that a man is able to deny himself his own desires, cross his own inclinations, and purely follow what reason directs as best, though the appetite lean the other way.[11]

On the other hand, Rousseau and the naturalists believed that natural desires and instincts should be followed implicitly.

Rousseau maintains that human happiness and human welfare are the natural rights of every individual, but that government, art, science, and education as they were then constituted interferes with man's natural tendencies and stifles the passions

that nature has implanted in him. He condemns the society of the eighteenth century that accepted materialism as a standard in morality, reason as a guide in thought, and self-interest as the principle of action, this polished, intellectual society that preserved its identity by a cold formalism and its morality by a meticulous observance of conventional rules. To be raised above the prejudice of this society man must follow the impulses of nature and judge all things in relation to their utility. That is why Emile is taken far from the vile morals of the town whose gilded surface makes them seductive and contagious to children. The superiority of the natural man to the social man, as Rousseau sees it, is clear and defined:

> The natural man lives for himself; he is the unit, the whole, dependent only on himself and on his like. The citizen is but the numerator of a fraction, whose value depends on its denominator; his value depends upon the whole, that is, on the community. Good social institutions are those best fitted to make a man unnatural, to exchange his independence for dependence, to merge the unit in the group, so that he no longer regards himself as one, but as a part of the whole, and is only conscious of the common life.[12]

But Rousseau did not condemn society in general; he merely condemned society as it existed in the eighteenth century. Really there is no distinction between the natural and social man, as Rousseau maintains that man, by nature, is a social being:

> . . . any one who wanted to consider himself as an isolated individual, self-sufficing and independent of others, could only be utterly wretched. He could not even continue to

> exist, for finding the whole earth appropriated by others while he had only himself, how could he get the means of subsistence?[13]

The one art absolutely necessary to a civilized man is that of living among his fellow-men. Contrary to what we may expect from a naturalistic philosopher, Rousseau's purpose is not to produce a noble savage but a man who would be best fitted to take his place in social life:

> But remember, in the first place, that when I want to train a natural man, I do not want to make him a savage and to send him back to the woods, but that living in the whirl of social life it is enough that he should not let himself be carried away by the passions and prejudices of men; let him see with his eyes and feel with his heart, let him own no sway but that of reason.[14]

Rousseau wished to train a man to be a man; then it would naturally follow that he would be a useful member of society. Furthermore, Rousseau maintained that it was possible for a youth, even in the imperfect society which existed, to become a perfect, or as he called him, a natural man.

Rousseau distrusted the ability of 'fashionable education' to produce a useful member of society. These pedantic, educational methods only prevent children from learning what they could learn much better by themselves. He condemns this "cruel education" that sacrifices the present to an uncertain future; that burdens the child with all sorts of restrictions and begins by making him miserable in order to prepare him for some far-off happiness he may never enjoy. Rousseau says:

> Even if I considered that education wise in its aims, how could I view without indignation those poor wretches subjected to an intolerable slavery and condemned like galley-slaves to endless toil, with no certainty that they will gain anything by it?[15]

Rousseau is surprised that ever since people began to think about education they should have discovered no other way of guiding children than emulation, jealousy, envy, vanity, greediness, base cowardice, and all the most dangerous passions, "passions ever ready to ferment, ever prepared to corrupt the soul even before the body is full-grown."[16] This education does nothing more than to make the child politely imperious. The child is far better off if he reads in the book of nature, if his thoughts are not in his tongue but in his brain, if he has less memory and more judgement; for 'fashionable education', "without choice or discrimination", loads the memory of the child "with a pack of rubbish."

According to Rousseau's educational system, the natural powers and inclinations of the child must not be thwarted: ". . . the education of the earliest years should be merely negative. It consists, not in teaching virtue or truth, but in preserving the heart from vice and from the spirit of error."[17] In Emile he divides his educational program into four periods: physical education from one to five years of age; sense education from five to twelve; intellectual education from twelve to fifteen; and finally, moral training from fifteen to twenty.

Rousseau borrows the ideas which Locke had formulated

on physical education. He stresses the necessity of observing the good rules of sleep, diet, air, and clothing; and says that no restrictions should be placed on the child's natural activity. This physical education is continued in the second period as the limbs and senses are exercised and trained. In order to do this, Emile performs certain physical exercises; but what is more important, his eye is exercised through natural problems in measuring, weighing, and estimating heights and distances, and his ear "rendered sensitive to harmony". Education of the senses is completed by continually exercising them. The child is given very little formal moral training in this period, but he acquires some ideas about conduct through "natural consequences". His senses should have become sharpened and his judgement properly exercised for use at the age of twelve, when he is to undertake the acquisition of knowledge. Emile develops an active mind through his observance of natural phenomena and incidental study of those subjects which are useful and which appeal to his interest, his natural curiosity being the sole guide throughout this period. Book-learning is practically unheard-of at this point; the only book Emile would be familiar with would be Robinson Crusoe, which "supplies the best treatise on an education according to nature."[18] This brings us to the final period in Emile's training when his heart is developed. This education of the heart is effected by visiting infirmaries, hospitals, and prisons, and by witnessing concrete examples of wretchedness in all stages. Thus Emile is brought in sympathetic union with

his fellow-man. The education of this period is one of social relationships, of learning to live with one's fellows. Emile also receives his religious education as he learns of the existence of God through His manifestation in nature.

Thus Rousseau trains the whole child: his body, senses, mind, and heart. His system does not produce people who have formed the habit of constantly seeking help from others, but it produces men, "strong, right-thinking men, vigorous both in mind and body, men who do not win admiration as children, but honour as men."[19] According to his conception it was debasing that man should be educated to behave correctly in an artificial society, or to follow blindly the doctrines of a faith. Instead, he conceived the function of education to be essentially a matter of development from within, not of accretion from without. Furthermore, for the first time, education finds its proper place within the life and experience of the child. The child is no longer seen as an adult viewed through the wrong end of the telescope, as a creature to be modelled on the conventionalized pattern of society; but he is recognized as having a unique nature of his own, and Rousseau's educational theories derive from this conception of the true nature of the child.

At a time of stagnation Rousseau breathed novelty into education. He attacked the Renaissance conception of education and condemned as "folly" the seventeenth and eighteenth-century desire for smatterings of encyclopaedic information. His influence on subsequent educational theory and practice was

considerable. Such great educators as Pestalozzi and Herbart were heavily indebted to him.[20] In Germany the work of Basedow, Salzmann, and Campe was a direct outgrowth and expression of Rousseau's naturalistic views.[21] The influence of Emile on English schools was not as great as in Germany, but Rousseau's literary influence exerted itself to a far greater extent, producing a rather extensive amount of children's literature and literature on the subject of education in general. Both the Monthly Review and Critical Review considered Emile as an important educational treatise. The work was translated into English in 1762, but as early as 1763, in a letter to Thomas Wharton, Thomas Gray recognizes its importance:

> I doubt you have not read Rousseau's Emile: everybody that has children, should read it more than once, . . . there are . . . a thousand important truths better express'd than ever they were before, that may be of service to the wisest Man. particularly I think he has observed children with more attention & knows their meaning & the working of their little passions better than any other Writer.[22]

Rousseau influenced many of the English poets and novelists at the end of the eighteenth century in a vague sort of way, but he influenced Brooke, Day, and Inchbald far more than the others. Without making a minute comparison of their novels and Emile, let us attempt to estimate the general influence of the French master on these three pedagogic novelists.

There does not seem to be any external evidence of influence on Brooke, as he is not known to have referred to Rousseau in any of his writings. However, the internal evidence

is unmistakable. The Fool of Quality is more deeply stamped with the seal of Rousseau than any other book of the period. Brooke's novel is the first English pedagogic treatise which clearly reflects Rousseau's educational theory as expounded in Emile. Brooke is not as radical as Rousseau, but in his elevation of the simple, natural life, his rejection of artificial society and finery, his desire to demolish class distinctions, his championship of liberty, his emphasis on the importance of physical activity, his attack on formal education, as well as in many other things, he follows the example of his French predecessor.

Day's indebtedness to Rousseau can be seen from both internal and external evidence. The internal evidence is Sandford and Merton: it can be easily seen that Day owes to Rousseau not only many incidents, but also much of the educational philosophy of the book. His praise of Emile is unqualified:

> Were all the books in the world to be destroyed, . . . the second book I should wish to save, after the Bible, would be Rousseau's Emilius. It is indeed a most extraordinary work - the more I read, the more I admire - Rousseau alone, with a perspicuity more than mortal, has been able at once to look through the human heart, and discover the secret sources and combinations of the passions. Every page is big with important truth.[23]

Day regards Rousseau as an inspired prophet, and for many years looked up to him with reverence. In a letter to Edgeworth in 1769, he eulogizes Rousseau:

> 'Excellent Rousseau!' first of humankind! Behold a system, which, preserving to man all the faculties, and the excellences,

> and the liberty of his nature, preserves a medium between the brutality and ignorance of a savage, and the corruptions of society![24]

But Day was not satisfied to demonstrate Rousseau's educational theory in a novel; he also attempted to pattern his own life on the example of Emile. His love affair with Margaret Edgeworth appears to be a real-life counterpart of the imaginary situation of Emile: Day is the Emile; Margaret is the Sophy; and Edgeworth is the confidant and friend. They are engaged and wish to marry, but like Emile, Day must leave his Margaret for a time:

> 'Emile, you must leave Sophy; I do not bid you forsake her; if you were capable of such conduct, she would be only too happy not to have married you; you must leave her in order to return worthy of her. Do not be vain enough to think yourself already worthy. How much remains to be done! Come and fulfil this splendid task; come and learn to submit to absence; come and earn the prize of fidelity, so that when you return you may indeed deserve some honour, and may ask her hand not as a favour but as a reward.'[25]

So Day left Margaret and went to London to study the graces. This may seem strange, but again he was only following the advice of Rousseau: "In the same way plunge a young man of twenty into society; under good guidance, in a year's time, he will be more charming and more truly polite than one brought up in society from childhood."[26] Emile left Sophy to prove his fidelity during a long absence, but he also wished to begin his study of government. Likewise, Day began his study of the English government at this time. In his second love affair with Elizabeth Sneyd, Day also followed the approach proposed

in Emile. Finally he echoed Emile in his own life by turning from political corruption and licentious cities to useful labour and rural life, "the earliest life of man, the most peaceful, the most natural, and the most attractive to the uncorrupted heart."[27] Day retired to a farm:

> The only property I desire is a little farm in some quiet corner. I will devote all my efforts after wealth to making it pay, and I will live without a care. Give me Sophy and my land, and I shall be rich.[28]

The case of Elizabeth Inchbald is not so clear-cut as Day's. The influence of Rousseau on the general philosophy of Nature and Art is undisputed, as the Rousseauistic contrast between the effects of a fashionable education and a natural education is unmistakable. Indeed, Boaden in his Memoirs once refers to Nature and Art under the title of The Prejudice of Education. However, the question of Rousseau's influence on A Simple Story has been a polemic issue and is a matter which will be discussed later.

The educational doctrines which Rousseau formulated in Emile were the basis of the educational ideas advanced by the pedagogic novelists. There were minor differences in approach and emphasis: Brooke placed his main emphasis on education of the heart: Day on education of the mind; and Inchbald on the superiority of a 'natural' education to a 'fashionable' one. These emphases were purely matters of taste. All three novelists agreed on the supremacy of a 'natural education', and, within themselves, form a self-contained group of novelists in the

in the latter half of the eighteenth century.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 1

1. After a life of activity in drama, verse, and pamphlet, Brooke chose the novel as the most effective way by which he could illustrate his educational proposals. It is evident from his biographer's comments that Day also regarded the novel as an educational force:

> In consequence of his opinion of the prevailing manners, and with a view to guard the rising generation against the infection of the ostentatious luxury and effeminacy, which, amid many excellent qualities, characterize the present age, he wrote the history of Sandford and Merton. Despairing of the effects of reason or even of ridicule on those who have already acquired their habits, he hoped to make some impression on the untainted minds of youth. . .
>
> It is in this light of counteracting the effeminacy and imbecility of the present manners, that the history of Sandford and Merton seems in merit and in effect to rise above any other work that has been written for children: and it will ever remain a monument of the benevolent and unambitious application of Mr. Day's genius to the good of mankind. How well he has succeeded in the execution of his design, appears evidently from the singular pleasure and interest with which the little readers run over these volumes. The book is written with a warmth that readily diffuses itself into the susceptible minds of youths, . . .
>
> The unambitious but benevolent employment of his time in writing books for children proves that utility, rather than the display of talent, was the motive of his writings. (Keir, An Account of the Life and Writings of Thomas Day, Esq. (London, 1791), 80-3.)

2. In the Preface to La Nouvelle Heloise Rousseau expressed his intention to use the novel as a vehicle for reform; he put his ideas "in the form of a novel merely to cater to what he considered the depraved taste of the public." (Heidler, The History, from 1700 to 1800, of English Criticism of Prose Fiction (Urbana, Illinois, 1928), 90.) Rousseau believed that literature should teach rather than delight. Only as an educational force did he consider the existence of the novel justified. Such being the case, he explained definitely how it should be composed and what it should teach:

> Books which are designed to be read in solitude, should be written in the language of retirement: if they are meant to instruct, they should make us in love with our situation; they should combat and destroy the maxims of the great world, by shewing them to be false and despicable, as they really are. With all these qualities a romance, if it be well written, or at least if it be useful, must

be hissed, damned, and despised by the polite world, as being a mean, extravagant, and ridiculous performance; and thus what is folly in the eyes of the world is real wisdom. (Rousseau, Preface to La Nouvelle Heloise, I, 12. Quoted in Heidler, English Criticism of Prose Fiction, 91.) This statement is significant because it indicates Rousseau's desire to utilize the novel for the expression of his philosophical and educational doctrines.

3. Wright, Sensibility in English Prose Fiction 1760-1814, A Reinterpretation (Urbana, 1937), 129.

4. Shaftesbury, Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times (Birmingham, 1773), II, 53.

5. Mackenzie, Man of Feeling, ed. Mrs. Barbauld, Vol. XXIX: The British Novelists (London, 1820), 19.

6. Bage, Man As He Is Not; or, Hermsprong, ed. Mrs. Barbauld, Vol. XLVIII: The British Novelists (London, 1820), 192.

7. Frances Brooke, The History of Lady Julia Mandeville, ed. Mrs. Barbauld, Vol. XXVII: The British Novelists (London, 1820), 72.

8. Frances Brooke, Emily Montague, III, 32-3. Quoted in Whitney, Primitivism and the Idea of Progress in English Popular Literature of the Eighteenth Century (Baltimore, 1934), 123-4.

9. Bage, Hermsprong, 192.

10. Brooke, The Fool of Quality; or, the History of Henry Earl of Moreland (London, 1766-70), II, 152.

11. Locke, The Educational Writings of John Locke, ed. John William Adamson (Cambridge, 1922), 28.

12. Rousseau, Emile, trans. Barbara Foxley (London, 1950), 7.

13. Ibid., 156.

14. Ibid., 217.

15. Ibid., 43.

16. Ibid., 56.

17. Ibid., 57.

18. Ibid., 147.

19. Ibid., 76-7.

20. Cubberly, The History of Education (Cambridge, 1948), 539.

21. Ibid., 533-8.

22. Gray, Letters of Thomas Gray, ed. John Beresford (Oxford, 1925), 253.

23. Edgeworth, Memoirs of Richard Lovell Edgeworth, Esq. (London, 1820), I, 226.

24. Idem.

25. Rousseau, Emile, 412.

26. Ibid., 292.

27. Ibid., 438.

28. Ibid., 420.

CHAPTER 2

HENRY BROOKE AND EDUCATION OF THE HEART

Like Rousseau, Brooke thought that education should bring out the healthy original instincts, foster, and develop the spontaneity and probity of nature. His educational solution to the problem of man in society springs from his conception of man and God. Brooke believes that man is composed of two diverse elements: the principle of self and the principle of benevolent love, each struggling to achieve superiority in the soul. The selfhood is the dark spirit of man which attempts to lure him into all that is evil:

> SELF is a poor, dark, and miserable avariciousness, incapable of enjoying what it hath, through it's [sic] grappling and grasping at what it hath not. The impossibility of it's holding all things makes it envious of those who are in possession of any thing, and envy kindles the fire of hell, wrath, and wretchedness throughout it's existence.[1]

The other principle is very contrary to the selfhood and works in an opposite direction:

> LOVE, on the other hand, is rich, enlightening, and full of delight. The bounteousness of it's wishes makes the infinity of it's wealth. And it cannot fail of finding (without seeking or requiring) it's own enjoyment and blessedness, in it's desire to communicate and diffuse blessing and enjoyment.[2]

The contrast between these two principles is made quite clear. The self contracts and closes the individual in upon himself, but love expands the heart with virtue and benevolence:

> SELF is wholly a MISER; it contracts what it possesses, and at the same time attracts all that it doth not possess. It at once shuts out others from it's own proposed enjoyments, and would draw into it's little whirlpool whatever others enjoy.

> LOVE, on the contrary, is a giving, not a craving; an expansion, not a contraction; it breaks in pieces the condensing circle of SELF, and goes forth in the delightfulness of it's desire to bless.[3]

In one of the instructive fables in the Fool of Quality, we have the following acknowledgement of Araspes, whose virtue had been first threatened and then destroyed by a victory of the selfhood:

> 'O Cyrus, it is manifest that I have two souls; for, if I had but one soul, it could not be, at once, both good and evil; not a lover, at the same time, of what is honest and dishonest; it could not at once desire and be averse to the same thing. It is, therefore, most evident that we have two souls; and, when the good soul hath the dominion, good works are performed; but evil works, when the evil soul predominates.'[4]

The whole conception is brought down to mundane terms by Mr. Fenton when he tells Harry that although there is a very bad boy within him, there is an exceedingly good boy there too.

Brooke does not believe that man is depraved in his earlier stages of existence. The emptiness, darkness, and desire in the creature are not evil in themselves but are the only possible cause of evil. Indeed, they are the indispensable foundation upon which all progress is built. Brooke says that man is born weak: "Man comes into this world the weakest of all creatures, and, while he continues in it, is the most dependent."[5] This weakness is good because it becomes the capacity through which man can improve himself:

> It is extremely good for the creature to be poor and weak, and empty, and dark, and desiring; for hereby he

> becomes a capacity for being supplied with all the riches, powers, glories, and blessedness of his God.[6]

But the selfish and craving will of the creature can produce natural and moral evil. Pride, covetousness, and envy beget hatred, wrath, and every kind of malevolence and malignity; the disappointment of these passions produces rancour and misery. Altogether, they constitute the whole nature and kingdom of hell in the soul.

The only way man is to gain strength is through his use of the power of God who is "infinite love", "infinite wisdom", and "infinite power". God foresaw man sunk in the inward darkness and wrath of his limited nature, externally besieged and tempted by lying offers of enjoyment, and internally rent by disappointed desires and malignant passions. But he had provided a redemption of stupendous potency:

> He had provided a seed of the SON OF HIS LOVE, that should take root in man's world of inward and outward evil, that should grow as a fragrant flower through corruption and abomination, into the freedom, the light, and the purity of heaven; that should reprove his unrighteousness, that should convince him of weakness, and soften him into sorrow for his own transgressions; that should melt him into a sense of the calamity of others; that should diffuse, as a dawning light through his dark and angry nature, subduing his pride, assuaging his passions; calling him forth from self into the expansion of benevolence, into all the charities and amities, the feelings and offices of the human heart thus made divine; and lastly, maturing in him a different nature and a new creature; that God may be in all men the ONE WILL TO THE ONE GOODNESS thereby uniting all men as one man in their God. For deep, indeed, are all his counsels; and all the mazes of his providence will finally unwind themselves in the rectitude and fulness of the wisdom of his love.[7]

God saw the possibility of moral and natural evil, but He saw

that such partial and temporary evil could be converted to the production of an infinity of good. So He infused a small embryo of the image which, in creation, had borne the perfect likeness of the Creator. If we suppress or quench this heavenly seed within us we become evil, malignant, and reprobate; but if we encourage and foster it, we become benevolent and replete with Divine propensities and affections. When man is convinced of his own pride and weakness, he can use the power of God. This expands his soul with benevolence and leads him to a greater love of God and a greater degree of sensitivity to the distresses of his fellow-creatures. These feelings soften the proud and angry self and call forth benevolence, charity, and humanitarianism; thus making divine the feelings and offices of the human heart. God Himself is a feeling Spirit, "an all-seeing, all-hearing, all-tasting, all-smelling, all-feeling, all-knowing, and all-governing Spirit";[8] therefore, man must also become a feeling creature. This can be best achieved by an education of the heart, which enables man to sympathize and feel rather than to rationalize and know. Thus, for Brooke, the most effective way to redeem society is through a thorough education of the human heart.

The best expression of Brooke's belief in the power of education of the heart and in the mode of its operation is to be found in the Fool of Quality. The sketchy and improbable plot of this novel can be easily summarized. The hero is Henry, the neglected younger son of the Earl of Westmoreland. The Earl lavishes all his attention on his elder son and heir, Richard;

subsequently, Harry is banished from his father's house and reared until he is five years old by his foster-mother. At this time a tall stranger appears in the neighbourhood. He is known as Mr. Fenton, but is really Harry Clinton, the child's uncle. Fenton wishes to protect Harry from the vices of fashionable life; therefore he takes him to his mansion in Hampstead and conducts his education. The child is given what Brooke considers an ideal education, of which more later. After the death of his mother and brother, Harry returns to Westmoreland, and, on his father's death, becomes the new Earl. He accompanies his uncle to France, returns to England, and marries Abenaidè, the white daughter of the Emperor of Morocco and Fanny Goodall. The novel ends with the wedding, and the extreme emotion which has been prevalent throughout reaches a new climax:

> Slow as Lord Moreland moved the multitude strove to retard him, by throwing themselves in his way, that they might satiate their eyes with the fulness of beauty. Bended knees and lifted hands, prayers, blessings, and exclamations were heard, and seen on all sides; and all the way as they went, thousands upon tens of thousands, shouted forth the hymenial of the celestial pair.[9]

The title of the novel has special significance.[10] Brooke detests the so-called wise men of the world, the men who are filled with deep erudition and science but who are not one jot the wiser for all their knowledge. Folly is by far superior to this false, intellectualized wisdom:

> I detest wisdom, I avoid it, I would not be hit by it. It is the Tarantula that spins a web, whereby innocence

> is entangled. It is a politician who opens a gulph for the swallowing up of the people. It is a lawyer who digs a grave for the burial of equity. . . .
>
> Descend to me, sweet Folly! if thou hast not, as I suspect, been my constant companion. Be, thou, my sister, my playfellow, thou kitten of the solemn cats of state and learning. But, no Thou never wert the offspring of such stupid progenitors. Thou art ever joyous, ever young, although coeval, in paradise with our first parents, ere, . . . they wished for the knowledge of good and evil.[11]

What is considered folly by the eyes of the world is wisdom in Brooke's eyes; what is wisdom by the standards of the world is really folly. Harry is thought a mere idiot by people of distinction, but he, with his excellence of person and feeling heart, is a fool of quality. Harry's folly is philosophy in her most exalted mood, and he, as a fool, utters the words of wisdom.

These words of wisdom will never be uttered if Harry's character is allowed to be moulded by typical eighteenth-century attitudes. Brooke believes implicitly in the power of environment to mould the character of the child. If Harry had remained in his father's house many of his natural tendencies would have been thwarted, and he would not have developed into the paragon of excellence and virtue that he was. He would have remained the same as his brother, a person whose inherent goodness had not been given a chance to mature. Brooke further illustrates his case by hypothetical examples. Suppose, he says, we take two children: one, a male infant born with a propensity to pride and arrogance; the other, a female born with a propensity to bashfulness and lowliness. If no future

influence, arising from accident or education, checks the pride of the one, or diverts the lowliness of the other, the male will view those around him with an habitual self-sufficiency and contempt of his species, and the female will regard her fellow-beings with an amiable diffidence and a complacent respect. But Brooke wishes to see if education can change these sentiments. If we place these two children in contrasting environments, will their characters be altered in any way? Brooke thinks that they will. If the man is made aware of the wants and weaknesses of his lapsed nature, and then educated in the never-failing school of Christian meekness, he will be as different from his former self as can possibly be imagined. This regenerated, benevolent, and lowly man will not retain his former brow of overbearance, eye of elevation, lip of ridicule, and glance of contempt. On the other hand, if the girl is placed in a fashionable environment, certain changes become manifest in her character:

> Miss comes to accommodate her taste and relish of things to the taste and relish of those whom she is proud to resemble. She now is ashamed of nothing, but in proportion as it is below the top of the mode; and she blushes at no indecency that fashion is pleased to adopt. Her whole soul and essence is futilized and extracted into shew and superficials. She learns that friendship, in high life, is nothing but compliment; and visits, intimacies and connections the polite grimace of people of distinction. That to talk elegantly upon nothing is the sum of conversation. That beauty and dress are the constituents of female perfection; and that the more we depreciate and detract from others, the more eminently we ourselves shall shine forth and be exalted. She is followed by fops, she is worshipped by fortune hunters. She is mounted aloft upon the wings of flattery, and is hardened against public opinion by self-conceit.[12]

Thus the innocent and good-natured disposition of the girl is perverted by the fashionable society to which she is exposed.

Brooke says that a distempered frame, still further weakened by a perverse, pusillanimous, and impatient temper, is an indication of the genuine descent of a person of fashion. Fashionable parents promise money, gaudy clothes, and sweet food to their children; and, in their manner of expatiating on the value of such articles, they often excite in the children's minds the appetites of avarice, vanity, and sensuality. Harry's father, the Earl of Westmoreland, recognizes the pernicious effect of this shallow training upon himself:

> With every advantage that could gratify either my vanity or my appetites, I cannot affirm that I ever tasted of true enjoyment; and I now well perceive that I was kept from being miserable, merely by amusement and dissipation.
>
> As I had the misfortune to be born to title and a vast estate, all people respected, in me, the possession of those objects which they themselves were in pursuit of. I was consequently beset with sycophants and deceivers of all sorts, and thereby, trained from my infancy, to unavoidable prejudices, errors, and false estimates of every thing. I was not naturally ill-disposed, but I was perpetually seduced from all my better tendencies.[13]

The older the children of fashion grow, the wiser they think themselves, and the more they become attached to trifles. Like Hercules, who was ruined by his fine coat, the poison of their artificial clothing seeps deep within their bodies and minds, bringing weakness and distempers upon both. The "wise" world in which they are brought up breeds heroic reprobates, by ascribing honour and acclamation to deeds that call loudly for infamy and the gibbet; for this world "was an ass from its very

commencement, and it will continue a dunderhead to the end."[14]

Brooke's condemnation of a 'fashionable education' is a corollary to his condemnation of the society that produced this type of education. He maintains that this education in the midst of sensuality and deception can be no good friend to the virtues. A 'fashionable education' encourages a child to become a slavish imitator of the superficial practices and prejudices of society. This fact is ably illustrated in the hypothetical case of a young lady educated by a number of fashionable ladies. As a result, the innocent girl suppresses her natural feelings and inclinations, and bridles the impulses of her affectionate and humble heart. She is taught to prize what she dislikes, praise what she disapproves, affect coldness and distance to inferiors, and "proportion her appearance of inclination and respect to the station of the party."[15] Harry's brother, Richard, is also a victim of this stultifying education. Although Richard was naturally unassuming and modestly disposed, the unremitted adulation of domestics and dependents could not fail to make some impression, and it was not long before "he was conscious of his condescension when he became familiar with you."[16] This attitude is the inevitable consequence of the training which has been forced upon the victim. The aim of the boarding-schools is no higher, their method a little more perverse. The Vindex episode is a clear illustration of their unsympathetic method of dealing with children. Mr. Fenton engages Mr. Vindex, the head of a boarding-school, to initiate

Harry and Ned, another protégé of Mr. Fenton, into the study of Latin grammar. Vindex arrives the next day doubly armed, with a monstrous birch in one hand, and a ferule in the other. He brutally whips Harry and Ned, with the result that both of them develop a strong aversion to him. When Fenton returns, he justly dismisses Vindex, condemning the needless use of the rod and the schoolmaster's motive behind its use:

> They associate the ideas of pain to those lessons and virtues which the pleasure of encouragement ought alone to inculcate. They, yet, more frequently apply the lash, for the indulgence of their own weaknesses, and for the gratification of the virulence of their own naughty passions.[17]

Children cannot be properly trained through fear because, as Fenton says, fear "can never make a good citizen, or a good soldier".[18] Perversion of virtue reaps its just rewards, so Vindex finds that his method boomerangs:

> My boys grew disorderly, and behaved themselves in school, without respect to my person, or regard to my government. Even my intimates shunned me, and would cast at me a side glance of smiling scorn as they passed. My school then melted from me like snow in a fog. Even my boarders forsook me.[19]

'Fashionable education' is thus shown to be detrimental to the teacher and pupil. It does not help the child, who knows nothing useful to himself or the world; it does not help the teacher whose character deteriorates still further as children become more acquainted with the ways of evil; and it does not aid society which rapidly approaches the nadir of human progress.

Thus Brooke demonstrates the deleterious effects of a

'fashionable' environment and education. He shows its power to mis-shape the mind of man and divert his attention from worthy objects to trivialities. Recognizing the pernicious effect of this environment upon character, Brooke places the hero of his novel in an environment where the natural virtues can best mature. In a natural environment man is more capable of feeling the existence of God because he is less misguided by the perversions of society. Impulse and inclination form the basis of action in the natural state. Brooke claims that impulse can lead more directly to feeling, which is fundamental to a love of both God and man.

Brooke is always anxious to show the superiority of his system of education to the fashionable type. The education of Harry and Richard is contrasted so that the reader may observe the respective effects of each:

> Mean while, the education of the two children was extremely contrasted. Richard, who was already entitled my little lord, was not permitted to breathe the rudeness of the wind. On his lightest indisposition the whole house was in alarms; his passions had full scope in all their infant irregularities; his genius was put into a hot bed, by the warmth of applauses given to every flight of his opening fancy; and the whole family conspired, from the highest to the lowest, to the ruin of promising talents and a benevolent heart.
>
> Young Harry, on the other hand, had every member as well as feature exposed to all weathers, would run about, mother-naked, for near an hour, in a frosty morning; was neither physicked into delicacy, nor flattered into pride; scarce felt the convenience, and much less understood the vanity of clothing; and was daily occupied, in playing and wrestling with the pigs and two mungril spaniels on the dunghill; or in kissing, scratching, or boxing with the children of the village.[20]

The pitfalls of fashionable life can only be avoided by a carefully-planned natural education. The tutor must show the child the insufficiency of all creatures, and more particularly the wants, weaknesses, and vileness of man's lapsed nature; and that no honour can belong to man in his state of depravity. If the child is educated in the school of adversity, his pride will be effectually tempered, and he will respect even the wretched, because he will acquire a social sense and a sympathetic feeling for their wretchedness.

A proper education of the heart is basic to Brooke's educational program.[21] Fenton quotes St. Paul to show that the law of nature is indelibly written in the heart:[22]

> 'Not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified. For, when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do, by nature, the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which shew the work of the law WRITTEN IN THEIR HEARTS, their consciences also bearing witness, and their thoughts, the mean while, accusing or else excusing one another.'[23]

All laws ever framed for the good government of man, laws which in themselves are nothing more than faint transcripts of the eternal Law of Benevolence, were first "written and again retraced in the bosom of the first man".[24] Therefore Fenton trains Harry never to "stint the sweet emotions" of his heart, and, under his guidance, Harry's heart is cultivated to be sensitive and feeling. The heart must be softened before Harry can love God and view his fellow-man with candidly sympathetic feelings. Fenton's explanation of God is emotional rather than

rational; Harry is not convinced of the love of God, but he is moved and transported: "O, Sir, exclaimed Harry, how you gladden, how you transport me!"[25] Harry's father, the Earl, has been told of the existence of Jesus many times, but only when he feels His love in his heart does he really believe:

> I feel it all, I feel it all. I am already, with all my corruptions, with all my transgressions, desirous of being crushed to nothing under the foot of my Redeemer. But he comforts instead of crushing me.[26]

Again we witness Brooke's realization of the need for education of the heart. But Brooke is not content to educate only the hero's heart; he also wishes to move, transport, and educate the hearts of his readers. Near the end of the Fool of Quality, the Friend, who represents the reading public, admits that the adventures of the characters of the novel have appealed "to every humane feeling of the heart".[27] The success of Brooke's plan can be educed from the Friend's comment on Mr. Fenton's story:

> Your story of your old friend is, hitherto, very simple, natural, and domestic; and to a mind, yet undebauched, exceedingly interesting and affecting; for it opens and investigates a number of little passages and mazes in the heart, which are quite closed, or imperceptible to persons of hard nerves and callous conceptions.[28]

Brooke's prime purpose is to educate the hearts of his characters and readers. However, he does not stop here. The educated man must be a useful member of society; his utility to society determines his true value. This explains Brooke's condemnation of the debtor's prison, as he believes that no

individual should be thrown into prison and thus prevented from being useful to himself and to his fellow-man. Harry must become a useful citizen of his country. For this reason, he is given an early impression of the shortness of human life and the nature of the world in which he is placed. Clement begins to do this, Fenton completes it. Harry is taken on a tour of London. First he sees its grace, elegance, and refinement; then its misery and wretched living conditions. Harry also studies the British constitution and government, visits the Tower, surveys the Armory, views the Monument and Exchange, and contemplates the solemnity of Westminster. This knowledge of the world around him is necessary for Harry to be a useful member of society, but he must be able to distinguish between natural and imaginary wants: "Let him learn, from this day forward, to distinguish between natural and imaginary wants; and that nothing is estimable, or ought to be desirable, but so far as it is necessary, or useful to man."[29]

The utility to society of Brooke's educational ideal is an indication of his true gentility. Fashionable parasites think that a "gentleman" is a person of fortune, above the vulgar, and embellished by manners that are fashionable in high society. They claim that fortune and fashion are the ingredients of a modern gentleman "for, whatever the fashion may be, whether moral or immoral, for or against reason, right or wrong, it is equally the duty of a gentleman to conform."[30] This type of gentleman Brooke does not want to produce, because he apprehends

that "true gentility is altogether independent of fortune or fashion, of time, customs, or opinions of any kind."[31] A true gentleman, as Brooke conceives him, is charitable to the poor, shows deference to all with whom he has dealings, displays a delicacy of behaviour "toward that sex whom nature has entitled to the protection, and consequently entitles to the tenderness, of man",[32] never envies superior excellence, and is always concerned and interested in others:

> . . . the character, or rather quality of a GENTLEMAN, does not, in any degree, depend on fashion or mode, on station or opinion; neither changes with customs, climates or ages. But, as the spirit of God can, alone, inspire it into man; so it is, as God is the same, yesterday, to-day, and for ever.[33]

Harry realizes that superficial distinctions form no part of the character of a real gentleman:

> And he clearly perceived that neither finery, grandeur of equipage, title, wealth, superior airs, affectation of generosity, neither a mischief-making temper, nor a taking delight in the broils, conflicts, passions, and pains of others, were any constituent qualities in this venerable character.[34]

Brooke wished to create a useful and virtuous member of society by producing a gentleman with a feeling heart. To achieve this end, certain qualities were inculcated in the mind and heart of the hero. Those qualities which Fenton instilled into Harry must be examined for a just evaluation of Brooke's pedagogic system.

The inculcation of virtue is a major point of the

educational program proposed in the Fool of Quality. Fenton believes that tutors should be solicitous to make men of worth rather than men of letters. Boys should be encouraged to perform actions of friendship, gratitude, generosity, and honour. Such actions would produce paragons of virtue and moral excellence. Fenton extols virtue and encourages Harry to become a man of honour and integrity. Fables are used to support the tutor's elevation of virtue. The story of Damon and Pythias bears testimony to the existence of virtue, with its essential difference from vice. An act committed for the good of others, as the substitution of Pythias for Damon, would normally be imputed to Pythias's folly and not to any virtue or good quality of his heart. But the act is proof of a virtue that is divine. Thus Harry is inspired to emulate the virtue of ancient heroes. He learns to disapprove every act that threatens to undermine virtue, and reproaches himself on his slightest deviation from its paths. But this negative approach to virtue is subsidiary to the positive performance of acts of virtue and benevolence. He gives clothes to the needy, provides food for starving men and women, receives beggars with open arms and aids them in their poverty, freely gives aid to unfortunate prisoners, and is always ready to comfort the distressed.

These humanitarian actions are the outward expression of Harry's benevolence. Brooke thinks that if man is to be saved from his lower self, he must turn to God who "is the

virtue of every heart that is softened by a sense of pity or touch of benevolence."[35] Benevolence is the basis upon which God builds the happiness of all His creatures:

> He sees that nothing is a good but virtue, and that nothing is a virtue, save some quality of benevolence. On benevolence, therefore, he builds the happiness of all his intelligent creatures; and, in this our mortal state, . . . He has ordained relative differences of rich and poor, strong and weak, sound and sickly, &c. to exercise us in the offices of that charity, and those affections, which, reflecting and reflected like mutual light and warmth, can alone make our good to all eternity.
>
> Benevolence produces and constitutes the heaven or beatitude of God himself: He is no other than an infinite and eternal Good Will. Benevolence must, therefore, constitute the beatitude or heaven of all dependent beings, however infinitely diversified through several departments and subordinations, agreeable to the several natures and capacities of creatures.[36]

In any society of mutual benevolence, each member would enjoy the strength, virtue, and efficacy of the whole. To ensure that the reader will thoroughly understand the term, Brooke defines 'benevolence' in his last novel, Juliet Grenville:

> Every species of virtue is a species of benevolence; it is a propensity or disposition to acts of beneficence; a will to do good - the same in the creature that it is in the Creator. It is a desire, a thirst, to diffuse and communicate blessings; and the farther it goes in this delightful progression, the wider reaches its dominion, its riches, its revenues; and, in proportion to the extent of its ardour in blessing, it finds itself unavoidable, inevitable blessed![37]

Benevolence is necessary for men to be brought into closer union with each other and with God. Brooke thinks that it is a quality that should be instilled into the hearts of all men. Therefore, the development of a benevolent heart is an important

point in the author's educational program, and benevolence is encouraged in the environment in which Fenton places Harry.

Benevolent and humanitarian actions lead man to a greater love and appreciation of his fellow-creatures. Fenton claims that man must be interested in others; others must be interested in him. If man subdues the selfhood, he can easily perceive the bond between men:

> Omit such necessary accomodations as are common to us with brutes; and all belonging to the immortal and divine humanity of man is magnetism, is fellowship; the feeling as of steel to adamant, and of adamant to steel. There is the friendhsip, the endearment, the love surpassing all other enjoyment.[38]

So Harry sees the need to love his fellow-man. Soon he respects even the wretched and acquires a fellow-feeling for their wretchedness.[39] These sympathetic feelings are based on a belief in the equality of man.[40] Brooke says that all distinctions fall away in the eyes of the Creator. Fenton aids Harry to feel a sense of the equality of men, and at the end of the novel Harry says:

> . . . I now perceive, Madam, how ridiculous all sorts of prejudices are, and find that time and observation may change our opinions to the reverse of what they were. I once had an aversion to all sorts of blacks, but I avow that there is something so amiable in the face of this youth, and his eyes cast such a lustre over the darkness of his countenance as is enough, . . . to make us in love with night, and pay no more worship to the gaudy sun.[41]

Brooke argues that since all men are equal, some men do not have the right to enslave others. The law of safety and well-

being to all is founded in the nature of God Himself, eternal, immutable, and indispensable. Slavery, says Brooke, is contrary to the law of God, therefore it cannot be condoned under any circumstances.[42] It is part of Harry's education to develop a sympathy for slaves and express a desire for slave emancipation.

Harry's sympathy must be extended even beyond slaves. He must be kind to animals.[43] Brooke tirelessly insists that all life is, in its ability to reveal God, sacred and inviolate; hence all animal life deserves our protection. Consequently, Harry protects his favourite cock from a beating by throwing his own body in the way of the blows. Later, Harry and Clement not only help a number of passengers who are in distress but also assist cattle that had fallen under the carriages.

To be truly virtuous, Harry must be humble. Fenton tells him that all the evil in him belongs to himself, and all the good belongs to God. He says that a person, in or of himself, cannot think a good thought, form a good wish, or oppose a single temptation. Therefore Harry must learn to be humble:

> From hence learn to be humble, and to think meanly of yourself, and not to ascribe to yourself any kind of goodness or virtue; for that would be sacrilege, it would be to rob God of his peculiar property of goodness. From hence further learn never to prefer yourself to others, or to think better of yourself than of any one living; for, so far as you are a creature, no one can be viler or faultier than you are; however God may be pleased, through his mercy and bounty to you, to be better in you than in others.[44]

Harry is told never to exalt himself in company or conversation; for, in exalting himself, he exalts his own proud spirit above the meek spirit of God. Pride and selfishness produce dissatisfaction and unhappiness; humility brings contentment of soul and mind.

In this way Harry's heart expands with benevolence and virtue. Brooke does not suggest that the hero's mind should be neglected, but it also must be trained to be active and alert. Under Clement's guidance, he masters the Latin and Greek languages, and is given insights into history and geography:

> Mr. Clement had instructed him in the use of the globes and maps, and, as he there led him from clime to clime and country to country, he brought him acquainted with the different manners, customs, laws, politics, government, rise, progress, and revolutions of the several nations through which they passed.[45]

We must note that Harry is given insights into the rise and fall of nations. Thus history does not become a dull and endless study. In Brooke's hands history is not an end in itself, but only a means to an end. Harry also studies the system of monetary exchange and makes a detailed examination of the British constitution. In this way he advances his knowledge of the world, "of the views, pleasures, manners, bents, employments, and characters of mankind."[46]

In his study of the customs and manners of men, Harry soon learns that beauty is not to be found in externals. Fenton believes that the graces of the mind are superior to all the

attractions of person and countenance:

> What is beauty? is it form,
> Proportion, colours pale or warm?
> Or is it, as by some defin'd,
> A creature of the lovers's mind?
> No - It is internal grace
> Pregnant in the form and face;[47]

Harry is taught to value those things that have intrinsic value to those "that receive their value and currency from the arbitrary and fickle stamp of fashion."[48] Therefore Harry is trained from his early years to express a disgust for ornament and finery. When he visits his father's castle, he regards Richard's laced-hat with utter disgust, then throws it into the midst of the glassware. He is presented with a number of glittering toys, but he throws them aside also. And so he advances in wisdom and virtue, indifferent to the ornament and superficial frills of fashionable life. Meekly claims that Harry is the greatest philosopher and hero the age has produced. By refusing his respect to the superficial distinctions which fashion inadequately substitutes as expressions of human greatness, he proves himself the philosopher; and in his boldness in defending those to whom his heart is attached, he proves himself the hero and man.

But Harry is not too much a hero to respect the dignity of honest labour. He is trained to look upon industry as a blessing and duty to man. He recognizes the mental virtues and temporal benefits that result from industry: industry makes men healthy, brave, honest, and social. He sees that industry incites men to commerce and good neighbourhood. And finally,

he sees that the works of industry are the works of peace.

So far we have surveyed the qualities inculcated in the mind and heart of the hero of the novel. But Brooke does not wish his hero to have an active mind and a puny body. For him physical education is just as important as mental and moral education.[49] Fenton is attentive to the health, action, and corporal strength of his little champion. To do this, he encourages such games as football, hurling, wrestling, leaping, running, cudgelling, fencing, and horsemanship. By the time Harry reaches the age of five and one-half, his courage, strength, and actions made him respected by all the little boys of the village. As he grows older, he advances in stature as well as in all personal accomplishments. At the age of ten, his physical progress is excellent:

> He could outrun the rein-deer, and outbound the antelope. He was held in veneration by all masters of the noble science of defence. His action was vigour, his countenance was loveliness, and his movement was grace.[50]

His feats of physical prowess are unparalleled; on one occasion, for example, with the strength of a Beowulf, he empty-handed kills a mad dog which a number of villagers, armed with staves and pitchforks, are unsuccessful in subduing. Harry strikes only for a worthy cause: the stealer of nuts is taught a lesson; the aristocratic young lord is put in his place; and when worsted in a religious argument, Harry supplements his failing logic with his never-failing right arm. He demonstrates his physical agility on many occasions. At a masquerade he eyes a

huge statue of Hercules, then "instantly cast away his cloak, clapped on his mask and winged helmet, grasped his caduceus with his right hand, and, laying his left on the top of the pedestal, sprung lightly up".[51] On another occasion he catches the top bar of a gate with his left hand and throws himself over, leaving his father and Mr. Meekly gaping in utter astonishment. And so the hero reaches the prime of youth, "glowing with health, action, and vigour, of beauty incomparable, beloved of all who knew him, and the attraction and admiration of every eye where he passed."[52]

The hero of the novel has been given a 'natural education'. His mind has been trained to be alert and active, his body to be vigorous and strong, and his heart expanded with benevolence and goodness. All faculties have equally matured. However, the heart holds the greatest significance for Brooke because it is through this faculty that man is led to a broader understanding of God and his fellow-creatures. The proper education of his heart enabled Harry to feel the distress of the unfortunate, and aroused in him a strong sense of pity, which led him to greater humanitarian actions. He acquired a knowledge of his own limitations and capabilities, gained a true humility, developed a sincere love of his fellow-man, and remained, at the end of the novel, truly virtuous in the eyes of both God and man.

The Fool of Quality illustrates the formative influence of environment on character. Brooke demonstrates the ill effects

of the prejudices of fashionable society and condemns its needless gratification of desires. This environment is shown to be incapable of producing a man; its product is a parasite whose action is governed by the weakness of his nature. On the other hand, Brooke shows how a 'natural education' can best equip a child to be a useful and virtuous member of society. The Fool of Quality shows how a child is guided through his various stages of development to manhood. He is placed in an environment that does not thwart the development of his natural virtues, an environment which produces a paragon of excellence. Thus the product of nature is virtuous, benevolent, altruistic, kind, sympathetic, humble, courageous, indifferent to ornament, mentally alert, physically strong, and useful both to himself and to the society in which he is to live.

Brooke's educational technique is commendable. Harry is not over-burdened with useless knowledge, but the knowledge he does acquire springs from his natural curiosity and interest. As an educator, Brooke does not rely on experimentation alone, but fables and instructional tales are employed freely.[53] Harry is unable to have a first hand acquaintance with the virtues of past heroes, therefore he must be told about them and inspired to emulate their heroic qualities. Fables and instructional tales form a large part in his education:

> At times of relaxation, the old gentleman, with the most winning and insinuating address, endeavoured to open his mind and cultivate his morals, by a thousand little fables, such as of bold sparrows, and naughty kids, that were carried away by the hawk, or devoured by the wolf, and of

> good robbins, and innocent lambs, that the very hawks and wolves themselves were fond of. For he never proposed any encouragement or reward to the heart of our hero, save that of the love and approbation of others.[54]

The Fool of Quality also contains the life-stories of the major characters. Some of these can be excused because they help to train Harry's heart to be sympathetic and benevolent. But Harry does not hear all of them; the only excuse for this extraneous material is that they help to educate the heart of the reader.

The success of Brooke's experiment in the Fool of Quality can possibly be estimated from a consideration of the praise his novel received. John Wesley perceived the likeness between Brooke's beliefs and his own, so he reissued the Fool of Quality to supply concrete illustrations for his own teaching. He praised the moral examples and especially the stress upon humanitarian feelings. Wesley himself considered emotion as the source of religion and good conduct. In his task of awakening the emotions of the masses, and of rekindling the good Samaritan spirit among them, he made the Fool of Quality a text book. Indeed, in Wesley's version, the novel became a supplement to the Bible for those who accepted Methodism. In the Preface to his edition Wesley praises Brooke's noble sentiments:

> But the greatest excellence of all in this Treatise is that it continually strikes at the heart. It perpetually aims at inspiring and increasing every right affection; at the instilling gratitude to God and benevolence to man. And it does this not by dry, dull, tedious precepts, but by the livliest examples that can be conceived: by setting before your eyes one of the most beautiful pictures that

> ever was drawn in the world. The strokes of this are so delicately fine, the touches so easy, natural, and affecting, that I know not who can survey it with tearless eyes, unless he has a heart of stone. I recommend it therefore to all those who are already, or desire to be, lovers of God and man.[55]

The Wesley version was popular and appeared in a large number of editions. Indeed, it was the form in which the book was best known until 1859, when Kingsley's edition appeared. Charles Kingsley, who was like Brooke in temperament, in imagination, in social, ethical, and religious ideas, prefaced his edition of the Fool of Quality with a glowing eulogy to the author.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 2

1. Brooke, Fool of Quality, IV, 88-9.
2. Ibid., 89.
3. Ibid., 88.
4. Ibid., II, 221.
5. Ibid., 80.
6. Ibid., 90.
7. Ibid., V, 118-9.
8. Ibid., IV, 301.
9. Ibid., V, 299-300.
10. Brooke chose the title from Pope's Dunciad:

    > Safe, where no Critics damn, no duns molest,
    > Where wretched Withers, Ward, and Gildon rest,
    > And high-born Howard, more majestic sire,
    > With Fool of Quality compleats the quire.
    > Thou Cibber! thou, his Laurel shalt support,
    > Folly, my son, has still a Friend at Court.
    > (I, 295-300)

11. Brooke, Preface to Fool of Quality, xxxvi.
12. Brooke, Fool of Quality, II, 119-20.
13. Ibid., I, 98-9.
14. Ibid., 157.
15. Ibid., II, 117.
16. Ibid., IV, 294.
17. Ibid., I, 214.
18. Ibid., 213.
19. Ibid., III, 256-7.
20. Ibid., I, 42-3.

21. The sub-title of Juliet Grenville is The History of the Human Heart. An expansion is given to this title: "It was rather a history of the secret process and workings of God in the human heart: a history interesting to all who are interested in nature; who are capable of the tears of delight or distress; and who feel the divinity of informing truth, descending and fathoming the lowest depths of their souls." (Quoted in Scurr, Henry Brooke (Minneapolis, 1922), 110-1.)

22. Rousseau had said in Emile: "The splendor of nature lives in man's heart; to be seen, it must be felt." (Emile, 131.)

23. Brooke, Fool of Quality, IV, 95.

24. Ibid., 94.

25. Ibid., 91.

26. Ibid., V, 222.

27. Ibid., IV, 292.

28. Ibid., III, 42-3.

29. Ibid., II, 106.

30. Ibid., 138.

31. Idem.

32. Ibid., 198.

33. Ibid., 205.

34. Ibid., 195.

35. Ibid., IV, 253.

36. Ibid., III, 242-3.

37. Brooke, Juliet Grenville. Quoted in Scurr, Henry Brooke, 112.

38. Brooke, Fool of Quality, V, 289.

39. Note that Brooke believes that man will acquire a social sense through a feeling for the wretchedness of his fellow-creatures. He borrowed this idea from Rousseau, who said in Emile: ". . . we are drawn towards our fellow-creatures less by our feeling for their joys than for their sorrows; for in them we discern more plainly a nature like our own, and a

pledge of their affection for us." (Emile, 182.)

40. Again Brooke borrows from Rousseau, who says in Emile: "By nature men are neither kings, nobles, courtiers, nor millionaires. All men are born poor and naked, all are liable to the sorrows of life, its disappointments, its ills, its needs, its suffering of every kind; and all are condemned at length to die. This is what it really means to be a man, this is what no mortal can escape." (Emile, 183.)

41. Brooke, Fool of Quality, V, 248.

42. The anti-slave movement was one of great significance for both humanitarian and revolutionary sympathizers. Since the time of Oronooko, the noble-minded negro had been a familiar figure in sentimental fiction. To the follower of Rousseau he acquired a peculiar interest as exemplifying primitive man in an ideal state of nature. To the Godwinian philosopher chattel slavery was an especially flagrant violation of political justice. To the practical reformer the slave trade was one of the burning issues of the time.

43. James Thomson rebuked all sports causing suffering to animals; in Liberty he espoused vegetarianism. Pope spoke against the indiscriminate slaughter of animals. Baker, like Sterne's Uncle Toby, complained even against the "murder" of a fly. This tendency, which began in the eighteenth century, reached its culmination in the nineteenth.

44. Brooke, Fool of Quality, II, 224.

45. Ibid., IV, 78.

46. Ibid., 223.

47. Ibid., II, 130.

48. Ibid., 106.

49. Montaigne, Locke, Rollin, Fleury, De Crouzas, and Rousseau believed that physical training was necessary for the proper education of children. In Emile Rousseau proves "the value of manual labour and bodily exercise for strengthening the health and constitution". (Emile, 23.) He wishes to synchronize physical and intellectual training: ". . . the scholar, while engaged in speculative studies, is actively using his body, gaining suppleness of limb, and training his hands to labour so that he will be able to make them useful when he is a man." (Ibid., 139.)

50. Brooke, Fool of Quality, IV, 78.

51. Ibid., 234.

52. Ibid., V, 223.

53. Rousseau had emphasized the importance of fables in Emile. Fables enable a child to acquire a maxim from a fact, "and the experience he would soon have forgotten is engraved on his mind by means of the fable." (Emile, 210.) Rousseau wishes that the maxims should not be explained, nor even formulated: "Nothing is so foolish and unwise as the moral at the end of most of the fables; as if the moral was not, or ought not to be so clear in the fable itself that the reader cannot fail to perceive it. Why then add the moral at the end, and so deprive him of the pleasure of discovering it for himself. The art of teaching consists in making the pupil wish to learn." (Idem.)

54. Brooke, Fool of Quality, I, 54-5.

55. Preface to Wesley's edition of the Fool of Quality. Quoted in Scurr, 99.

CHAPTER 3

THOMAS DAY AND EDUCATION IN THE MIND

Thomas Day advanced his educational philosophy through the medium of the novel. Day had been so strongly influenced by Rousseau's educational ideas that he attempted to make practical demonstration of them by educating two orphan girls to be paragons of excellence and virtue.[1] Although this scheme failed, Day was unwilling to let his educational convictions die and disappear. Sandford and Merton, published between 1783 and 1789, was his attempt to perpetuate them.

From his genuine interest in children and early attempts to educate them, Day acquired an interest in writing books for children. He wished to supply the need for children's books at the time:[2]

> All who have been conversant in the education of very young children, have complained of the total want of proper books to be put into their hands, while they are taught the elements of reading. I have felt this want in common with others, and have been very much embarrassed how to supply it.[3]

At first he thought he could supply this need by selecting passages from books that were adapted to the child's understanding. Realizing the defects of this method, he decided to publish a volume of stories that might interest the minds of children. This method was still defective; therefore, he resolved to collect stories he thought adapted to the faculties of children and connect them by a continued narrative "so that every story might appear to rise naturally out of the subject, and might, for that reason, make the greater impression."[4] He claimed that he had written the novel for the use of children, and, indeed, the

sub-title of Sandford and Merton is "A Work Intended for the Use of Children". To make the work more interesting to those for whom it was intended, Day chose two children as the main characters, and "endeavoured to make them speak and behave according to the order of nature."[5] He preserved a sufficient degree of simplicity to make it intelligible to very young children. Day also maintained that the work was not meant to be a formal treatise on education, but a story intended for the minds of children:

> . . . I hope nobody will consider this work as a treatise on education: I have unavoidably expressed some ideas upon this subject, and introduced a conversation, not one word of which any child will understand; but all the rest of the book is intended to form and interest the minds of children: it is to them that I have written; it is from their applause alone I shall estimate my success; and, if they are uninterested in the work, the praises of a hundred reviewers will not console me for my failure.[6]

Nevertheless, evidence in the same preface indicates that Sandford and Merton is, in spite of Day's disclaimer, an educational treatise:

> My ideas of morals and of human life will be sufficiently evident to those who take the trouble of reading the book; it is unnecessary either to apologize for them, or to expatiate upon the subject; but such as they are, they are the result of all my reasoning, and of all my experience.[7]

Although Day admits that one of the conversations in the novel is beyond the comprehension of children, he still includes it to shed further light on the educational doctrines expounded in the novel. Again, the book is not merely a child's book

with a "purpose"; it is a child's book with a coherent philosophy. Day's concern for the amusement of children is subsidiary to his concern for their instruction and education.

In our discussion of the pedagogical system of Henry Brooke we observed that he placed almost unqualified emphasis on the education of the heart. His concern for the development of the mind and body was secondary to his interest in the proper direction of the feelings. Brooke emphasized feeling, emotion, and the heart rather than reason and the mind. Indeed, he can be called the true Man of Feeling. But Day emphasizes the mind more than the heart. He is more of the Jacobin rationalist, and his work shows that the Jacobin temperament became manifest in England before the actual outbreak of the French Revolution. Whereas Brooke's primitivism is of the sentimental kind, Day's primitivism has more in common with the rationalistic than the sentimental type.[8] Day looks upon his educational principles in much the same way as the earlier rationalists had looked upon the laws of nature. This rationalistic strain is very much reinforced in a passage from his Letters of Marius:

> I have often thought it a wonderful fallacy of some devines to deprecate human reason in order to exalt religion; for, unless that religion be imported by particular inspiration to every individual, what other method is there of establishing it, than proofs adapted to his reason? . . . But this fallacy does not seem to be confined to the venerable order of the clergy. Politicians practice it at least with equal success, when they descant upon the blindness and ignorance of, what they call, the multitude.[9]

When one believed, as Day did, in agreement with the Jacobin Rationalists, that the mind had only to distinguish a desirable end to feel completely assured of gaining that end and attaining a future perfection in human relationships, then one could neglect the problem of selfishness and corrupting passions.

Day takes up the complementary position to Brooke. Brooke elevates the heart over the mind; Day elevates the mind over the heart. Of course, he does not completely neglect the heart any more than Brooke completely neglects the mind. Day says at one point in Sandford and Merton that the educator must employ all his knowledge of the human heart to reclaim men from their vices and win them over to the cause of virtue. But for Day, the mind is the superior faculty:

> Indeed, the real seat of all superiority, even of manners, must be placed in the mind; dignified sentiments, superior courage, accompanied with genuine and universal courtesy, are always necessary to constitute the real gentleman; and where these are wanting, it is the greatest absurdity to think they can be supplied by affected tones of voice, particular grimaces, or extravagant and unnatural modes of dress; which, far from becoming the real test of gentility, . . .10

The mind must be cultivated and governed by good habit. In Sandford and Merton the tutor, Barlow, draws an analogy between the body and mind, maintaining that if the most trifling habits of body and speech can be changed by continual attention, then the mind, which is not subject to any different laws, can also be changed through constant exercise and proper discipline.

Barlow concludes his argument by saying that an improper education of the mind may form a wild, ungovernable character; but a proper education of the mind can produce a virtuous character that would prove a blessing to the individual and his country. The tutor takes great pains to cultivate all the faculties of Harry Sandford's mind. He is justly rewarded for his labour, as Mr. Merton says of Harry: "That little boy. . . has the noblest mind that ever adorned a human being". With Harry the task is relatively easy, because his mind has been disciplined from an early stage in his life. Tommy Merton has not been so fortunate, because his mind has not been subjected to any early restriction or restraint. Therefore, Tommy's regeneration becomes the central problem of the novel. He is the character through which the author demonstrates the effectiveness of his educational scheme. The tutor, Barlow, takes Tommy's undisciplined mind, places it in a suitable environment, aids him to control his thoughts and actions, and soon leads him to regeneration and usefulness.

The faculties of Tommy's mind could never have been effectively cultivated if Day had not had such a strong belief in the power of environment to mould the mind. Day realized the importance of early impressions in moulding the mind and character:

> May not all human characters frequently be traced back to impressions made at so early a period, that none but discerning eyes would ever suspect their existence? Yet nothing is more certain; what we are at twenty depends upon what we were at fifteen; what we are at fifteen

> upon what we were at ten; where shall we then place the beginning of the series?[12]

It is impossible to say whether Day got his sense of the importance of early impressions from Locke by way of Rousseau, or more directly from the associationists and utilitarians.

The formative influence of environment is demonstrated in the characters of Harry and Tommy. Harry Sandford was trained from an early stage in his life to be courteous, honest, and humane; therefore he can easily resist the temptation of idleness and intemperance. Tommy is not so fortunate. He was born and bred in the weakness of fashionable society; consequently, the early impressions he receives are conducive to the degeneration of his character. In the hands of Mr. Barlow, Tommy makes favourable progress. He learns to control his pride, sees the value of being useful to himself, becomes more generous, and adopts the right attitude to humanitarian actions. But when the time comes for Tommy to visit his parent's house Mr. Barlow expresses a slight concern for his welfare "as he knew he [Tommy] would meet a great deal of company there, who would give him impressions of a very different nature from what he had with so much assiduity been labouring to excite."[13] Tommy's mind improved in the favourable atmosphere Barlow provided for him, but the ideas which the tutor endeavoured to inculcate in the mind of the pupil were not given a chance to mature. Therefore, Barlow was worried, and rightly so. Tommy quickly fell a victim to the flatteries of the young ladies and their sycophantic mothers. Worse still, he came under the influence of two public

school products, Compton and Mash. The impressions which he received from Mr. Barlow were not strong enough to withstand this fresh onslaught from the fashionable world:

> Tommy himself had now completely resumed his natural [former] character, and thrown aside all that he had learned during his residence with Mr. Barlow; he had contracted an infinite fondness for all those scenes of dissipation which his new friends daily described to him; and began to be convinced, that one of the most important things in life, is a fashionable dress. In this most rational sentiment he had been confirmed by almost all the young ladies, with whom he had conversed since his return home. The distinctions of character, relative to virtue and understanding, which had been with so much pains inculcated upon his mind, seemed here to be entirely unheeded. No one took the trouble of examining the real principles or motives from which any human being acted: while the most minute attention was continually given to what regarded merely the outside. He observed that the omission of every duty towards our fellow creatures, was not only excused, but even to a certain degree admired, provided it was joined with a certain fashionable appearance; while the most perfect probity, or integrity, was mentioned with coldness or disgust, and frequently with open ridicule, if unconnected with a brilliant appearance. As to all the common virtues of life, such as industry, economy, a punctuality in discharging our obligations, or keeping our word, these were qualities which were treated as fit for none but the vulgar.[14]

This new system seemed much easier to him than the old one, for, instead of worrying about his manners or understanding, he could safely indulge all his caprices, give way to all his passions, be haughty, unjust, and selfish. He could be ungrateful to his friends, disobedient to his parents, a glutton, an igorant blockhead, in short, everything which appears "frivolous or contemptible" without incurring the least condemnation, provided that his hair hung fashionably about his ears, his buckles were sufficiently large, and his politeness

to the ladies unimpeached. One thoughtless action follows another, until finally Tommy hits his remonstrant friend, Harry, in the face. This climaxes his ungratefulness to Harry and his unattentiveness to the sound principles of his tutor. Tommy justly reaps the empty rewards of his unworthy behaviour, as his insolence and ingratitude become apparent to his father and himself. While speaking of his son to Mr. Barlow, Mr. Merton says that Tommy "has just behaved in such a manner as shews him to be radically corrupted, and insensible of every principle but pride."[15] However, Barlow is more optimistic and is confident that Tommy can be transformed if given a little more of the correct training:

> . . . yet I do not see it in quite so serious a light as yourself: and though I cannot deny the dangers that may arise from a character so susceptible of false impressions, and so violent at the same time; yet I do not think the corruption either so great or so general as you seem to suspect.[16]

Fortunately, Barlow proves to be correct. Tommy admits his own unworthiness and hears the story of Sophron and Tigranes. Spurred on by this fresh example of virtue rewarded, he resolves to make a greater effort to improve his character. He performs humanitarian actions, condemns the superficiality of fashionable dress, accepts the quality of man, and humbly begs forgiveness from his injured friend. Tommy is regenerated. Through Tommy, Day has shown how environment can shape character: the innate goodness of man acted on by a fashionable environment brings pride, helplessness, irreligion, uselessness, discontent,

callousness, ingratitude, physical weakness, and cowardice; the innate goodness of man acted upon by a rigorous environment brings modesty, self-reliance, religion, usefulness, contentment, pity, honesty, physical strength, and courage.

Day's ideas on education were the result of his disillusionment with the whole existing structure of society. He loathed everything Lord Chesterfield stood for, and with the Dashbits of Oxford he had even less sympathy. Their attention to dress evoked his scorn and illustrated for him the luxury and effeminacy of the age. Contemptuously he viewed their cocked hats and lace, their fencing, dancing, chatter, and flirtation. Day castigated the idleness, profligacy, and self-indulgence of fashionable society. In Sandford and Merton he says that the conveniences of society softened man's mind to sloth and effeminacy. In one of the fables of the novel, the story of Sophron and Tigranes, Chares reports that the ease and plenty which the Egyptians enjoyed enervated their manners and destroyed all vigour of body and mind: in Egypt, he says, "the great business of existence is an inglorious indolence, a lethargy of mind, and a continual suspense from all exertion."[17] The inactivity and improper indulgence of fashionable society produce people whose chief characteristic is shallowness of mind and spirit:

> Those who engross the riches and advantages of this world, are too much employed with their pleasures and ambition, to be much interested about any system, either of religion or of morals; they too frequently feel a species of habitual intoxication, which excludes every serious thought, and

> makes them view with indifference every thing but the present moment.[18]

Thus Day condemns the evils of this fashionable world: its prejudice and superficiality, the undesirable effects of useless ornament, the artificiality of fashionable dress, and the degenerating effects of luxury.[19] He believes that the baleful influence of corrupt institutions should be removed. Man must revert to the natural state of poverty:

> Poverty, that is to say, a state of labour and frequent self-denial, is the natural state of man; it is the state of all in the happiest and most equal governments, the state of nearly all in every country; it is a state in which all the faculties both of body and mind are always found to develope themselves with the most advantage, and in which the moral feelings have generally the greatest influence.[20]

In the natural state the feelings are an influential guide to action, and the body and mind are permitted to develop without constraint.

Day asserts that this natural state is superior to the artificial state of civilized society. He claims that ease, wealth, and power unscrupulously obtained can never produce happiness, but that goodness and hard work can. The rich man who spends his whole time in eating, drinking, sleeping, and amusing himself grows proud, insolent, and capricious, and imagines he has a right to command others. On the other hand, the poor man, who is obliged to labour from morning to night, is always happy, cheerful, and contented. Besides this, he is a good and virtuous man, humane to everybody, honest in his

dealings, always accustomed to speak the truth, and, therefore, beloved and respected by all his neighbours. Day decides that human nature is least perverted among the lower classes, where it is least disguised by art. He uses a well-chosen analogy to show the superiority of the natural to the fashionable. If a physician wished to promote good health, he must condemn the intemperate habits of the rich and recommend simplicity of diet, early slumbers, and moderate exercise in the open air. Similarly, if a legislator was preparing a universal code for all mankind, he must arraign the pernicious habitudes of an indulgent society, and establish rules of conduct which restore moral and natural order and diminish the wild inequality produced by pride and avarice. In Sandford and Merton Day is both the physician and legislator, advocating the elevation of the natural over the artificial.

Day begins his attack upon 'fashionable' education early in the novel. Before he comes under the guidance of Mr. Barlow, Tommy is shown to be deficient in knowledge and manners because of the education he has received:

> By this kind of education, when Master Merton came over to England, he could neither write nor read, nor cipher; he could use none of his limbs with ease, nor bear any degree of fatigue; but he was very proud, fretful, and impatient.[21]

Day condemns the products of public schools. Master Compton, Master Mash, and Miss Matilda betray their shallow training by their actions. Compton is thought a very genteel boy, though "all his gentility consisted in a pair of buckles so big that

that they almost crippled him; in a slender, emaciated figure, and a look of consummate impudence."[22] He had almost finished his education at a public school, where he had learned every vice and folly, without the least improvement either of his character or understanding. Master Mash, also a public school product, thought that the summit of all human ambition was to bet successfully in horse-races. He too was "improving his talents" by a public education and longed impatiently for the time when he would be set free from any restraint whatsoever. Miss Matilda had also been given the "best" of a fashionable education. All of these fashionable products are similar: the great object of all their knowledge and education is only to waste, consume, destroy, and dissipate what is produced by others. Miss Simmons sums up Day's attitude when she condemns their selfish desires and lack of consideration for their fellow-creatures:

> '. . . those who expect so much for themselves, without being willing to consider their fellow-creatures in turn, in whatever station they are found, are always the most mean, ignorant, and despicable of the species.'[23]

Day believes that the educator must oppose pride and sensuality:

> Should he be despised, or neglected by all the rest of the human species, let him still persist in bearing testimony to the truth, both in his precepts and example; the cause of virtue is not desperate while it retains a single friend; should it sink for ever, it is enough for him to have discharged his duty. . . . He is strictly bound never to teach any thing contrary to the purest morality; but he is not bound always to teach that morality in its greatest

> extent. In that respect, he may use the wisdom of the serpent, though guided by the innocence of the love. If, therefore, he sees the reign of prejudice and corruption so firmly established, that men would be offended with the genuine simplicity of the Gospel, and the purity of its primeval doctrines, he may so far moderate their rigour, as to prevent them from entirely disgusting weak and luxurious minds. . . . the Christian minister may certainly use his own discretion in the mode of conveying his instructions; and it is permitted him to employ all his knowledge of the human heart in reclaiming men from their vices, and winning them over to the cause of virtue.[24]

The educator's task is to reform mankind, and Day maintains that he who undertakes the education of a child undertakes the most important duty in society. He says that the seeds of different qualities frequently lie concealed in the character, and only await an opportunity of exerting themselves: it is the business of education to apply such motives to the imagination as may stimulate it to laudable exertions. Thus a proper education can preserve a young man from gross immorality. Day does not think that a single educator can prevent the mass of mankind from acquiring prejudices and corruptions, but when the educator finds them in this state he must use all the wisdom he possesses to bring about their reformation. The product of this educator would be virtuous and useful to society, and would not be fettered by any of the stultifying prejudices fostered by a fashionable educator.

Tommy was transformed from a social parasite into a useful man by the inculcation of certain qualities in his mind and heart. These qualities are the components of Day's system of 'natural education'. To fully evaluate this education

we must now consider the qualities instilled into Tommy's mind and heart.

The second volume of Sandford and Merton had upon its title page a quotation from Lord Monboddo:

> But I do not know that there is upon the face of the earth a more useless, more contemptible, and more miserable animal than a wealthy, luxurious man, without business or professions, arts, sciences, or exercises.[25]

As Barlow does not want Tommy to become this kind of animal, he exerts all his resources to make his pupil hardy, humane, and useful. Tommy learns much about many useful things; some by fables, some by sad experience, and some by tutorial conversation. The story of The Gentleman and the Basket-maker contrasts the useless actions of the rich with the useful existence of the poor. Day is never tired of illustrating the superiority of the hardy inhabitants of such countries as Greenland, Lapland, Arabia, and Kamtschatka. The Greenlanders and Kamtschatkans hold an attraction for him because they survive in a very cold climate and under many hardships. The Arabians and Laplanders are also praised for their useful and hardy existence. The example of these hardy inhabitants encourages Tommy to see the advantages of a knowledge of the useful. He also learns the benefits of the useful through sad experience. His refusal to do his share of the work at Mr. Barlow's results in his exclusion from the supper-table. After several similar incidents, Tommy realizes the value of being useful and says: "I have been thinking that a man should know

how to do everything in the world."[26] Therefore, he plants wheat and corn, and begins to build a house.

The tutor also helps Tommy to become a useful man through an incidental education in natural phenomena. Tommy learns the difference between night and day, discovers that the sun may be bigger than the earth, learns about constellations, the Pole-Star, how to find the North from the Pole-Star, and the relative positions of North, South, East, and West. Mr. Barlow also describes the principles of magnetism and the compass to him, and gives him a demonstration in the use of the telescope. Tommy is incidentally instructed in the use of such practical instruments as the wheel, wedge, lever, and balance. He is shown the use and pleasures of reading, and encourages to read on his own initiative. At the end of the novel, Tommy expresses his gratitude to Barlow for teaching him to value the useful:

> '. . . to your example I owe most of the little good that I can boast: you have taught me how much better it is to be useful than rich or fine: how much more amiable to be good than to be great. Should I ever be tempted to relapse, even for an instant, into any of my former habits, I will return hither for instruction, and I hope you will again receive me.'[27]

Tommy's conception of a gentleman prevented him for a time from accepting and valuing Mr. Barlow's emphasis on the useful. Tommy is under the delusion that he is a born gentleman, therefore he has the right to command others to work for him. His ideas are gradually changed by experience and by his application of the well-chosen words of Harry and Barlow. Harry holds up to

his friend the example of effeminate young gentlemen, and says that a person must labour and exercise his limbs if he expects them to be strong. Barlow points out Tommy's folly in his satiric summary of the fashionable conception of a gentleman:

> A gentleman is one that, when he has abundance of every thing, keeps it all to himself; beats poor people, if they don't serve him for nothing; and when they have done him the greatest favour, in spite of his insolence, never feels any gratitude, or does them any good in return.[28]

Harry does not wear fine clothes like the other young "gentlemen", but he has within his mind the seed of true gentility and dignity of character. According to Day, fine clothes, a fine house, and a great deal of money are not at all related to true gentility; but "dignified sentiments, superior courage, accompanied with genuine and universal courtesy, are always necessary to constitute the real gentleman".[29] Day says that when these qualities are lacking, they cannot be supplied by affected tones of voice, particular grimaces, or extravagant and unnatural modes of dress. Gradually Tommy realizes that if he wishes to distinguish himself as a gentleman, he must distinguish himself by having more knowledge and moral improvement than others, than by fine clothes or by trifles which anybody can purchase.

Politeness is a characteristic of the true gentleman. Day believes that politeness cannot be acquired from the dress, gestures, or cant expressions of the higher classes. Politeness consists in a disposition to oblige everybody around us, and to say or do nothing which can give them disagreeable impressions.

To be truly polite, Day says that both goodness of heart and a just way of thinking are required.

Closely related to the characteristics of a gentleman are the qualities of virtue and benevolence which the tutor inculcated in the pupil. Day, whose life was one continual struggle to exemplify the existence of virtue, wrote Sandford and Merton to perpetuate his ideas on virtue.[30] The third volume of the novel has this Spartan motto on the title page:

> 'Let not, O generous youth! thy mind recoil
> At transitory pain, or manly toil!
> Nor fondly linger in the painted vale,
> Nor crop the flowers, nor woo the summer's gale!
> Heedless of pleasure's voice, be thine the care
> Nobly to suffer and sublimely dare!
> While virtue waves on high her radiant prize
> And each hard step but lifts thee to the skies.'[31]

By following this strenuous ideal of education Harry develops a virtuous character. Tommy is taught that greatness of character can only be acquired through virtue and not by sloth, finery, or indulgence; he who would excel others in virtue must first excel them in temperance and application.

Before Tommy is placed under the care of Barlow, he yields to every intemperate desire to which he is subject. Moderation and temperance are two words which are not in his vocabulary. Harry aids Barlow to show Tommy the benefits of being temperate:

> '. . . we must only eat when we are hungry, and drink when we are dry; and that we must only eat and drink such things as are easily met with; otherwise we shall grow peevish and vexed when we can't get them.'[32]

Later in the novel, in the History of a surprising cure of the Gout, Tommy is shown the effects of intemperance. The illness of the rich gentleman resulted from his own sloth and intemperance, therefore the physician found it necessary to recommend a contrary method to cure him - exercise, abstinence, and mortification. This cure worked on the intemperate gentleman and "he never again relapsed into his former habits of intemperance, but, by constant exercise and uniform moderation, continued free from any considerable disease to a very comfortable old age."[33] The story is told for Tommy's benefit, and he learns that intemperance and excess are dangerous to the body and mind.

Tommy's pride is tempered by lessons in moderation and humility. Mr. Barlow holds up the example of the Greenlanders to Tommy and tells him that he should learn to bear ridicule with patience. The pupil's practice of humbling himself is not strong enough to prevent him from falling a victim to his pride while at home, but after witnessing the disastrous consequences of his pride and ingratitude, he sees the virtue of humility.

This humility of spirit is accompanied by a humility of taste. At first Tommy attached much importance to external ornamentation; it was indeed a definite change for him to condemn fashionable dress and manners, and to assume an indifference to ornament:

> Tommy now entered the room, but with a remarkable change in his dress and manner. He had combed the powder

> out of his hair, and demolished the elegance of his curls; he had divested his dress of every appearance of finery; and even his massy and ponderous buckles, so long the delight of his heart and the wonder of his female friends, were taken from his shoes, and replaced by a pair of the plainest form and appearance. In this habiliment, he appeared so totally changed from what he was, that even his mother, who had lately become a little sparing of her observations, could not help exclaiming, 'What, in the name of wonder, has the boy been doing now? Why, Tommy, I protest you have made yourself a perfect fright, and you look more like a plough-boy than a young gentleman.'
>
> 'Mamma,' answered Tommy, gravely, 'I am now only what I ought always to have been. Had I been contented with this dress before, I never should have imitated such a parcel of coxcombs as you have lately had at your house; nor pretended to admire Miss Matilda's music, which, I own, tired me as much as Harry, and had almost set me asleep; nor should I have exposed myself at the play and the ball; and, what is worst of all, I should have avoided all my shameful behaviour to Harry at the bull-baiting. But, from this time, I shall apply myself to the study of nothing but reason and philosophy; and therefore I have bid adieu to dress and finery for ever.'[34]

Day believes that ornament and love of fashionable finery can stifle the growth of benevolence in the minds and hearts of young children. Therefore, Barlow is careful to turn Tommy's mind from trifles and to instil into him a genuine love of his fellow-creatures and a desire to alleviate their suffering. The tutor sets a fine example for Tommy in this respect. He is the friend of all the poor in the neighbourhood: he gives them food and medicine when they are ill, employs them when they are idle, instructs them in their duty, and teaches them how to be happy in this world and in the next.[35] Like Fenton in the Fool of Quality, Barlow has an annual dinner when he comforts the poor of his parish:

> Mr. Barlow himself received his guests, and conversed

> with them about the state of their families and their affairs. Those that were industrious and brought their children up to labour, instructing them in the knowledge of their duty, and preserving them from bad impressions, were sure to meet with his encouragement and commendations. Those that had been ill, he assisted with such little necessaries, as tended to alleviate their pains, and diffuse a gleam of cheerfulness over their sufferings'. . .[36]

Inspired by his tutor's example, Tommy gives ragged Jacky Smithers a loaf of bread and a suit of clothes. However, he does this for the wrong motive - to prove that he is a gentleman. Later, under Barlow's direction, he shows real benevolence to poor Jacky's family by sending them food and suitable clothes.[37] In the company of his fashionable friends, Tommy subdues these humanitarian tendencies, but soon he admits his deficiencies and becomes truly sympathetic toward the distressed. He gives a shilling to a poor Highlander with three starving children, and later takes the entire family to his house for refreshment. These actions improve his character and give him a greater peace of mind: ". . . Tommy went forward, feeling a greater pleasure at this little act of humanity, than he had long been acquainted with among all the fine acquaintance he had lately contracted."[38]

To have a true feeling for his fellow-man Tommy must accept the equality of men. Day's conviction that all men are born equal leads him to condemn all kinds of slavery.[39] Barlow reveals the shallowness of Tommy's arguments in favour of the slave trade:

> Mr. B. And what right have the people who sold the poor

> negroes to your father, to sell them, or what right has your father to buy them? Here Tommy seemed to be a good deal puzzled, but at length he said: They are brought from a country that is a great way off, in ships, and so they become slaves. Then, said Mr. Barlow, if I take you to another country, in a ship, I shall have a right to sell you? -T. No, but you won't sir, because I was born a gentleman. -Mr. B. What do you mean by that, Tommy? -Why (said Tommy, a little confounded), to have a fine house, and fine clothes, and a coach, and a great deal of money, as my papa has. Mr. B. Then if you were no longer to have a fine house, nor fine clothes, nor a great deal of money, somebody that had all these things might make you a slave, and use you ill, and beat you, and insult you, and do whatever he liked with you? -T. No, sir, that would not be right neither, that any body should use me ill. -Mr. B. Then one person should not use another ill? -T. No, sir. -Mr. B. To make a slave of any body, is to use him ill, is it not? -T. I think so. -Mr. B. Then no one ought to make a slave of you? -T. No, indeed, sir. -Mr. B. But if no one should use another ill, and making a slave is using him ill, neither ought you to make a slave of any one else. -T. Indeed, sir, I think not; and for the future I never will use our black William ill; nor pinch him, nor kick him, as I used to do.[40]

Later, Tommy hears The Story of the Grateful Turk, and he sees that a slave can be more honourable than a Christian. As his education progresses, he realizes the injustice of slavery of any kind and expresses a definite desire for slave-emancipation.

Day believes that sympathy must even be extended to animals.[41] Tommy is told a number of fables to soften his heart toward animals. The story of Androcles and the Lion demonstrates that "even the fiercest beasts are capable of being softened by gratitude, and moved by humanity".[42] Barlow reinforces this fable with a little tutorial advice: ". . . if you want to tame animals, you must be good to them, and treat them kindly, and then they will no longer fear you, but come to you and love you."[43] But in showing his kindness to animals,

Tommy suffers from pride and inexperience. The pig he tries to feed involves him in difficulties and leaves him disillusioned and indignant. His subsequent attempts to show kindness to animals are a little more successful; the bleeding lamb he courageously rescues turns out to be Harry's, and is the object through which Harry is forever grateful to his friend. Virtue is always rewarded in Day's novels.

There were two things which Mr. Barlow thought more important than the humane treatment of animals and the distribution of property to the needy. One of these duties was the instilling of just notions of morals and religion; the educator is strictly bound never to teach anything contrary to the purest morality. In Sandford and Merton Day attempted to reconcile Rousseau's naturalism with a sounder morality. The second of Barlow's important tasks was the encouragement of industry and virtue in his pupil.[44] The tutor provides several fables to illustrate the rewards of industry. The moral of the story of The Flies and the Ants is expressed by one of its characters:

> '. . . The Flies are all dead, because they were careless animals, who gave themselves no trouble about laying up provisions, and were too idle to work: but the Ants, who had been busy all the summer, in providing for their maintenance during the winter, are all alive and well; and you will see them as soon as the warm weather returns.'[45]

The story of Two Brothers shows that industry is infinitely better than gold. Through fables and sad experience Tommy learns the value of industry and the peace of mind it promotes.

We still have to consider one aspect of Tommy's education.

This is his physical education. At the beginning of the novel Day draws a contrast between the weak body of the child of fashion and the strong body of the child of nature. Tommy "could use none of his limbs with ease, nor bear any degree of fatigue; but he was proud, fretful, and impatient";[46] on the other hand, Harry's education had made him strong and healthy: "Harry, as he had always been accustomed to run about in the fields, to follow the labourers while they were ploughing, and to drive the sheep to their pasture, was active, strong, hardy, and fresh-coloured."[47] Harry tells Tommy that physical exercise is far better than all the conveniences to which the latter has been accustomed. Working in the air gives Tommy a better appetite, and soon the additional exercise improved his health and strength:

> . . . for when I was less than I am now, I remember I was always fretful and hurting myself, though I had two or three people constantly to take care of me. At present, I seem as if I was quite another thing: I do not mind falling down and hurting myself, or cold, or weariness, or scracely any thing which happens.
>
> Mr. B. And which do you prefer; to be as you are now, or as you were before?
>
> T. As I am now, a great deal, sir; for then I always had something or another the matter with me. Sometimes I had a little cold, and then I was obliged to stay in for several days; sometimes a little headache, and then I was forced to take physic; sometimes the weather was too hot, then I must stay within, and the same if it was too cold; I used to be tired to death, if I did but walk a mile, and I was always eating cake and sweetmeats till I made myself sick. At present I think I am ten times stronger and healthier than ever I was in my life.[48]

This physical strength brings with it a new courage and physical endurance. Here again the splendid example of his

friend aids him. Harry, who is a boy of extraordinary courage and agility, performs many courageous feats. He saves Tommy's life by pulling a snake from his leg. In his encounter with the insolent Mash, the entire group of spectators entertain the sincerest respect for Harry's courage. Mash attempts to crush his enemy who is so much inferior in size, strength, and years; "but Harry possessed a body hardened to support pain and hardship; a greater degree of activity, a cool, unyielding courage, which nothing could disturb or daunt."[49] Consequently, Harry gives Mash a thorough beating.[50] Shortly after this episode Harry, "with a courage and presence of mind above his years,"[51] saves Tommy from being gored by an angry bull. Throughout the novel Tommy hears fables which help to inspire courage in him. The History of Leonidas, King of Sparta gives a practical demonstration of the valour and patriotism that Barlow wants his pupil to have. Tommy learns from The History of the Two Dogs that "it is in vain to expect courage in those who live a life of indolence and repose".[52] In this environment his courage quickly developed. He caught and resolutely tamed an escaped monkey. Later he courageously defended a lamb from a fierce dog.

Thus the education of Tommy Merton progresses and is completed. Tommy is the most human character in the novel: he displays human pride, asks natural questions, shrinks from pain and danger, and involves himself in disastrous experiments. Nevertheless, his pride must be controlled. He must be made

the target of Mr. Barlow's shafts and be remade in the image of Harry Sandford. Henry Brooke had given some attention to the education of Henry Moreland, but Thomas Day was the first in England to illustrate a purely natural form of education by which the mind as well as the heart and body of the child would be trained.[53] Day hoped to reform man by means of the kind of education illustrated in Sandford and Merton. From our study of this novel we have seen that the product of a 'natural education' would possess the following qualities: humility, morality, benevolence, politeness, patience, true gentility, moderation rather than uncontrolled excess, kindness to animals, a love of virtue, a thorough knowledge of the hardy and useful, humanitarianism, altruism, a sense of the equality of man, physical strength and vigour, courage, respect for the property of others, a desire for slave-emancipation, a knowledge of natural phenomena, and a belief in the wholesomeness of poverty and honest labour.

Day sought to inculcate these qualities in the minds of his pupils through constant exercise and proper discipline. He was convinced that human nature is infinitely more weak than wicked; and that the greater part of all bad conduct springs rather from a want of firmness than from any settled propensity to evil. By exercise, abstinence, and repeated mortification, Tommy's pride is tempered and he is regenerated.

Day's educational technique is closely related to the actual qualities he propounded. Tommy's mind is not cloyed with useless, unrelated knowledge; the tutor is clever in whetting the pupil's appetite for knowledge.[54] There are many examples

to illustrate this approach. One day as they "happened to pass near a windmill", Tommy wanted to know how it operated. Harry tells Tommy the name of this strange building, and then they examine every part of it with the greatest curiosity. Tommy is told how to grow corn and this is enough for him to desire to grow his own. Later the tutor incites the pupil's curiosity about history,[55] and again, instead of formal instruction, Tommy is left to his own resources to learn about the histories of various countries: "'You are now able to read for yourself,' replied Mr. Barlow; 'and therefore, by examining the histories of those countries, you may be informed of every thing you desire.'"[56] The pupil's knowledge increases by incidental rather than by formal instruction. For example, when Tommy and Harry feared that their trees might perish from the want of moisture, they damned a small stream to lead the water near the roots of the trees. Barlow looked upon this activity with the greatest satisfaction as it provided him a perfect opportunity to teach the boys about the Nile and irrigation. Thus, this subject is not introduced suddenly, but grows naturally out of the boy's work and discussion. Very often Barlow draws the correct answer from his pupil by repeated questioning:

> 'Indeed,' said Tommy, 'that is very surprising; for I thought all birds had flown away whenever a man came near them; and that even the fowls which are kept at home would never let you touch them.' -Mr. B. And what do you imagine is the reason of that? -T. Because they are wild. -Mr. B. And what is a fowl's being wild? -T.

> When he will not let you come near him. -Mr. B. Then a fowl is wild, because he will not let you come near him; and will not let you come near him, because he is wild. This is saying nothing more than that when a fowl is wild, he will not let you approach him. But I want to know what is the reason of his being wild. -T. Indeed, sir, I cannot tell, unless it is because they are naturally so. -Mr. B. But if they were naturally so, this fowl could not be fond of Harry. -T. That is because he is so good to it. -Mr. B. Very likely. Then it is not natural for an animal to run away from a person that is good to him? -T. No, sir, I believe not. -Mr. B. But when a person is not good to him, or endeavours to hurt him, it is natural for an animal to run away from him, is it not? -T. Yes. -Mr. B. And then you say he is wild, do you not? -T. Yes, sir. -Mr. B. Why then it is probable that animals are only wild because they are afraid of being hurt, and that they only run away from the fear of danger. I believe you would do the same from a lion or a tiger. -T. Indeed I would, sir. -Mr. B. And yet you do not call yourself a wild animal? -Tommy laughed heartily at this, and said, No.[57]

Observation and experimentation are also an integral part of Day's educational approach. Through experiment Tommy learns the practical use of many devices: the wedge, windlass, compass, wheel, balance, and lever. He uses the lever to move a snow-ball, but when the sticks break, he finds that he is unable to budge the same snow-ball with the remaining pieces: "'That is very curious, indeed,' said Tommy; 'I find that only long sticks are of any use.' 'That,' said Harry, 'I could have told you before; but I had a mind you should find it out yourself.'"[58] This appeal to the pupil's natural curiosity has its desired result:

> Tommy was wonderfully delighted with all these experiments, and declared that from this day forward he would never rest till he had made himself acquainted with every thing curious in every branch of knowledge.[59]

The pupil is taught to examine things and acquire knowledge himself. Thus the components of Day's educational technique are proper motivation, incidental learning, observation and experiment, and any formal instruction that may be required to supplement the knowledge arising from these means.

Day also makes considerable use of fables to demonstrate his educational doctrines. These stories are not isolated from the narrative, but are carefully integrated throughout the novel. They are the nucleus of Sandford and Merton. On this ground the work has been dismissed as simply "a tissue of inserted stories".[60] Such a statement overlooks the essential greatness of the novel. The author's aim is not to reproduce well-known stories, but to incite young children to perform useful and virtuous deeds. Therefore, the fables do not exist for their own sake, but are only a means to an end. Their purpose is to elucidate the educational ideas of the novel. For example, the story of Sophron and Tigranes[61] illustrates many of Day's firmest beliefs: the superiority of the natural over the artificial, the benefits of industry, the necessity of a sympathetic feeling for our fellow-men, the effectiveness of labour and study in producing a strong mind and body, the need for a courageous spirit, and the superiority of the hardy and useful.

In this manner Day educated his ideal. Perhaps we are inclined to jest at his lofty conceptions and pass them off as the delirious results of an eccentric mind. Such

an attitude is erroneous. We grant that Day's belief in the strength of human nature was idealistic. Also, we cannot have all the benefits of civilization without retaining some of the disadvantages. But the educational doctrines advanced in Sandford and Merton are of some significance. Day attempted to achieve the impossible - to model a perfect man; his courage in his life and work is worthy of emulation. It must also be remembered - in respect not only of Day but of nearly all children's writers for fifty years after Sandford and Merton appeared - that neither writers nor readers expected anything but didacticism. To be good, very very good, not mundanely happy, was a spontaneous desire. The enjoyment of mischief, or even of soulless levity, would have been utterly shocking to any normal child before about 1840. Before we dismiss Thomas Day as a prig and Sandford and Merton as an example of his priggishness, it would be well to remember the tradition in which the author wrote and the requirements he was trying to satisfy. Even forgetting this for a moment, Day is still significant in the history of human thought. His conception of the child as a new and independent creature helped to undermine the neo-classical conception of the child as a miniature adult. His idea that education is a guidance in the choice of good habits and the cultivation of a humane disposition is not far distant from the ideal of all educationalists, but his method is unique. If it were possible for children to be imbued with the qualities which Day wished to instil into the minds and hearts of the children in his novels, then the

world would probably be a better place in which to live.

The full extent of Day's success or failure in Sandford and Merton can never be really assessed. We can estimate the success in a small way by examining the light in which the novel was regarded at different times in its history. The first volume of the novel was published in 1783. Its reception was auspicious, as is shown in the conclusion to a criticism in the English Review:

> This author deserves praise, both for the plan, and the execution of his work, which is much the best we have seen, and is adapted to the capacities of very young children. Perhaps it had been better if he could have left out the serious conversation on religion, as it happens to be beyond the understanding of those to whose use the work is didicated. Although nearer the even than the morn of life ourselves, we read the work with pleasure. The author's motto is, Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not: So far are we from forbidding them, that we invite parents to put this book into their children's hands, as one of those few from which the little ones may learn just and noble sentiments of integrity.[62]

After the publication of the second volume in 1786, the Monthly Review praised both author and work:

> The sensible and ingenious Author (Mr. Day) possesses in great perfection the happy art of conveying useful information, just and manly sentments, and important precepts, in the form of dialogue and story. Excellent lessons of hardy temperance, activity, humanity, generosity, and piety; rational views of society; and withal, many articles of instruction in science, are, in this little volume, agreeably wrought up into the form of narration.[63]

The popularity of Sandford and Merton came in three waves: from 1786 to 1798, from 1808 to 1830, and from 1850 to 1890. By 1797 it had been published in Ireland, by 1793 in America.

The first volume was translated into German in 1788. Arnold Berquin, the author of L'Ami des Enfants, translated two volumes into French in 1789. During the second period of popularity the literary reputation of Sandford and Merton was high. The third period of popularity began in 1850. The novel appealed strongly to the moral sentiments of Victorian parents and proved very popular with their story-loving children. The esteem in which the book was held throughout the greater part of the Victorian Age can be seen from the remarks of Cecil Hartly:

> Of all the writings for early youth that have come from the world since the appearance of Robinson Crusoe, not one other has afforded so much amusement, conveyed so much valuable information in the humble arts of life, in science, in morals - not one other has had so elevating an influence over the mind, as the History of Sandford and Merton.[64]

For seventy-five years after its publication Sandford and Merton was used as a textbook in schools.[65]

NOTES ON CHAPTER 3

1. The two girls were taken from the Shrewsbury Orphanage, and were named Sabrina and Lucretia. Finding London inconvenient for his experiment, Day took his pupils to Avignon. There, they were shut off from any knowledge of the world, and their minds opened to the ideas the tutor wished to instil. Day did all that a man could possibly do. He taught them gently, careful not to overstrain their minds. He strove to teach them to live simply and think nobly; to despise dress and love philosophy. Sabrina was by far the better child. Lucretia was stupid and peevish. Day had been deceived; at the end of a year he knew that she had no chance of becoming a paragon. So Lucretia was given a dowry and later married off to a linen-draper. Day returned to London with Sabrina, took a house near Lichfield, and pursued his plan for educating her. He trained her on Spartan principles with the idea of strengthening her nerves and giving her the simplicity and tastes of the ideal savage. He dropped burning sealing wax on her arm to teach her to bear pain. He fired a pistol at her petticoats to teach her courage. He intended to marry her, but his resolution was quickly changed as a result of a trifling neglect on Sabrina's part:

> From his letters at this time I was persuaded, that he would marry her immediately; but a very trifling circumstance changed his intention. He had left Sabrina at the house of a friend under strict injunctions as to some peculiar fancies of his own; in particular, some restrictions as to her dress. She neglected, forgot, or undervalued something, which was not, I believe, clearly defined. She did, or she did not, wear certain long sleeves, and some handkerchief, which had been the subject of his dislike, or of his liking; and he, considering this circumstance as a criterion of her attachment, and as a proof of her want of strength of mind, quitted her for ever. (Edgeworth, Memoirs, I, 339.)

Poor Day had again been disillusioned by the quirks of human nature.

In Sandford and Merton Day describes a woman educated according to his ideas; the ideas of 1786 were, if anything, milder than those of 1770:

> This young lady's name was Simmons. . . . the care of her had devolved upon an uncle, who was a man of sense and benevolence, but a very great humourist. This gentleman had such peculiar ideas of female character, that he waged war with most of the polite and modern accomplishments. As one of the first blessings of life, according to his notions, was health, he endeavoured to prevent that sickly delicacy, which is considered as so great an ornament in fashionable life, by a more robust

and hardy education. His niece was accustomed, from her earliest years, to plunge into the cold bath at every season of the year, to rise by candle-light in winter, to ride a dozen miles upon a trotting horse, or to walk as many, even with the hazard of being splashed, or soiling her clothes. By this mode of education Miss Sukey. . . acquired an excellent character, accompanied, however, with some dispositions, which disqualified her almost as much as Harry for fashionable life. She was acquainted with all the best authors in our language, nor was she ignorant of those in French, although she could not speak a word of the language. Her uncle, who was a man of sense and knowledge, had besides instructed her in several parts of knowledge, which rarely fall to the lot of ladies; such as the established Laws of Nature, and a small degree of Geometry. She was, besides, brought up to every species of household employment, which is now exploded by ladies of every rank and station, as mean and vulgar, and taught to believe that domestic economy is a point of the utmost consequence to every woman who intends to be a wife or mother. (Day, The History of Sandford and Merton (London, [1853]), 282-3.)

Many of these ideas on female education were prevalent at the time. In the sixth volume of Hugh Trevor a lady falls from a runaway horse. This incident gives Holcroft an opportunity to express his ideas on female education: "She would have been in no danger, if she had behaved but with the ordinary resolution of a man; and the accident led me to reflect on the ill education to which women are subjected. They seem to be esteemed by men in proportion as they are helpless, timid, and dependent. It is supposed they cannot be affectionate unless their leading feature be imbecility". (Holcroft, Hugh Trevor, VI, 63. Quoted in Proper, Social Elements in English Prose Fiction, 115.) Mary Wollstonecraft demanded a better education for the middle-class girl and even for those of lower station, who lived in a more natural state, unspoilt by fashionable influences and consequently more susceptible to fresh, mental impressions. Maria Edgeworth's interest in education, and in female education in particular, was not restricted to her educational stories, but was also apparent in her novels. She wanted a woman to be brought up not only to be a good housewife, but sided with Mary Wollstonecraft in wanting her to be fit to enter some profession so as to be able to fight life's battle independent of matrimony.

2. At the time when the first volume of Sandford and Merton was published, in 1783, books for children were uncommon, and it was far easier to find seventeenth century ones than those of that period of the eighteenth century; still it ran through

nine editions and was translated into French and German. The hell-fire tale, such as Thomas White's A Little Book for Little Children, was still popular. Isaac Watt's Divine and Moral Songs was still read, but it smelled powerfully of fire and brimstone. Watts informed the infant mind that:

There is a dreadful hell
And everlasting pain;
Here sinners must with devils dwell
In darkness, fire and chains.

There were also the penny and sixpenny chapbooks containing fairy stories such as Jack the Giant Killer, Red Riding Hood, Blue Beard, and many others. These books did nothing to instil moral principles in the child; and although he should not be over-dosed with fire and brimstone, the child must certainly be improved. Day disliked the hell-fire tales that were then provided for children. He also disliked the juvenile books of John Newbery. Edgeworth said that "Mr. Newbery's little books" were inadequate. Fairy tales were trumpery - "fantastic visions", not at all "useful". The children's book-cupboard seemed almost as bare as Mother Hubbard's, of which, naturally, Day could take no cognizance.

The Unitarian Mrs. Barbauld was the first to write moral stories for children without the terrors which pious people thought necessary and desirable. Her stories elevated the useful and the moral, and attempted to inculcate the virtues in the minds of children. When Lessons for Children from Two to Three Years Old appeared in 1780, the Edgeworths admired it exceedingly, and Mr. Edgeworth began Harry and Lucy "to have diffused, through an interesting story, the first principles of morality, with some of the elements of science and literature, so as to show parents how these may be taught, without wearying the pupil's attention." (Memoirs, II, 335.) Day'a ideas of suitable literature were severly moral, therefore, Mrs. Barbauld's Lessons and Edgeworth's Harry and Lucy became the progenitors of his Sandford and Merton.

3. Day, Preface to Sandford and Merton, vi.

4. Ibid., vii.

5. Idem.

6. Ibid., viii.

7. Ibid., vii.

8. Sentimental primitivism developed from the idea that man is naturally good and benevolent and that he is universally moved by a moral sense which is independent of the exercise of reason. Rationalistic primitivism tended to derive the qualities

of goodness and sagacity in the natural man from the unobstructed operation of the light of reason.

9. Day, Letters of Marius: or Reflections upon the Peace and the East-India Bill, and the Present Crisis (London: 1784), 13-4. Quoted in Whitney, Primitivism and the Idea of Progress, 135.

10. Day, Sandford and Merton, 11.

11. Ibid., 435.

12. Ibid., 23.

13. Ibid., 280.

14. Ibid., 304-5.

15. Ibid., 335.

16. Idem.

17. Ibid., 366.

18. Ibid., 24.

19. The new economic conditions resulting from the Industrial Revolution produced an enormous increase in wealth. This vast accumulation of wealth led to the belief on the part of some that luxury and wealth caused the degeneracy of society. The London Magazine of the period provides ample illustration of this fact. In 1754 the following statement is made: luxury "not only evervates the people, and debauches their morals, but also destroys their substance." (London Magazine, XXIII (September, 1754), 409.) In 1756 another writer says that "Our riches may perhaps be greater than formerly, but I am sure that our virtue is less." (London Magazine, XXV (January, 1756), 15-6.). Another writer in 1764 claims that "A little rational consideration will enable us to discover the kindred links between luxury, rapine, meanness, extravagance, misery, idleness, vice and guilt." (London Magazine, XXXIII (December, 1764), 620.) In 1774, there is an "Essay on Luxury" in which luxury is said to have poisoned the whole nation. ("Essay on Luxury", London Magazine, XLIII (October, 1774), 481.) Finally in 1779, appeared a somewhat more extensive essay which says: "Wherever these two daemons, Avarice and Sensuality, take possession of the soul, the whole man is debased, and every principle of moral virtue is eradicated from the mind." ("On Avarice and Luxury, and their Influence on the Happiness of a Trading People", London Magazine, XLIII (December, 1779), 539.) The above extracts from the London Magazine are quoted

in Whitney, Primitivism and the Idea of Progress in English Popular Literature of the Eighteenth Century (Baltimore, 1934), 46-8.

Richard Price, John Brown, and Henry Brooke also outline the degrading effects of luxury. In the Fool of Quality Brooke says that luxury degrades man:

> ". . . till the pinnacle of art shall put a limit to desire, till invention shall be exhausted, and no longer prolific of new wants and additional wishes in man.
>
> But so long as untried allurements, so long as untasted pleasures, so long as new objects can be set up to our imagination in our eager pursuit after happiness on earth, our wishes will enflame our impatience to reach the prize; in proportion to that impatience our endeavours will be exerted; in proportion to such exertion the fences of law and morals will be broke through, or trampled down; and, in proportion to the insufficiency of moral restraints, all sorts of fraud and violence, of licentiousness and corruption, of debauchery and profligacy, must prevail throughout the world." (Brooke, Fool of Quality, II, 156-7.)

20. Day, Sandford and Merton, 15.

21. Ibid., 2-3.

22. Ibid., 291.

23. Ibid., 314.

24. Ibid., 21-2.

25. Quoted in Gignilliat, The Author of 'Sandford and Merton': A Life of Thomas Day, Esq. (New York, 1932), 272.

26. Day, Sandford and Merton, 114.

27. Ibid., 507.

28. Ibid., 54.

29. Ibid., 11.

30. Of course Day's ideas on virtue were not confined to Sandford and Merton. In the History of Little Jack, Jack learns that as a good soldier he must always tell the truth, and that if he is honest and dutiful in this world, Heaven is assured him in the next. In the Preface to The Children's Miscellany Day informs us that he united with some gentlemen of fortune and literary abilities to make a selection of material "which might engage the minds of children to the improvement of their knowledge, and inspire them with an early love of virtue." (Quoted in Gignilliat, 300.)

31. Quoted in Gignilliat, 281-2.

32. Day, Sandford and Merton, 8.

33. Ibid., 184.

34. Ibid., 476. This incident has a parallel in the Fool of Quality (I, 90-4). At his father's house, Harry was equipped with highly ornamented clothes. Mr. Fenton then told him the story of Hercules and how his character was ruined by a fine coat, whereupon Harry immediately stripped of all his fashionable trimmings.

35. In the History of Little Jack, Jack's humanitarianism is shown in the same way: "To all his poor neighbors he was kind and liberal, relieving them in their distress, and often entertaining them at his house, where he used to dine with them, with the greatest affability, and frequently relate his own story; in order to prove that it is of very little consequence how a man comes into the world, provided he behaves well, and discharges his duty when he is in it." (Day, History of Little Jack. Quoted in Gignilliat, 306.)

36. Day, Sandford and Merton, 270.

37. In the Fool of Quality Mr. Fenton keeps a room full of clothes for Harry to dispense to the needy.

38. Day, Sandford and Merton, 385.

39. There were pleas for slave-emancipation in the literature of the time. Robert Bage and Mrs. Smith distinguished themselves by their pleas for emancipation of slaves and humaner methods of punishment, thus continuing the work begun in the novels of Mrs. Behn (Oroonoko), Robert Paltock (Peter Williams, 1751), Henry Mackenzie (Julia de Roubigné, 1777), and Dr. John Moore (Zeluco, 1786). Thomas Day did not confine his expression of his detestation of the slave-trade to Sandford and Merton. His philippic against slavery is worth reprinting: "Slavery is the absolute dependence of one man upon another; and is, therefore, as inconsistent with all ideas of justice as despotism is with the rights of nature. It is a crime so monstrous against the human species that all those who practise it deserve to be extirpated from the earth. It is no little, indirect attack upon the safety and happiness of our fellow creatures, but one that boldly strikes at the foundations of all humanity and justice. Robbers invade the property, and murderers the life of human beings; but he that holds another man in bondage, subjects the whole sum of his existence to oppression, bereaves him of every hope, and is, therefore, more detestable than robber and assassin combined." (Day, Fragment of an Original Letter on the Slavery of the Negroes, Written

in the Year 1776, 24. Quoted in Gignilliat, 128.) The English Review passes a comment upon this pamphlet: "Mr. Day has given to the common arguments against slavery. . . spirit and manliness." (English Review, III (June, 1784), 470. Quoted in Gignilliat, 226.)

40. Day, Sandford and Merton, 48-9.

41. This quality in Day's character is delightfully illustrated in an incident recorded in Blackman. While his friend, Jones, was removing a dusty law volume from a shelf, a large black spider fell to the floor. "'Day,' cried Jones hastily, 'kill that spider, kill that spider.' 'No,' replied Day with his habitual coolness, 'I will not kill that spider. I do not know that I have a right to kill it. Suppose when you are going in your coach to Westminster Hall, a superior being, who, perhaps, may have as much power over you as you have over that spider, should say to his companion, "Kill that lawyer, kill that lawyer"; how should you like that, Jones? And, I am sure to most people, a lawyer is a more noxious animal than a spider.'" (Blackman, A Memoir of the Life and Writings of Thomas Day, Author of 'Sandford and Merton', 29. Quoted in Gignilliat, 123.)

42. Day, Sandford and Merton, 51.

43. Ibid., 91.

44. In a letter to Edgeworth, Day emphatically states the rewards of industry: "Says nature, 'Dig, plough, grub, fish, hunt, build, and you will be rewarded for your pains.' - 'No,' say the French, the English, or some other refined people; 'we chuse to be idle and sentimental.' - 'Then starve,' says nature - 'this is my eternal, immutable decision, of which neither plays, nor poetry, nor oratory, nor sentiment, will ever change one tittle.'" (Quoted in Edgeworth, Memoirs, II, 95.)

45. Day, Sandford and Merton, 28.

46. Ibid., 3.

47. Idem.

48. Ibid., 208-9. In the History of Little Jack Day also shows how strength and health are fostered in the natural state: "It was wonderful to see how this child, thus left to nature, increased in strength and vigour. Unfettered by bondages or restraints, his limbs acquired their due proportions and form; his countenance was full and florid, and gave indications of perfect health; and, at an age when other

children are scarcely able to support themselves with the assistance of a nurse, this little foundling could run alone." (Day, History of Little Jack. Quoted in Gignilliat, 301.)

49. Day, Sandford and Merton, 323.

50. This fight is very similar to the one between Harry and the usual larger boy in the Fool of Quality (I, 73-4). The fights between Harry and Slinker, and Harry and Tom (I, 146-8) show the smaller boy victorious over the larger, but very generous to him after the fight.

51. Day, Sandford and Merton, 328.

52. Ibid., 43.

53. Day himself said in the Preface to Sandford and Merton that Brooke had not given enough attention to education in the Fool of Quality: "Nor can I help expressing my regret, that the very ingenious author of that novel has not deigned to apply his great knowledge of the human heart to this particular purpose. He would, by these means, have produced a work more calculated to promote the good of his fellow-creatures, though not his own fame, than a hundred volumes of sentimental novels, or modern history." (Day, Preface to Sandford and Merton, vi.)

54. In Emile Rousseau says that the tutor must arouse the desire in the scholar to learn: "Present interest, that is the motive power, the only motive power that takes us far and safely." (Emile, 81.)

55. One of Day's closest friends, Richard Lovell Edgeworth was so strongly influenced by Rousseau's educational theories that he attempted to conduct the education of his own son according to them. In his Memoirs Edgeworth records his educational experiment:

> After my return from Ireland in 1765, when I established myself at Hare Hatch, I formed a strong desire to educate my son according to the system of Rousseau. His Emile had made a great impression upon my young mind, as it had done upon the imaginations of many far my superiors in age and understanding. His work had then all the power of novelty, as well as all the charms of eloquence; and when I compared the many plausible ideas it contains, with the obvious deficiencies and absurdities, that I saw in the treatment of children in almost every family, with which I was acquainted, I determined to make a fair trial of Rousseau's system. My wife complied with my wishes, and the body and mind of my son were to be left as much as possible to the education of nature and of accident. I was but twenty-three years old, when I formed this resolution; I steadily pursued it for several years, notwithstanding the opposition with

which I was embarrassed by my friends and relations, and the ridicule by which I became immediately assailed on all quarters.

I dressed my son without stockings, with his arms bare, in a jacket and trowsers such as are quite common at present, but were at that time novel and extraordinary. I succeeded in making him remarkably hardy: I also succeeded in making him fearless of every danger, and, what is more difficult, capable of bearing privation of every sort. He had all the virtues of a child bred in the hut of a savage, and all the knowledge of things, which could well be acquired at an early age by a boy bred in civilized society. I say knowledge of things, for of books he had less knowledge at four or five years old, than most children have at that age. Of mechanics he had a clearer conception, and in the application of what he knew more invention, than any child I had then seen. He was bold, free, fearless, generous; he had a ready and keen use of all his senses, and of his judgment. But he was not disposed to obey; his exertions generally arose from his own will; and, though he was what is commonly called good-tempered and good-natured, though he generally pleased by his looks, demeanour, and conversation, he had too little deference for others, and he shewed an invincible dislike to control. With me, he was always what I wished; with others, he was never any thing but what he wished to be himself. He was, by all who saw him, whether of the higher or lower classes, taken notice of; and by all considered as very clever. I speak of a child between seven and eight years old, and to prevent interruption in my narrative, I here represent the effects of his education from three to eight years old, during which period I pursued with him Rousseau's plans. (Edgeworth, Memoirs, 177-9.)

Later, Day and Edgeworth visited Rousseau in Paris and exhibited Edgeworth's boy, Richard. This visit is significant for two reasons: first, it displays the esteem with which they held Rousseau; and second, Rousseau admitted during the visit that history can be profitably learned by children. Edgeworth records this visit in his Memoirs: "He took my son with him in his usual morning's walk, and when he came back, Rousseau told me, that, as far as he could judge from two hours observation, he thought him a boy of abilities, which had been well cultivated; and that in particular his answers to some questions on history proved, contrary to the opinion given in Emilius and Sophia, that history can be advantageously learned by children, if it be taught reasonably, and not merely by rote." (Memoirs, I, 258.)

56. Day, Sandford and Merton, 43.

57. Ibid., 90-1.

58. Ibid., 216.

59. Ibid., 266.

60. Wagenknecht, Cavalcade of the English Novel (New York, 1944), 97.

61. The name Sophron appears often in Percival's Father's Instructions, Tigranes apparently comes from Xenophon's Cyropaedia.

62. English Review, II (Nov., 1783), 178-9. Quoted in Gignilliat, 298.

63. Monthly Review, LXXV (Nov., 1786), 361-4. Quoted in Gignilliat, 299.

64. Quoted in Gignilliat, 342. Edward Dowden says that Sandford and Merton "had probably a larger number of readers than any other work of the period." (The French Revolution and English Literature, 20. Quoted in Gignilliat, 337.)

65. Wright, Sensibility in English Prose Fiction, 137.

CHAPTER 4

ELIZABETH INCHBALD AND THE SCHOOL OF ADVERSITY

The didactic intention does not seem to be so explicit in the novels of Elizabeth Inchbald as in the novels we have just discussed. Brooke wished to educate the heart of his pupil and reader; Day wanted his novels to serve as a means for the moral improvement of all children. Both novelists meticulously demonstrated the qualities which had to be inculcated in the minds and hearts of their imaginary pupils if they were to become useful and virtuous members of society. Inchbald can be grouped in the same class with the other two pedagogic novelists, but she uses a different approach in presenting her educational doctrines. There is no Barlow nor Fenton in her novels, no tutor who assiduously indoctrinates a young mind susceptible to fresh impressions. Her characters appear suddenly, but do not disappear as easily. We are given a brief but satisfactory account of their educational background, then asked to judge their respective actions, and witness the extent to which the educational training is responsible for the happiness or unhappiness of each character. Inchbald is concerned with cause and result. She is intent upon portraying the different results of a 'natural' education and a 'fashionable' one. As she does not painstakingly describe the development of each character, her intention has often been mistaken. Nevertheless, in the opinion of this writer, Elizabeth Inchbald is an educational novelist, and it is only when she is regarded as such that the supposed structural irregularities of her novels are seen to be really masterful strokes of design.

Some critics maintain that her first novel, A Simple Story, does not have any didactic purpose. Joughin says that this novel "is not a novel with a purpose, and there is very little outright philosophy to be found in its pages. Rousseau casts only the faintest shadow upon the work."[1] Gregory discredits the importance of the last two paragraphs of the novel and says that as there is little emphasis on education elsewhere in the novel, then it seems probable that the moral was merely tacked on in an attempt to give unity to what is obviously two separate stories.[2] Proper also claims that nowhere in the book is stress laid on any educational argument that might convince the reader of an alleged educational "purpose".[3] The strongest argument is put forward by McKee:

> I contend that A Simple Story was not intended by its author as a purpose novel. From the internal evidence I have shown that the closing paragraphs were probably added just prior to the date of publication, and that minor alterations were made in the novel at the same time, in order to prepare the way for these paragraphs. I have pointed out in the chapter on origin and inspiration, and merely alluded to it in the present chapter, that the novel was written, not as a treatise on education, but as a novel in which the strong passion of love was to be portrayed. And from the testimony of those who have read the work critically I have shown that with three at least I am in agreement; and by an analysis of the conclusions of those with whom I do not agree, I have, I believe, demonstrated that the evidence upon which such conclusions are based is not convincing, and therefore I contend that A Simple Story is not a purpose novel.[4]

This appears to be a very forceful argument. We shall not delay to answer each individual point of it, since it will become fairly obvious from our subsequent discussion of the novel that A Simple Story is not a love story, but an educational novel.

On the other hand, there are a number of significant critics who maintain that the novel is an educational treatise. Cross claims that it is an attack upon the boarding schools of the time.[5] Halliday maintains that Inchbald's novel is in the tradition of pedagogical treatises: "The business of writing pedagogical treatises under the guise of fiction was continued in Elizabeth Inchbald's Simple Story. . . . The Simple Story is directed against that strange institution, the young ladies' boarding school."[6] Wright also says that Inchbald's "main thesis in A Simple Story was that the best education was adversity, that misfortune would expand one's deepest feelings and would develop courage and independence."[7] Birkhead believes that the novel illustrates the effects of an improper education on a girl of excessive sensibility.[8] Raleigh classes A Simple Story and Nature and Art together and says that both novels show the prevalent ideas on education.[9] Both Saintsbury[10] and Baker[11] include A Simple Story in the class of purpose fiction. Heidler also says that the novel is an educational novel and that Miss Milner's faults are due to the education she received.[12]

The first draft of A Simple Story was completed in 1779, but it was not until 1791 that it was published. Meanwhile Inchbald revised the novel and gave it to several of her friends to criticize. It was criticized by Godwin "and the plot was in a measure altered in deference to his advice."[13] Godwin's biographer does not tell us how much the plot was

changed, but his language indicates that the alteration was small. Littlewood thinks that Godwin probably inspired the closing paragraphs on the effects of education;[14] however this is not fact, but mere speculation. The questionable influence of Rousseau on the novel has also led critics to dispute the educational basis of the novel. Boaden says in his Memoirs that Inchbald was translating Rousseau's Confessions in 1790,[15] but it is quite probable that she had read Emile much earlier.

It is quite possible for one to over-emphasize these two facts: the alteration of the plot by Godwin, and the uncertain influence of Rousseau on Inchbald. A woman who was well-known in literary circles could not be entirely ignorant of the literature of the time. She was probably acquainted with Brooke's Fool of Quality, which was published in its entirety in 1770. Also, Boaden only mentions that Inchbald was translating Rousseau's Confessions in 1790. He does not say that she was reading it for the first time or that she was unacquainted with the rest of Rousseau's works. It would be almost impossible for any biographer to state definitely whether a person had read or had not read a certain book. However, it is unwise to attempt to decide, without sufficient evidence, how much of Rousseau Inchbald did read, and how much of the plot Godwin did or did not alter. It is far wiser to turn to the novel itself and see if it bears unmistakable evidence of Inchbald's intentions.

The plot of A Simple Story can be easily summarized. Miss Milner, the product of a fashionable education, is placed under the guardianship of Dorriforth, a Roman Catholic priest. She falls in love with him, but conceals her feelings until Dorriforth becomes Lord Elmwood and is dispensed from his priestly vows. After several serious personality conflicts, the pair are married. The second part of the story opens after seventeen years have elapsed, and a new heroine is introduced. Unfaithfulness to her husband results in the banishment of Lady Elmwood and her young daughter from Elmwood Castle. In accordance with the mother's dying request, the daughter, Matilda, is returned to her father's house, but upon the condition that she should never appear before him. However they meet accidentally, and Matilda is banished a second time from her home. This lasts for a short time as her father rescues her from the clutches of a debauched man of fashion. Father and daughter are reconciled, thus ending the novel happily. Other important characters in the novel are Sandford, a Jesuit priest and adviser to Lord Elmwood; Miss Woodly, the tender-hearted friend of Lady Elmwood and her daughter; and Harry Rushbrook, the nephew of Lord Elmwood and heir to his estate. Rushbrook and Matilda are engaged to be married at the end of the novel.

Inchbald claims that the purpose of the novel is to illustrate the power of education to form character, and to demonstrate the respective effects of a proper and improper

education:

> He [the reader] has beheld the pernicious effects of an improper education in the destiny which attended the unthinking Miss Milner. On the opposite side, what may not be hoped from that school of prudence, though of adversity, in which Matilda was bred?
>
> And Mr. Milner, Matilda's grandfather, had better have given his fortune to a distant branch of his family, as Matilda's father once meant to do, so that he had given to his daughter A PROPER EDUCATION.[16]

An improper education, by which Inchbald means a 'fashionable' one, can incur disastrous consequences; but a 'natural education', an education in the school of prudence and adversity, can help a person to be happy with himself and the world.

In the novel Inchbald says that education is the second nature of man, yet it has the power to overrule his first nature. Man's initial impulses can easily lure him to disregard all that is good and holy; therefore they must be controlled by education. In the case of Miss Woodly, education, or her second nature, is the motivating force behind all her actions; although she is tempted to condone the violation of things consecrated to Heaven, her previous training and education will not permit her to do it. Miss Milner is not subject to similar compulsions; Inchbald claims that if the heroine had been properly trained, then her love for the priest Dorriforth would have been checked before it became dangerous:

> Had she [Milner] been early taught what were the sacred functions of a Roman ecclesiastic, though all her esteem, all her admiration, had been attracted by the qualities and accomplishments of her guardian, yet education would have given such a probition to her love, that she would have

> been precluded from it, as by that barrier which divides a sister from a brother.
>
> This, unfortunately, was not the case; and Miss Milner loved Dorriforth without one conscious check to tell her she was wrong, . . .[17]

Thus Inchbald believes that education is a powerful factor in shaping attitudes and character. The type of education one receives depends upon the environment in which one has been reared; consequently, Inchbald's belief in the power of environment to determine character is great.[18] She maintains that exterior circumstances influence not only the external manners, but even the persons of some people:

> Miss Milner in Lord Elmwood's drawing-room, surrounded by listeners, by admirers, . . . animated with approbation and applause - and Miss Milner, with no giddy observer to give her actions a false eclat destitute of all but her own understanding, (which secretly condemns her) upon the point of receiving censure from her guardian and friend, are two different beings. Though still beautiful beyond description, she does not look even in person the same. In the last-mentioned situation, she was shorter in stature than in the former - she was paler - she was thinner - and a very different contour presided over her whole air, and all her features.[19]

Miss Milner's education is responsible for the way she thinks and acts.

The heroine of the first part of the novel is a typical product of the 'fashionable' education which Brooke and Day had condemned in their novels. Unlike these two novelists, Inchbald is not so meticulous in the outline of her educational program, but she states clearly and concisely the type of education the heroine received, the folly it fostered, and the deterioration

of character it encouraged. The impulsiveness in the author's own character is carried over into her writings; we are only directly told twice that Miss Milner was educated at a boarding-school, but this is enough, as we are given ample evidence of the fact throughout the novel. Inchbald tells us that when Miss Milner returns from the Protestant boarding-school she has been attending, she is filled with the ideas that ladies of fashion usually imbibe at such places. The endless pursuit of personal accomplishments "had left her mind without one ornament, except such as Nature gave; and even they were not wholly preserved from the ravages made by its rival, Art."[20] Miss Milner is idle, indiscreet, and giddy. Vanity is the only passion which holds a place in her bosom:

> . . . vanity defined into all the species of pride, vain-glory, self-approbation; an inordinate desire of admiration, and an immoderate enjoyment of the art of pleasing, for her own individual happiness, and not for the happiness of others.[21]

Thus unmoved by any sympathetic feeling for others, Milner's attentions are centred solely around herself and her own vain desires. Her character is misformed and misled by the folly and vain pretensions of fashionable society; her mind is stultified by its clichés and superficial expression:

> From her infancy she had been indulged in all her wishes to the extreme of folly, and started habitually at the unpleasant voice of control. She was beautiful; she had been too frequently told the high value of that beauty, and thought every moment passed in wasteful idleness during which she was not gaining some new conquest. She had a

> quick sensibility, which too frequently discovered itself in the immediate resentment of injuries or neglect. She had, besides, acquired the dangerous character of a wit; but to which she had no real pretensions, although the most discerning critic, hearing her converse, might fall into this mistake. Her replies had all the effect of repartee, not because she possessed those qualities which can properly be called wit, but that what she said was delivered with an energy, an instantaneous and powerful conception of the sentiment, joined with a real or a well-counterfeited simplicity, a quick turn of the eye, and an arch smile. Her words were but the words of others, and, like those of others, put into common sentences: but the delivery made them pass for wit, as grace in an ill-proportioned figure will often make it pass for symmetry.[22]

Such is the depth of Miss Milner's character. She had many faults because she was never taught self-control or self-discipline, and had never been trained to resist the temptations of vain desire.

Inchbald suggests periodically throughout the novel that nature has endowed Milner with many desirable qualities, but that these have been gradually suppressed by a continual indulgence in frivolous trivialities. At times her natural character, unadorned by art, expresses itself:

> 'Independent of her fortune, she had beauty to captivate the heart of any man; and with all her follies, she has a frankness in her manner, an unaffected wisdom in her thoughts, a vivacity in her conversation, and withal, a softness in her demeanour, that might alone engage the affections of a man of the nicest sentiments, and the strongest understanding.'[23]

Her father's death changes her haughty mien to a pensive one. She implicitly obeys the commands of her guardian; when he relents and permits her to attend a party he had forbidden her to attend before, the vain and haughty Miss Milner sinks

underneath his kindness and weeps with sincere gentleness and patience. She is occasionally willing to relieve the distress of others: she secretly sells some of her valuable ornaments to pay the debt of an acquaintance, Mr. Hillgrave; on one occasion, when her old enemy, Sandford, has a headache, she, through pity, provides a cure to relieve it. The incident is insignificant enough in itself "but the manner was the material part. The unaffected concern, the attention, the good will she demonstrated in this little incident, was that which made it remarkable".[24] Alone in the presence of her guardian, every look she has borrowed to set off her charms is annihilated; and she becomes a native beauty, with only the artless arguments of reason to support her. Dorriforth tells her that even in the midst of her gayest follies, he shall still reverence her internal sensations. Milner claims that her heart is by nature sincere, but when it cherishes fatal propensities, she indulges in the grossest falsehoods rather than reveal the truth.

The heroine's heart is often affected by many worthy tendencies, but these good inclinations are very often intercepted and arrested by some long-practised folly. There is a constant struggle between Milner's naturally good qualities and the qualities instilled into her character by her education. Elated with many successes, art usually wins. Assured of Lord Elmwood's love, she takes great pleasure in testing the strength of his affection:

> Are not my charms even more invincible than I ever believed them to be? Dorriforth, the grave, the pious, the anchorite Dorriforth, by their force, is animated to all the ardour of the most impassioned lover - while the proud priest, the austere guardian is humbled, if I but frown, into the veriest slave of love. She then asked, 'Why did I not keep him longer in suspense? He could not have loved me more, I believe: but my power over him might have been greater still. I am the happiest of women in the affection he has proved to me; but I wonder whether it would exist under ill treatment? If it would not, he still does not love me as I wish to be loved - If it would, my triumph, my felicity, would be enhanced.'[25]

She again professed all her former follies and indulged them with less restraint than ever. As Dorriforth's ward, Milner had been sometimes gentle and always obedient; as a mistress, she was sometimes haughty, and, to opposition, always insolent. She was charmed to see his love struggling with his censure, his politeness with his anxiety; and, by the light, frivolous, or resentful manner in which she treated his admonitions, she triumphed in showing to Miss Woodly, and, more especially to Mr. Sandford, how much she dared to presume upon the strength of his affections. She deliberately disobeyed his injunction not to attend a masquerade, but here she exceeded her limits, and Lord Elmwood resolved never to see her again. She realized the unhappiness her folly had brought her, and acknowledged that she alone had been instrumental to her fate:

> 'The fate I have drawn upon myself, he shall find I can be resigned to; and he shall be convinced, that the woman, of whose weakness he has had so many fatal proofs, is yet in possession of some fortitude - fortitude, to bid him farewel, without discovering one affected or one real pang, though her death should be the consequence of her suppressed sufferings.'[26]

However, Elmwood relents and they are immediately married. They enjoy four years of unexcelled happiness, which is then marred by Lord Elmwood's visit to his possessions in the West Indies. Lady Elmwood diverts the melancholy hours of his absence by fleeing to the dangerous society of Lord Frederick Lawnly, whose mind, depraved by fashionable vices, could not repay her for a moment's loss of her husband. Elmwood returns suddenly from his prolonged absence, and his unfaithful wife flees in shame from him. No longer virtuous and permanently estranged from her husband, Lady Elmwood dies in a gloomy house on the borders of Scotland. Indiscreetness, vanity, a susceptibility and incessant yearning for flattery all combined to bring about her ultimate tragedy. The folly of of art triumphs over the prudence of nature, and the once beautiful and virtuous Miss Milner becomes no longer beautiful and virtuous.

In the character of Miss Milner Mrs. Inchbald perfectly demonstrates the triumph of art over nature. When she has proved this to her own satisfaction and to the satisfaction of the reader, she allows seventeen years to elapse before she resumes the narrative. The story re-opens, and we have a new heroine. Living far from the whirl of social life, Lady Elmwood's daughter, Matilda, receives a very different education from her mother:

> Educated in the school of adversity, and inured to retirement from her infancy, she had acquainted a

> taste for all those amusements which a recluse life affords. She was fond of walking and riding; was accomplished in the arts of music and drawing, by the most careful instructions of her mother; and as a scholar, she excelled most of her sex, from the pains which Sandford had taken with that part of her education, and the superior abilities he possessed for the task.
>
> In devoting certain hours of the day to study with him, others to music, riding, and such harmless recreations, Matilda's time never appeared tedious at Elmwood Castle, although she received and paid no one visit: . . .[27]

Matilda's training is the exact opposite of that which her mother received. She had an excellent understanding and was taught by her mother the esteem and admiration of her father's virtues. The beauty of her person, grandeur of her mien, delicacy of her sex, extreme tenderness of her heart, and melancholy of her situation combined to make Matilda a paragon worthy of emulation. She did not disobey her father's strict injunctions, but resigned herself to her situation with patience. On one occasion she regretted her unkindness on uttering a disparaging remark about Rushbrook, and Sandford "rejoiced to see how much she reproved herself."[28] This constant desire to eliminate any weakness in her character made Matilda almost as perfect as humans are capable of; Sandford seldom found fault with her, not because he loved her, but because she seldom did wrong. She was sensitive to the misfortune of others and attempted to alleviate any distress which she could. Although detrimental to her own interests, she compassionately pleads with her father not to banish Rushbrook from his house:

> She saw the impending frown, and, rushing towards him, took his hand fearfully, and knelt at his feet. 'Mr.

> Rushbrook is my relation,' she cried in a pathetic voice, 'my companion, my friend: before you loved me he was anxious for my happiness, and often visited me to lament with and console me. I cannot see him turned out of your house without feeling for him what he once felt for me.'29

Inchbald paints Matilda to be tender-hearted, dutiful, modest, understanding, and virtuous - a true product of nature.

In A Simple Story Mrs. Inchbald effectively demonstrates how training in worldly wisdom leads to ruin, and how education in the school of adversity, by encouraging kindness and love, brings lasting contentment. When the novel is interpreted in this light, the sharp break in the plot is justified. The break is not a structural deficiency, but a means of avoiding the introduction of much superfluous material that would do nothing to support the author's thesis. The design of the novel is not irregular, but excellent for the purpose at hand. Inchbald wishes to illustrate the formative influence of environment on character and to exhibit the ultimate result of two sharply-diverse methods of education; the most effective way of doing this is to choose a product of each type of education and portray the thoughts and actions of each. This is what Inchbald does in A Simple Story: Miss Milner, the product of a fashionable education, causes her own unhappiness and untimely death; her daughter, Matilda, educated in the school of adversity, where her natural virtues are not thwarted but promoted, experiences peace and happiness. The argument is forcefully presented. When the two important characters are introduced, they are mature and their habits of life are pretty

well fixed. The stage is simply set, and the reader is immediately ready to observe their actions. All detail unnecessary for the argument is excluded, and the novel which first appears to be structurally deficient, becomes masterfully executed. A Simple Story is an educational novel, and only when it is regarded as such can it be properly understood.

In Nature and Art Inchbald's views on education are more concentrated and direct. The novel is a story of two brothers, William and Henry Norwynne, and their sons. Henry secures employment as a fiddler; through his efforts William is sent to university and becomes a priest in the Anglican Church. William succeeds in the material things of life and becomes first a dean and then a bishop; Henry is estranged from his brother because of his marriage to a woman socially inferior to him. His wife dies, so he goes to Africa. Both brothers have sons, who are also called William and Henry; William receives all that a conventional society has to offer, Henry remains unblemished in the hands of nature. The younger Henry is sent back to England to live at the house of his uncle. Both cousins fall in love, Henry with Rebecca Rymer, William with Agnes Primrose. Henry retains his natural simplicity, undertakes a hazardous journey to rescue his father, and happily returns to England to marry Rebecca. On the other hand, William undoes Agnes, and, through his unthinking actions, perpetuates the cruelty and injustice of the society in which he has been reared.

The opening chapters of Nature and Art are concerned with the exemplification of an analogy of Henry Brooke. Brooke claims that if a man is born with a propensity to pride and arrogance, and if no future influence, arising from environment or education, checks this pride, then the person will soon view all around him with an habitual self-sufficiency and contempt of his species. On the other hand, if another person is born with a propensity to humility and lowliness, and if these qualities are not diverted by education, then it will not be long before this person will regard all around him with an amiable diffidence and a complacent respect. In Nature and Art both brothers are said to have the qualities of "honesty, sobriety, humility," but William is sometimes disturbed by the passions of a proud and disdainful mind. This disposition is given an opportunity to mature at the university he attends, and William returns a proud, haughty, and selfish man, the transformation being attributed to an artificial training. His advancement from priest to bishop increases rather than diminishes the pride of his countenance, sternness of his brow, and majesty of his walk. This pride estranges his brother from him, conquers all his inclinations towards charity and sympathy, and is the cause of his mental unhappiness. The character of Henry develops on totally different lines. He preserves his natural dispositions of humility and charity, is affectionate to his wife, benevolent to his brother, and patiently endures the insults he receives in repayment. This resignation and fortitude are rewarded as

he is rescued from his bondage on the Zocotora Island by his dutiful son. He returns to England to live simply but happily with his son and daughter-in-law.

Through the characters of the two brothers Inchbald shows how the education and environment of a person can determine his happiness. However, this is not the main way in which she illustrates her thesis in the novel, as she introduces two old acquaintances of the pedagogic novel - the child of nature and the child of art.

Inchbald castigates the shams of the fashionable world. The representatives of this society who people her novel are depicted in their true colours. The dean's wife, Lady Clementina, is moved by one passion only, and that is vanity:

> If she complained she was ill, it was with the certainty that her languor would be admired: if she boasted she was well, it was that the spectator might admire her glowing health: if she laughed it was because she thought it made her look pretty: if she cried, it was because she thought it made her look prettier still. If she scolded her servants, it was from vanity, to show her knowledge superior to theirs: and she was kind to them from the same motive, that her benevolence might excite their admiration. Forward, and impertinent in the company of her equals, from the vanity of supposing herself above them, she was bashful even to shamefacedness in the presence of her superiors, because her vanity told her she engrossed all their observations. Through vanity she had no memory; for she constantly forgot every thing she heard others say, from the minute attention which she paid to every thing she said herself.
>
> She had become an old maid from vanity, believing no offer she received worthy of her deserts; and when her power of farther conquest began to be doubted, she married from vanity, to repair the character of her fading charms. In a word, her vanity was of that magnitude, that she had no conjecture but that she was humble in her own opinion; and it would have been impossible to have convinced her that

> she thought well of herself, because she thought so well, as to be assured that her own thoughts undervalued her.[30]

Lady Clementina is a striking portrayal of the weakness and vanity of the fashionable world. No less striking and no less vain are Lord and Lady Bendham who are blatant hypocrites and effeminate parasites. In the eyes of the world they feign virtue and justice, but this is a very ineffective cloak over their sharp tongues and weak minds. All of these characters partake of the fruits of their empty existences: wearing a fashionable dress that only half covers her, Lady Clementina catches cold, wastes away, and dies; Lord Bendham's death is a result of intemperance, of "a mass of blood infected by high-seasoned dishes, mixed with copious draughts of wine";[31] Lady Bendham impairs her fortune and health by excessive gaming. Henry muses over the costly tomb of Lord Bendham: "'Are sculpture and poetry thus debased,' he cried, 'to perpetuate the memory of a man whose best advantage is to be forgotten; whose no one action merits record, but as an example to be shunned?'"[32] With thoughts very similar to these he regards the edifice of the dead William as a heap of rubbish piled together to fascinate weak understandings, and to make even the wise and religious man forget why he was sent into this world.

The younger William is born and bred in the pride of fashionable society. Possessing a handsome person, he gratifies his father's pride and his mother's vanity. It is unfortunate for him that he is trained to be a man before he is even a child.

His mind is not permitted to develop freely; William is taught what to think rather than trained how to think. The character he develops because of this inadequate training is carefully summarized by Inchbald in the novel:

> Young William passed his time, from morning till night, with persons who taught him to walk, to ride, to talk, to think like a man - a foolish man, instead of a wise child, as nature designed him to be.
>
> This unfortunate youth was never permitted to have one conception of his own - all were taught him - he was never once asked, 'what he thought'; but men were paid to tell him 'how to think.' He was taught to revere such and such persons, however unworthy of his reverence; to believe such and such things, however unworthy of his credit: and to act so and so, on such and such occasions, however unworthy of his feelings.
>
> Such were the lessons of the tutors assigned him by his father - those masters whom his mother gave him did him less mischief; for though they distorted his limbs and made his manners effeminate, they did not interfere beyond the body.
>
> Mr. Norwynne (the family name of his father, and though but a school-boy, he was called Mister) could talk on history, on politics, and on religion; surprisingly to all who never listened to a parrot or magpie - for he merely repeated what had been told to him without one reflection upon the sense or probability of his report. He had been praised for his memory; and to continue that praise, he was so anxious to retain every sentence he had heard, or he had read, that the poor creature had no time, for one native idea, but could only re-deliver his tutors lessons to his father, and his father's to his tutors. But, whatever he said or did, was the admiration of all who came to the house of the dean, and who knew he was an only child. Indeed, considering the labour that was taken to spoil him, he was rather a commendable youth; for, with the pedantic folly of his teachers, the blind affection of his father and mother, the obsequiousness of the servants, and flattery of the visitors, it was some credit to him that he was not an ideot, or a brute - though when he imitated the manners of a man, he had something of the latter in his appearance; for he would grin and bow to a lady, catch her fan in haste when it fell, and hand her to her coach, as thoroughly void of all the sentiment which gives grace to such tricks, as a monkey.[33]

William has no common share of the attractions which captivate weak or thoughtless minds. He is never known to defy the statutes of good-breeding; even though sincerity, his own free will, duty to his neighbours, and many other virtues and privileges are the sacrifice. His whole concern is with public opinion and material advancement; introduced into the courtly circles of Lord Bendham, his worldly soul is entranced by the glare and show, his thoughtless mind by the titles and retinues. Incessant material pursuits make him oblivious to the unnecessary suffering of which he has been the cause. A short time of ungratifying happiness is the fruit of William's labours, and he is left at the end of the novel to spend the remainder of his life in sorrow and remorse.

William not only causes his own unhappiness but also that of other people who have the misfortune to be associated with him. This explains Inchbald's interruption of the narrative to relate the tragedy of the unfortunate Agnes. Agnes Primrose, the daughter of humble parents, possesses delicate thoughts and a heart tender enough to experience true love. William unscrupulously takes advantage of her love and succeeds in undoing her. William's callous neglect of Agnes in favour of his own material success causes her deterioration from virtue to vice. Driven from service to service, Agnes finds employment in a house of ill-repute and is eventually forced to steal through necessity. She is caught by the law and condemned to death by William, the same William who was

the initial cause of her ruin. Through Agnes, Inchbald shows how innocence is perverted by the arts and flattery of a seducing man. If William's character had been moulded according to sounder principles than it was, his own unhappiness as well as Agnes's would have been prevented:

> Had William followed the common dictates of charity; had he adopted private pity, instead of public munificence; had he cast an eye at home, before he sought abroad for objects of compassion, Agnes had been preserved from an ignominious death, and he had been preserved from - Remorse - . . .[34]

But William does not follow the common dictates of charity because his training has not equipped him to be virtuous and altruistic. The difference between his character and that of his cousin is caused by the different educations they received. Far from being fettered by trifling and undeserving attitudes, Henry's mind is permitted to develop freely. He displays anxious curiosity and childish surprise at every new object which presents itself:

> '. . . he has always shown a quickness and a willingness to learn, and would, I dare say, if he had been brought up under your care, have been by this time a good scholar - but you know I am no scholar myself. Besides, not having any books here, I have only been able to teach my child by talking to him; and in all my conversations with him, I have never taken much pains to instruct him in the manners of my own country; thinking, that if ever he went over, he would learn them soon enough? and if he never did go over, that it would be as well he knew nothing about them.'[35]

The ironic fact about this is that if Henry had been educated under the tutorship of his uncle, his natural curiosity would

have been checked, and he would have become a mere parrot like his cousin William. In England Henry gives his own opinion, contradicts, and even acts in opposition to persons "whom long experience and the approbation of the world had placed in situations which claimed his implicit reverence and submission."[36] His mind has not even been prejudiced by a precocious knowledge of the principles of religion.[37] When the time arrives for his religious instruction, his impressionable mind is capable of receiving the doctrines without prejudice:

> The dean was eloquent, Henry was all attention; his understanding, expanded by time to the conception of a God - and not warped by custom, form the sensations which a just notion of that God inspires - dwelt with delight and wonder on the information given him! - lessons, which, instilled into the head of a senseless infant, too often produce, throughout his remaining life, an impious indifference to the truths revealed.[38]

Henry's mind has never been trained to attach needless importance to trifles: "I have instructed him too, to hold in contempt all frivolous vanity, and all those indulgences which he was never likely to obtain."[39] Henry does not estimate happiness by material surroundings; he believes it has a sounder basis:

> 'Some persons, I know, estimate happiness by fine houses, gardens, and parks; others, by pictures, horses, money, and various things wholly remote from their own species; but when I wish to ascertain the real felicity of any rational man, I always inquire <u>whom he has to love</u>. If I find he has nobody, or does not love those he has, even in the midst of all his profusion of finery and grandeur, I pronounce him a being in deep adversity. In loving you, I am happier than my cousin William; even though I am obliged to leave you for a time.'[40]

Worldly objects divert man's attention from his fellow-creatures. Therefore Henry is taught to love his neighbours in spite of their failings in character:

> '. . . I have taught him to love, and to do good to his neighbour, whoever that neighbour may be, and whatever may be his failings. Falsehood of every kind I included in this precept as forbidden, for no one can love his neighbour and deceive him.'[41]

The child of nature remains true to his father's teachings; his sympathetic heart softens to the misfortune of Agnes, and he helps her in her distress. He is unaware of his own virtues, as his whole faculties are absorbed in others. Dutiful and affectionate to his father, sympathetic to the distress of the unfortunate, indifferent to ornament, exempt from prejudice, possessing a free and intelligent mind, humble, virtuous, sincere in his affections, honest and truthful - Henry, the product of a natural education, enjoys happiness and peace of mind, and is an asset to any society in which he finds himself.

The philosophy of the novel is summarized in the last chapter. Here we see the elder Henry, his son, and daughter-in-law impassionately advocating justice and the equal distribution of resources:

> 'While I have health and strength,' cried the old man, and his son's looks acquiesced in all the father said, 'I will not take from any one in affluence what only belongs to the widow, the fatherless, and the infirm; for to such alone, by Christian laws - however custom may subvert them - the overplus of the rich is due.'[42]

They extol industry and honest labour: "Labour gives a value

to rest, which the idle can never taste".[43] Every day father and son labour for their living and enjoy the peace of mind industry promotes. They condemn the lassitude of the rich who bend to every inclination and thus draw calamity upon themselves. The state of poverty is superior to this idle state of intemperance:

> 'I once,' replied the younger Henry, 'considered poverty a curse; but after my thoughts became enlarged, and I had associated for years with the rich, and now mix with the poor, my opinion has undergone a total change - for I have seen, and have enjoyed, more real pleasure at work with my fellow-labourers, and in this cottage, than ever I beheld, or experienced, during my abode at my uncle's: during all my intercourse with the fashionable and the powerful of this world.'[48]

That children reverence the rich and despise the poor is the fault of education:

> 'But this is the fault of education, of early prejudice,' said the elder Henry. 'Our children observe us pay respect, even reverence, to the wealthy, while we slight or despise the poor. The impression thus made on their minds in youth is indelible during the more advanced periods of life; and they continue to pine after riches, and lament under poverty: nor is the seeming folly wholly destitute of reason; for human beings are not yet so deeply sunk in voluptuous gratification, or childish vanity, as to place delight in any attainment which has not for its end, the love or admiration of their fellow-beings.'
>
> 'Let the poor then,' cried the younger Henry, 'no more be their own persecutors - no longer pay homage to wealth - instantaneously the whole idolatrous worship will cease - the idol will be broken.'[49]

Thus Inchbald shows in Nature and Art how character is best formed. The product of fashionable society is shown to be led on by pride and vain pursuits of material success.

His natural virtues of honesty, truth to himself, and love of his fellow-man are subdued in his attempt to gratify his endless desires. The product of 'fashionable education' is subject to many temptations; his training has not provided sufficient strength to withstand these temptations; consequently, he falls an easy victim to the flattery and folly of the society in which he lives. His mind is gradually conditioned to accept and promulgate these fashionable vices. Art triumphs over Nature, the material man conquers the spiritual man. In contrast to this debaucher of morals, Inchbald presents the product of a 'natural education', a child who has been educated in the school of adversity. The struggle against misfortune and poverty enables this child to develop a strength of character he could never develop if he lived in a society which did not provide an opportunity to test and strengthen his character. Man's struggle for survival in adversity helps him to rely on his own resources. He learns the value of honest labour and feels the peace of mind it promotes. He is independent of other men for his living, therefore the passions of contempt and jealousy are given little opportunity to gain supremacy over his feelings and actions. The product of this education is exempt from all prejudices; he scorns none of his fellow-creatures, however wretched or despicable the creature may be. A bond of common benevolence links him to God and to the rest of his kind. His happiness is assured because it depends upon the purity of his mind, and not upon external circumstances.

In his soul the strength of Nature triumphs over the weakness of Art; his natural affections remain uncontaminated and serve as an unerring guide for his humanitarian actions.

The pedagogical novelists satisfied a definite need in the eighteenth century, in the latter years of which the optimism and complacency of the neo-classical age were rudely shaken. Artists examined the society in which they lived and found many things to criticize. Many believed that their society had reached a low point of degradation. They longed to rectify the prevalent social evils, hence they advocated a new foundation on which to base society. Many solutions to the existing problems were proposed, not the least significant being a more effective system of education. Rousseau breathed novelty into these ideas in his philosophical writings and especially in his educational treatise, Emile. The ideas expounded in this novel were taken, modified, and illustrated by many English novelists. But Rousseau's ideals received a fuller treatment in the novels of Brooke, Day, and Inchbald.

Henry Brooke advocates the education of the human heart. Brooke believes that in man a dichotomy exists of the principle of self and the principle of benevolent love. Fashionable society is of such a nature that it offers food to the devouring selfhood and thus leads man from the paths of virtue. Man's regeneration consists in a use of the power which God bestows.

God gives man the power to feel the distress of his fellow-creatures. This feeling softens the proud and angry self and calls forth benevolence, charity, and humanitarianism; thus making divine the feelings and offices of the human heart. Thus the most effective way to redeem society is through a thorough education of the human heart, and it is here that Henry Brooke places his emphasis.

The contrast between the natural and artificial becomes more sharply defined in the novels of Day and Inchbald. Day believes that constant exercise and proper discipline are necessary to form the minds of young children. 'Fashionable education' stultifies the natural development of the mind and encourages the child to attach needless importance to trifles. On the other hand, a 'natural education' trains a child to be a useful and virtuous member of society. These ideas were further illustrated in the novels of Elizabeth Inchbald.

The pedagogical novelists denounced the advance of the material man over the moral and spiritual man. They visualized a world where men would be bound to each other by a bond of common affection, a world where man would trust man, and nation would trust nation. The system of education they proposed was to prepare man to live in such a world. They, as novelists, are long since dead and forgotten by most of us, but the solution they offered is still alive. Men today desire to develop the virtues of a Cincinnatus, to despise the world's shibboleths of rank and fashion, and to grow in the power to

live simply, work honestly, and think nobly. But very few are sufficiently strong to undertake the sacrifice which this entails. They do not have the strength of Thomas Day to live a life of virtue. And now, looking back almost two hundred years, we must question the merit of the 'natural education' proposed at this time. Was it after all but a quack panacea, impotent to heal the chronic and deep-seated diseases of mankind; or have we failed, have we indeed held the elixir vitae in our hands, and then, like wilful children, thrown it away?

NOTES ON CHAPTER 4

1. Joughin, The Life and Work of Elizabeth Inchbald, 309. Quoted in McKee, Elizabeth Inchbald, Novelist (Washington, 1935), 141.

2. Gregory, The French Revolution and the English Novel (New York, 1915), 198-9.

3. Proper, Social Elements in English Prose Fiction, 165.

4. McKee, Elizabeth Inchbald, Novelist, 147.

5. Cross, Development of the English Novel (New York, 1924), 87.

6. Holliday, English Fiction (New York, 1912), 271-2.

7. Wright, Sensibility in English Prose Fiction, 138.

8. Birkhead, "Sentiment and Sensibility in the Eighteenth-Century Novel", English Association - Essays and Studies, XI, 108. Quoted in McKee, 142.

9. Raleigh, The English Novel (London, 1929), 248.

10. Saintsbury, "The Growth of the Later Novel", Cambridge History of English Literature, XI (Cambridge, 1932), 292.

11. Baker, Guide to the Best Fiction (New York, 1932), 258.

12. Heidler, History of English Criticism of Prose Fiction, 94.

13. Paul, William Godwin, I, 73. Quoted in McKee, 133.

14. Littlewood, Elizabeth Inchbald and her Circle (London, 1921), 87.

15. Boaden, Memoirs of Mrs. Inchbald, I, 272. Cited in McKee, 45.

16. Inchbald, A Simple Story, ed. Mrs. Barbauld, Vol. XXVIII: The British Novelists (London, 1820), 353.

17. Ibid., 75-6.

18. Inchbald could very well have been influenced in this respect by a play she translated. She calls the play The Child of Nature in her version. The child of nature is reared in total

seclusion by the Marquis Amanza in his castle in Spain. In order to keep her mind completely uncontaminated from the world, the Marquis does not allow her any books except his own, "Hear me, Amanthes," he says to her at the end of his labours, "I have heitherto secluded you from the tumult and dissipation of the world, in order to form your heart and mind; and to give you leisure to attain every useful science, and every accomplished talent - you have surpassed my utmost expectations - and I would now enjoy the pride of what I have completed - I must show you to the world - we were born for society, and you will be the ornament and delight of that which you shall make your choice." (Brulart de Sillery, The Child of Nature, trans. E. Inchbald (London, 1788), 13. Quoted in Whitney, Primitivism and the Idea of Progress, 131.) Amanza has brought up his ward in isolation in order to give her the virtues of the primitive child of nature. Witness the Epilogue:

> The Child of Nature was, in days of yore,
> What, must I fear, we shall behold no more,
> The simple dress, the bloom that art wou'd shame,
> The frank avowal, and the gen'rous flame;
> The native note, which sweetly warbling wild,
> Told the soft sorrows to the charming child -
> Turn to a modern Miss, whose feather'd brow
> Speaks the light surface of the soil below
> . . . . . .
> Thus the feelings of the youthful day,
> By fashion's raging tempest whirl'd away: -
> May I, but with no wish to under-rate her,
> Entreat you to prefer our Child of Nature.
> (Quoted in Whitney, 131.)

19. Inchbald, A Simple Story, 50-1.

20. Ibid., 3.

21. Ibid., 18.

22. Ibid., 13-4.

23. Ibid., 133-4.

24. Ibid., 110.

25. Ibid., 143.

26. Ibid., 183-4.

27. Ibid., 230. It is significant that Henry Brooke uses the phrase 'the school of adversity' in the Fool of Quality. He also praises the efficacy of this type of education: ". . .

should this scorner prove so happy as to be educated in the never-failing school of christian meekness; even the school of adversity, of pain, sickness, depressing poverty and mortification; his lofty crest by degrees will be effectually unplumed; his sufficiency and high mindedness will sink to a humble prayer and look out for relief; and he will respect even the wretched, because he will acquire a social sense and fellow-feeling of their wretchedness." (Fool of Quality, II, 115.)

28. Inchbald, A Simple Story, 242.

29. Ibid., 351.

30. Inchbald, Nature and Art, ed. Mrs. Barbauld, Vol: XXVII: The British Novelists (London, 1820), 227-8.

31. Ibid., 371.

32. Ibid., 368.

33. Ibid., 232-3.

34. Ibid., 352.

35. Ibid., 236.

36. Ibid., 260.

37. Inchbald follows Rousseau implicitly in this respect. Rousseau says in Emile: "We hold that no child who dies before the age of reason will be deprived of everlasting happiness; the Catholics believe the same of all children who have been baptised, even though they have never heard of God. There are, therefore, circumstances in which one can be saved without belief in God, and these circumstances occur in the case of children or madmen when the human mind is incapable of the operations necessary to perceive the Godhead. The only difference I see between you and me is that you profess that children of seven years old are able to do this and I do not think them ready for it at fifteen." (Emile, 221.)

38. Inchbald, Nature and Art, 257. Elsewhere Henry speaks for Inchbald when he says: "This is the true education on which to found the principles of religion. The favour conferred by Heaven in granting the freedom of petitions to its throne, can never be conceived with proper force, but by those whose most tedious moments during their infancy were not passed in prayer. Unthinking governors of childhood! to insult the Deity with a form of worship, in which the mind has no share; nay worse, has repugnance: and by the thoughtless habits of youth, prevent, even in age, devotion.'" (Nature and Art, 259.)

39. Inchbald, Nature and Art, 236-7.

40. Ibid., 327.

41. Ibid., 236.

42. Ibid., 372.

43. Ibid., 373.

44. Idem. The inferiority of wealth to poverty is also depicted in A Simple Story: "Do you suppose that wealth can be esteemed, which has not been able to make you respectable? What is it makes wealth valuable? Is it the pleasure of living in a fine house, or of wearing fine clothes? These are pleasures a lord enjoys but in common with his valet. It is the pleasure of being conspicuous which makes riches desirable; but if we are conspicuous only for our vice and folly, had we not better remain in poverty?" (A Simple Story, 315.)

45. Inchbald, A Simple Story, 375.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Pedagogical Novels Discussed.

Brooke, Henry. The Fool of Quality; or, The History of Henry Earl of Moreland. 5 vols. London: W. Johnston, 1766-70.

Day, Thomas. The History of Sandford and Merton. London: John Kendrick, [1853] .

Inchbald, Elizabeth. Nature and Art. Ed. Mrs. Barbauld. Vol. XXVII: The British Novelists. London: F. C. and J. Rivington, et al., 1820.

Inchbald, Elizabeth. A Simple Story. Ed. Mrs. Barbauld. Vol. XXVIII: The British Novelists. London: F. C. and J. Rivington, et al., 1820.

2. Additional Primary Material.

Bage, Robert. Man As He Is Not; or, Hermsprong. Ed. Mrs. Barbauld. Vol. XLVIII: The British Novelists. London: F. C. and J. Rivington, et al., 1820.

Brooke, Frances. The History of Lady Julia Mandeville. Ed. Mrs. Barbauld. Vol. XXVII: The British Novelists. London: F. C. and J. Rivington, et al., 1820.

Burney, Frances. Cecilia; or, Memoirs of an Heiress. Ed. Mrs. Barbauld. Vols. XL, XLI, XLII: The British Novelists. London: F. C. and J. Rivington, et al., 1820.

Burney, Frances. Evelina; or The History of a Young Lady's Introduction to the World. Ed. Mrs. Barbauld. Vols. XXXVIII, XXXIX: The British Novelists. London: F. C. and J. Rivington, et al., 1820.

Edgeworth, Richard L., and Edgeworth, Maria. Memoirs of Richard Lovell Edgeworth. 2 vols. London: R. Hunter, et al., 1820.

Goldsmith, Oliver. The Vicar of Wakefield. London: Macmillan, 1927.

Gray, Thomas. Letters of Thomas Gray. Ed. John Beresford. London: Oxford University Press, 1925.

Hazlitt, William. The Spirit of the Age. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1925.

Hopkins, Annette B., and Hughes, Helen S., Edd. The English Novel before the Nineteenth Century. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1915.

Keir, James. An Account of the Life and Writings of Thomas Day. London: John Stockdale, 1791.

Locke, John. The Educational Writings of John Locke, Ed. John W. Adamson. Cambridge: University Press, 1922.

Mackenzie, Henry. Julia de Roubigne. Ed. Mrs. Barbauld. Vol. XXIX: The British Novelists. London: F. C. and J. Rivington, et al., 1820.

Mackenzie, Henry. The Man of Feeling. Ed. Mrs. Barbauld. Vol. XXIX: The British Novelists. F. C. and J. Rivington, et al., 1820.

Moore, Dr. John. Zeluco. Ed. Mrs. Barbauld. Vols. XXXIV, XXXV: The British Novelists. London: F. C. and J. Rivington, et al., 1820

Pope, Alexander. The Dunciad. Ed. James Sutherland. London: Methuen and Company, 1953.

Rousseau, Jean J. Discours sur l' Origine et les Fondements de l' Inegalite parmi les Hommes. Intro. F. C. Green. Cambridge: University Press, 1941.

Rousseau, Jean J. Emile. Trans. Barbara Foxley. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1950.

Rousseau, Jean J. The Social Contract and Discourses. Trans. G. D. H. Cole. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1952.

Shaftesbury, The Earl of. Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times. 3 vols. Birmingham: John Baskerville, 1773.

Smith, Charlotte. The Old Manor House. Ed. Mrs. Barbauld. Vols. XXXVIII, XXXIX: The British Novelists. London: F. C. and J. Rivington, et al., 1820.

3. Secondary Sources.
Well known reference books are not included.

Allen, Walter. The English Novel. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, 1958.

Baker, Ernest A. Guide to the Best Fiction. New York: Macmillan, 1932.

Baker, Ernest A. The History of the English Novel. 10 vols. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1950.

Beers, Henry A. A History of English Romanticism in the Eighteenth Century. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1926.

"Bi-centenary of Virtue", Times Literary Supplement, June 19, 1948, 344.

Brailsford, H. N. Shelley, Godwin, and their Circle. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1913.

Cross, Wilbur L. The Development of the English Novel. New York: Macmillan, 1924.

Cubberly, Ellwood P. The History of Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1948.

Darton, F. J. H. Children's Books in England. Cambridge: University Press, 1958.

Duggan, Stephen P. A Student's Textbook in the History of Education. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1916.

"Elizabeth Inchbald", The Living Age, CXCIX (December 16, 1893), 643-60.

Fairchild, Hoxie N. The Noble Savage: A Study in Romantic Naturalism. New York: Columbia University Press, 1928.

Foster, James R. "The Abbe Prevost and the English Novel", PMLA, XLII (1927), 443-64.

Gignilliat, George W. The Author of 'Sandford and Merton': A Life of Thomas Day, Esq. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932.

Gillet, Eric. "The Fool of Quality", The London Mercury, XXX (September, 1934), 420-8.

Graves, Frank N. A Student's History of Education. New York: Macmillan, 1937.

Green, F. C. Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Cambridge: University Press, 1955.

Gregory, Allene. The French Revolution and the English Novel. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1915.

Heidler, Joseph B. The History, From 1700 to 1800, of English Criticism of Prose Fiction. Urbana (U.S.A.): University of Illinois, 1928.

Holliday, Carl. English Fiction. New York: Macmillan, 1932.

Horne, Charles F. The Technique of the Novel. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1908.

Littlewood, S. R. Elizabeth Inchbald and her Circle: The Life Story of a Charming Woman (1753-1821). London: Daniel O'Connor, 1921.

Lockwood, M. "Thomas Day", The Nineteenth Century, XLII (July, 1897), 74-86.

Lovett, Robert M., and Hughes, Helen S. The History of the Novel in England. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1932.

McKee, William. Elizabeth Inchbald, Novelist. Washington: The Catholic University of America, 1935.

Pollard, A. F. The History of England: A Study in Political Evolution. London: Williams & Norgate, 1918.

Powell, Dilys. "Search for a Perfect Wife", The Living Age, CCCLIII (December, 1937), 356-9.

Pritchett, V. S. The Living Novel. London: Chatto & Windus, 1946.

Proper, Coenraad. Social Elements in English Prose Fiction between 1700 and 1832. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1929.

Raleigh, Sir Walter. The English Novel. London: John Murray, 1929.

Sadler, Sir Michael. Thomas Day, An English Disciple of Rousseau. London; Cambridge University Press, 1928.

Saintsbury, George. "The Growth of the Later Novel", The Cambridge History of English Literature, XI. Cambridge: University Press, 1932.

Scott, Sir S. H. The Exemplary Mr. Day, (1749-1789), Author of Sandford and Merton. London: Faber and Faber, 1935.

Scurr, Helen M. Henry Brooke. A Thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Minnesota, 1922.

Stevenson, Lionel. "Brooke's Universal Beauty and Modern Thought", PMLA, XLIII (1928), 198-209.

Tompkins, J. M. S. The Popular Novel in England (1770-1800). London: Constable & Company, 1932.

Toynbee, Arnold. Lectures on the Industrial Revolution of the Eighteenth Century in England. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1920.

Wagenknecht, Edward. Cavalcade of the English Novel from Elizabeth to George VI. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1944.

Warner, James R. "'Emile' in Eighteenth-Century England", PMLA, LIX (1944), 773-91.

Whitney, Lois. Primitivism and the Idea of Progress in English Popular Literature of the Eighteenth Century. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1934.

Wright, Walter F. Sensibility in English Prose Fiction (1760-1814), A Reinterpretation. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1937.