1923

Roman education under the early Empire

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Thesis

ROMAN EDUCATION UNDER THE EARLY EMPIRE

Submitted by

EFFIE SHERWOOD GOOZEE

(A.B.Pasadena Univ., 1913)

In partial fulfilment of requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

1923

ROMAN EDUCATION
UNDER THE EARLY EMPIRE

OUTLINE

I TRAINING AT HOME

1. Under the Early Republic.
2. Under the Early Empire.
3. The content and method of instruction.
4. The educational value of imitation.

II ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS (Ludi Literarum)

1. Their origin and importance.
2. The teacher. (Ludi magister)
3. Supervision of instruction.
4. Studies.
    (1) reading.
    (2) writing.
    (3) counting.
5. Methods.
6. Discipline.

III SECONDARY SCHOOLS (Grammar Schools)

1. Their position.
2. Entrance requirements.
3. The teacher. (Grammaticus)
4. The curriculum.
    (1) grammar.
    (2) orthography.
    (3) literature.
        (a) what to read.
        (b) how to read.
    (4) writing.
    (5) geometry and astronomy.
    (6) music.
    (7) oratory.
    (8) gymnastics.
5. Criticisms of the curriculum.

IV THE SCHOOLS OF RHETORIC

1. Defined.
2. Their relation to Secondary Schools.
3. Their recognition.
4. The qualifications of the teacher. (Rhetor.)

IV THE SCHOOLS OF RHETORIC - continued

5. Discipline.
6. Aim.
7. Curriculum.
   (1) literature.
   (2) composition.
   (3) theory of rhetoric.
   (4) declamation.
   (5) other subjects.

V CONCLUSION

PREFACE

The following thesis on ROMAN EDUCATION UNDER THE EARLY EMPIRE is based chiefly on the INSTITUTIC ORATORIA of M. Fabius Quintilianus. Quintilian was educated in Rome and was also a successful teacher there from about 60 A.D.-- 80 A.D., consequently he was well acquainted with the system of education as it existed in the early days of the Empire.

His "Institutic Oratoria" is a treatise on Roman Education. Monroe says it is the most elaborate and complete treatise ever written. In this book Quintilian discusses the education of an orator from his infancy to mature manhood. His conclusion are the result of personal experience and classroom observation, and also of careful study and investigation.

In many respects his views of education and his methods of instruction are ideal rather than actual, and yet they argue that there must have been some schools where the educational and moral standards were high, as well as that there were some that were below the standard.

In the succeeding pages many of the pedagogical ideas of Quintilian have been quoted at length because of the information they give of the problems of those days, and because of the similarity of those to the educational problems of today.

ROMAN EDUCATION UNDER THE EARLY EMPIRE

1 TRAINING AT HOME

Longum est iter per praecepta, breve et efficax per exempla. Seneca, Ep. Vl. 5.

In the early years of the Republic almost the entire education of the Roman boy and girl was under the supervision of their parents. This education was largely moral. Laurie[1] says, "The sense of duty to moral law, to parental authority, and to the state was ever present to the boy." Religious hymns, national songs, and the Twelve Tables furnished material for a limited literary training. When the boy became old enough he accompanied his father to the forum and to the camp, and soon took an active part in public affairs. The girls continued their domestic training under the supervision of their mothers.

A considerable change both in method and content was noticeable in the education of Roman youth in the later years of the Republic, which carried over into the first years of the Empire. Rome had been greatly influenced by the Greek spirit, and nowhere was this influence more effective than upon Roman education. While the fathers and mothers in some homes continued to assume the responsibility of the education of their sons and daughters, there was a general tendency to leave the training of the children to a nurse, or pedagogue, or private tutor, as was the custom of the Greeks. There was also a general tendency to a more literary training than formerly.

[1] Pre-Christian Education, p. 341

This was due to the stimulus of Greek learning and also to the fact that a national literature was being developed in Rome.

Children generally received some instruction in reading and writing at home before they were old enough to attend the elementary schools, the age varying according to the attention given to their education, and to the inclination of the children to learn. Quintilian encouraged early, purposeful training for children. "For," he says, "though the knowledge absorbed in these years may be but little, yet the boy will be learning something more advanced during that year, in which he would otherwise have been occupied with something more elementary. Such progress each successive year increases the total, and the time gained during childhood is clear profit to the period of youth ..... Let us not waste therefore the earliest years."

He continued by saying, "I am not however so unacquainted with differences of age, as to think that we should urge those of tender years severely, or exact a full complement of work from them; for it will be necessary, above all things, to take care lest the child should conceive a dislike to the application which he cannot yet love, and continue to dread the bitterness which he has once tasted, even beyond the years of infancy. Let his instruction be an amusement to him; let him be questioned and praised; and let him never feel pleased that he does not know a thing; and sometimes, if he is unwilling to learn let another be taught before him, of whom he may be envious. Let him strive for victory now and then, and generally suppose that he gains it; and let his powers be called forth by rewards, such as that age prizes."

Instit. Orat., 1.1. 18-20

The Romans, as did the Greeks, recognized and used imitation as an educational method. For the Greek, a proper environment furnished the objective, but for the Roman the ideal was a concrete character. Monroe[1] says, "The Roman youth was to become pious, grave, reverential, courageous, manly, prudent, by the direct imitation of his father and of old Romans of so heroic a character as to be embodied in their legends and histories, yet withal men who had actually walked the streets and had gathered in the Forum before him." This is why so much importance was given to a proper choice of associates from their earliest childhood. Quintilian says if you are going to educate a boy to be an orator, the time to start this training is in his infancy. Place about him only educated people, those who speak correctly and who are well mannered. His parents, nurse, pedagogue, and companions must all be worthy examples for him to imitate; for he will imitate them whether they are worthy or not, and will imitate more quickly and remember longer the bad habits, either of speech or of conduct of any of his associates, than he will the good.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

We are by nature most tenacious of childish impressions; just as the flavor first absorbed by vessels when new persists, and the color imparted by dyes to the primitive whiteness of wool is indelible. Quintilian, 1. 1. 5.

The elementary schools were known as ludi litterarum or ludi litterarii. At first they merely supplemented the training of the home and were not considered essential, but gradually

[1]Hist. of Education, p. 189

as they developed, and were more patronized, they came to take almost the entire charge of the early education of Roman children. Though as Monroe[1] says, "This phase of educating being non-Grecian, never received any general attention, nor such teachers - often mere slaves - any public esteem."

The teacher was called the ludi magister. He opened his school in a private house or booth or porch, and for a small tuition gave instruction to both boys and girls of the families who were inclined to place their children under his care. These teachers were not always properly qualified for their positions and too often were engaged in teaching as a last resort to secure means for a livelihood, although the remuneration was very small. The true Roman father took particular care in seeing that the teacher to whom he sent his children was the best teacher available, not only from a literary but also from a moral standpoint, for he felt that the teacher had a great influence upon the children.

Children generally entered the elementary schools at the age of six or seven and continued until they were twelve, although the age varied with the child and with the teacher. The training included the rudiments of reading and writing and counting. If the child had had no previous home training he began by learning the letters of the alphabet. It was quite likely that he learned the Greek alphabet first, and then the Latin. There were different methods of giving this instruction. Quintilian[2] gives the following as his idea of the best method of learning the alphabet. "I am not satisfied with the course (which I note is usually adopted) of teaching small

[1] Hist. of Education, p. 198 [2] Instit. Orat., 1.1. 25

children the names and order of the letters before their shapes. Such a practice makes them slow to recognize the letters, since they do not pay attention to their actual shape, preferring to be guided by what they have already learned by rote. It is for this reason that teachers, when they think they have sufficiently familiarized their young pupils with the letters written in their usual order, reverse that order or rearrange it in every kind of combination, until they learn to know the letters from their appearance and not from the order in which they are heard. It will be best therefore for children to begin by learning their appearance and names just as they do with men." He suggested giving them the letters cut out of ivory, which they could handle, if this would make the instruction more attractive to the children.

After they had thoroughly learned the letters of the alphabet they began to learn the different syllables. These were studied carefully and in detail. Next they learned the combination of syllables to form words and then the combination of words to form phrases. To insure proper pronunciation the pupils were given difficult words and combination of sounds to practice repeatedly until they could say them with ease and certainty. They were taught to spell by syllables.

The child was not hurried in learning to read. Care was taken that he read slowly and accurately, with proper emphasis and understanding. One of the main text books of the elementary schools was Latina Odyssia of Livius Andronicus. The greater part of the instruction was oral. The teacher read aloud to the pupils as well as the pupils to the teacher, and together they discussed the content of the poem and analysed its form

and meter.

Much emphasis was placed upon the value of training the memory of the child. Teachers gave the children selections from their reading to memorize, and they were particular to select those passages which contained precepts, and examples of moral conduct, for they felt that the child's character was permanently influenced by these early impressions.

At the same time the child was learning to write. Since in those days there were no printing presses all students were encouraged to write for themselves, so that later they need not hire slaves or copyists to take dictations for them. In these schools the childred learned only the first principles of writing. Seneca[1] gives the following account of how they were taught to write. "Children are taught to form their letters, their fingers are held and their hands directed and led to teach them to fashion and counterfeit letters; then they are commanded to follow such and such examples, and by them to remodel their writings. So is our mind strengthened if it be instructed by setting up some example after which it may pattern." Quintilian tells of practically the same method only he is a little more definite in stating that the counterfeit letters were made by tracing the forms carved in wooden or waxed tablets, and that the examples which they later learned to copy were aphorisms and maxims which contained some sound moral lesson.

The process of learning to count and make mathematical calculations was a tedious task because of the cumbersome system of notation. Children were taught to count on their fingers, and instructed to make calculations with the use of an abacus,

[1]Ep. 94. 51

or counting board which was provided with pebbles. Horace suggested that the relative importance the Greeks and Romans placed upon teaching children how to solve mathematical problems might be a reason for the comparative literary genius of the two people.

The methods of instruction varied. Teachers had all classes of children to work with, and had to resort to many methods to retain the interest of the students, and to secure interest from others who were less attentive. Quintilian[1] says that when he went to school his teacher introduced class competitions which he thought did more to increase their interest in their work and to incite them to study than all the 'exhortations of their instructors, the watchfulness of their pedagogues, and the prayers of their parents.' Some teachers used games which were of an educational value, and in these supervised games the children were taught habits of unselfishness, honesty, and self-control. They were occasionally given a holiday to relieve the continual routine of school work.

The discipline of these schools was severe. That corporal punishment was a common method of correction may be concluded from the mural decorations which have been recovered, and from extracts from the various writters of Roman literature. Martial[2] called the 'ferula' - a rod used for punishing - the scepter of the pedagogues. Horace[3] says that his teacher Orbilius was fond of flogging him. Martial[4] in one of his epigrams says that the neighbors complained because they were disturbed by savage scoldings of the abominable school masters, and by the cries of the students who were being punished. Quintilian[5]

[1] Instit. Orat., 1.1. 23. 25 [2] X. 62. 10

[3] Ep. 11. 1. 70 [4] Epigram 68 [5] Instit.Orat.,1. 111. 13, 14

objected to this method of discipline and insisted it was only fit for slaves, and was an insult to students; that it was a reflection upon the teacher as a disciplinarian to resort to such methods of correction, and that it did not bring permanent and desirable results. Plutarch[1] advanced the same ideas as Quintilian. He said, "We ought to lead children to good actions by reason and exhortations and assuredly not by blows and torture."

There was among some an aversion to sending children to these public schools. The chief objections were that they were dangerous to the morals, and that one teacher could not give the proper time to each student. Quintilian believed that both of these objections were groundless. He found that the morals could be and often were more corrupted at home by lenient parents and uncouth slaves. He also insisted that since only a small part of the time was required to give direction to the work of the day, and a greater part of the time was given to study, the teacher would easily have time to give the necessary individual attention to every pupil. Then too, there was much instruction which could be given to a whole class as effectively as to one pupil. "The voice of a lecturer is not like a dinner which only suffices for a limited number; it is like the sun which distributes the same quantity of light and heat to all."[2]

Quintilian saw that there were also direct advantages which could be gained from attending public schools. The stimulus which came from association with other children had a decided educational value. Each child had the benefit of the

[1] De Lib. Educ. XII [2] Quintilian, Instit.Orat.,1. 11. 14

instruction given to the other children, and by seeing others praised or corrected he was being taught indirectly what to emulate and what to avoid. There was also in such schools an opportunity for the social instinct to be developed to a greater degree than was possible under private instruction, and since the future orator would have to live in publicity, and be employed in the duties of public life, it was to his advantage to become accustomed from his childhood to move in society without fear. Quintilian also mentioned the fact that many delightful friendships were formed in those early years which lasted unbroken to old age, which, he said, acquired the binding force of a sacred duty;' for initiation in the same studies has all the sanctity of initiation in the same mysteries of religion.'

111 S E C O N D A R Y S C H O O L S

The study of literature is a necessity for boys and the delight of old age, the sweet companion of our privacy and the sole branch of study which has more solid substance than display. Quintilian 1. IV. 5.

The secondary schools were called Grammar Schools and were under the supervision of the Grammatici. There were two Grammar Schools, the Greek and the Latin; the former gave the same instruction as Latin Grammar School, but in the Greek language. Generally students entered the Greek Grammar School first, remaining in them until they had gained a fairly comprehensive knowledge of Greek literature. In the meantime they entered the Latin Grammar School and continued their work in both schools.

' Instit. Orat., 1. 11. 20

Under the Empire there was a change in the attitude of the Romans toward the Latin Grammar Schools which at this time had increased to such an extent that hardly a province town was without a grammar school. They were recognized by the State as necessary institutions of learning though they were not under the oversight of the government and there was no compulsion to their establishment nor attendance. This was a marked contrast to the position these schools first held. Suetonius gives the following account in the 'Lives of Eminent Grammarians'. "The science of grammar was in ancient times far from being in vogue in Rome; indeed it was of little use in a rude state of society, when people were engaged in constant war and had not much time to bestow upon the cultivation of the liberal arts."

Students entered the grammar schools at about the age of twelve and stayed in them until they were ready for the school of the rhetor. The instruction generally covered a period of four years. About the only requirement for entrance in the school of the Grammaticus was the ability to read and write without difficulty.

Parents were very exacting in the demands they made upon the grammatici. Juvenal[1] could not let this pass without his comment. While some allowance must be made for the exaggeration of the satirist, yet no doubt the condition was much as he pictured it. He says, "You parents impose severe exactions of him that is to teach your boys, that he be perfect in the rules of grammer for each word - read all histories - know all authors as well as his own finger-ends, that if questioned at hazard,

[1] Sat. VII

while on his way to the Thermae or the baths of Phoebus he should be able to tell the name of Anchises' nurse, and the name and native land of the step-mother of Anchemolus - tell off hand how many years Acestes lived - how many flagons of wine the Sicilian King gave to the Phrygians. Require of him that he mould their youthful morals as one models a face in wax. Require of him that he be the reverend father of the company, and check every approach to immorality.

"It is not a light task to keep watch over so many boyish hands, so many twinkling eyes. 'This,' says the father, 'be the object of your care! - and when the year comes round again, receive for your pay as much gold as the people demand for the victorious charioteer! '" (Meaning the charioteer would receive for an hour's work as much as a teacher for a year's.)

As the name of these schools implies, grammar was the major subject of the curriculum. To the Romans grammar meant more than the term means today. It included some study of formal grammar, but in its broader sense it meant a study of literature. Quintilian included under the study of grammar the art of speaking well and the interpretation of poets. But a proper understanding of literature required some information of other subjects, and accordingly quite a varied list of subjects was taught in these schools, with literature as the medium of instruction.

The first lessons of formal grammar began with learning the different parts of speech. Grammarians differed in regard to the number of them, some holding that there were only three, and others that there were more. Eight was the number generally agreed upon: the noun, pronoun, verb, adverb, participle,

preposition, conjunction and interjection. Next, attention was given to learning the declension of the nouns and the conjugation of the verbs, since a ready knowledge of these was necessary to enable the student to read and interpret literature.

Philology was also considered a part of grammar. This was an interesting study because of the great number of foreign words in the Latin language. Sometimes in determining the origin of words the results were rather far-fetched and doubtful, for every one depended upon his own resources, since there were no standard authorities to consult.

Orthography began with the study of the alphabet. The alphabet was divided into consonants and vowels, and the vowels into semivowels and mutes. The Greek and Latin alphabets were compared, the proper pronunciation of vowels was discussed, and the characteristic change of vowels when joined with prepositions, and also the change which took place in a change of tense. Next was the study of syllables. These were studied to determine their quantity and sound. Not all long syllables were marked, but only those where the same word had a different meaning according as a syllable was long or short, and terminal vowels to show distinction in case.

Quintilian[1] was in favor of words being spelled as far as possible according to the phonetic value of the syllable. "For," he says, "the use of letters is to preserve the sound of words and to deliver them to readers as a sacred trust; consequently they ought to represent the pronunciation we are to use."

Reading held the most prominent place in the curriculum. Great care was taken to place before the child only that reading which was considered the best. Quintilian says that

[1] Instit. Orat., 1. Vll. 31

children must not read only that which is eloquent, but it is more important that they study what is morally excellent, because their minds are deeply impressed by what they read in their childhood.

It was customary to begin with the poets Homer and Vergil. Although the children were not able adequately to appreciate the merits of these, still they could gain much from studying them, and early develop a taste for what was best in literature. They also read from Ennius, from Accius and Pacuvius, from Plautus and Terence, and from Horace. The old Latin poets were read not so much for their style, which in comparison with later writers was often cumbersome, but for the vigor and strength which was in their writings, which was noticeably lacking in some of the more recent literature, and which made them valuable models for students to be familiar with.

The students were given thorough instruction in the art of reading well, and much time was given in school to oral reading. The problems were much the same as they are today. Children were instructed to observe punctuation marks, to avoid reading poetry in a sing-song tone, to read ahead and grasp the meaning of the verse that they might read with proper emphasis, and with a fitting inflection of the voice. They were taught to avoid any affectations or mannerisms, and to read in a simple, natural way. A class discussion followed the reading. Each selection was explained and analysed as to grammar, meter, diction, arrangement, treatment, and allusions. The Romans had that type of mind which delighted in analyses and technical investigations, but they were inclined to become too much

engrossed in details. Quintilian disapproved of spending too much time on unnecessary inquiry into unimportant questions, since there were many of the minor details which could never be satisfactorily settled, and he said he would consider it a merit rather for the grammaticus to confess that there were some things he did not know.

A systematic study in writing compositions was begun in these schools. Much emphasis was placed upon the necessity of using good language. The children were taught to confine themselves to simple and current expressions. Barbarisms and solecisms were not allowed. One fault that had to be constantly guarded against was the tendency to use foreign words, especially Greek. Students were urged rather to use Latin words whenever possible and thus develop a familiarity with their own language. Archaic words were permissible if they were not too frequent. "Usage," Quintilian says[1], "is the surest pilot, and we should treat language as currency minted with the public stamp. ..... I will define usage as the agreed practice of educated men, just as where our standard of morals is concerned I should define it as the agreed practice of all good men."

For the first lessons in composition the students were given Aesop's Fables to pharaphrase. They gave the stories in a simple, natural way, orally at first, and then wrote them in the same style. As the boys improved in originality of thought and in interpretation, they were allowed more freedom in expressing their ideas and were permitted to write more elaborately. They chose moral sayings and aphorisms from their reading, and used them as bases for themes. Sometimes they wrote character

[1] Instit. Orat. l. Vl. 3, 45

delineations, or chose short stories from the poets. They depended upon their teachers to give them the general outline for their compositions and the methods for developing them.

The rudiments of geometry and music were also studied by the pupils of the grammar schools, though instruction in these subjects was given by special teachers. Geometry as it was taught by the Romans was given more of a practical than a scientific application. Cicero[1] says, "Among the Greeks geometry was in the highest honor, but we have set the limits of this science at its practical applicability in measuring and calculating." Quintilian thought that the study of geometry was very valuable in education because of its logical nature, he thought that it sharpened the wits and trained the mind to close thinking, and promoted habits of orderly arrangement and logical deduction.

Music among the Romans was never developed as an art for its own sake. In the schools music was taught merely that the students might gain a knowledge of the principles of rhythm and melody that they might make practical use of these principles, first in understanding the meter of poetry, and secondly in knowing how to read poetry with the proper inflection and how to control their gestures when speaking. Some teachers thought that the music of the old days furnished better material for teaching than did the modern music. For they felt that modern music lacked the solidity of the earliar compositions, and that the modern themes and the performers were less sincere and less worthy of imitation than those of the older type.

Students were given some training in oratory before they left the schools of the grammatici. Certain selections from

[1] Tusc. Disput. 1. 2. 5

their reading were memorized and then recited before the class. The pupils were given careful instruction as to proper gestures, facial expressions, and control of the voice. They chose the comic actor as their model, but were not allowed to indulge in any of the mannerisms or crude expressions of the actor which they were likely to see on the stage at that time. Special attention was given to correct pronunciation in order to keep the boy from falling into any bad habits of speech, such as lisping or cutting off the words at the end.

The Romans never felt the same as the Greeks did in regard to physical training, either as to its aim or its importance. While some training was given in the schools, its aim was purely practical; to give grace to personal bearing, to develop the body and to relieve awkwardness. Training never extended beyond boyhood. For one to devote himself to a professional life of a gymnast was considered beneath the dignity of a Roman.

There were some who thought it was not best for the children to study so many and such varied subjects at the same time. For they thought it tired and confused their minds, and they were not physically or mentally able to carry such a heavy program; nor did they think it was possible for them to do any of their work well when they had to divide their time among so many subjects.

Quintilian[1] approved of the existing curricula of the grammar schools and gave the following reasons for his positions. First, because of the great capacity of the human mind. Naturally the mind is swift, nimble, and versatile, and cannot be restricted to doing one thing, but insists on devoting its

[1] Instit. Orat., 1. XII

attention to several different things at one time. For example, the harpist simultaneously exerts the memory, gives attention to the tone and inflection of his voice, plays different strains of music with each hand and pats his foot on the floor to beat time. The man of public affairs divides his day into periods for different activities, he visits the courts, waits on his friends, gives some time to his family, some to recreation and some to pleasure. The farmer does not devote a certain time of the year to cultivating only vines, and then when the grapes have been gathered, begin to cultivate olives, and after they have been harvested cultivate his orchards. Instead he cares for all his fruit at the same time as the seasons may require.

A second reason for believing that it was profitable to divide the hours among different branches of study was because the mind is refreshed and restored by variety. A change of studies is like a change of food. No man wants to eat one kind of food every day for several months and then change that food for one other item of diet and follow that program indefinitely. Rather he finds that the stomach receives greater nourishment from a variety of foods. A variety of studies incites attention and interest, and thus by a change of subjects the mind is better nourished.

Again, boys at this age are capable of enduring fatigue and of standing strain. Their minds are not set and are more easily impressed. The children are not conscious of much effort being exerted on their part if they are properly taught, for at this period of their lives they depend upon the instruction of their teachers and do not carry much responsibility for their own progress.

Another observation Quintilian had made was that there would never be a period in the lives of the students when they would have more time to devote to the study of these various subjects. When they grew older and were in the higher schools they would be occupied in more original and individual work, and would have less time for these subjects which could be taken in the grammar schools. Nor did he think they were too difficult for the mental capacity of students at this age. He thought that some teachers were advancing this objection merely as a cloak for their own indolence, because they did not love their work but were teaching for mercenary ends.

IV THE SCHOOLS OF RHETORIC

Duae sunt artes quae possunt locare homines in amplissimo gradu dignitatis: una imperatoris, altera oratoris boni. Ab hoc enim pacis ornamenta retinentur: ab illo belli pericula repulluntur. Cicero, Pro Murena, 14.

The Latin Rhetorical Schools, modeled after the Greek Rhetorical Schools, were institutions representing the culmination of a practical literary education. These schools were more influenced by the Greek spirit of culture than were the other schools; in fact, their organization and the content of their curriculum proved that Greece had here 'led captive her rude conqueror'. But although the Romans took over the educational system of Greece, they nevertheless stamped it with their own individuality, and developed the system into a more definite and practical organization than the Greeks had done up to this time or ever could do.

Training in the school of the Rhetor generally began at the age of fifteen or sixteen when the boy had put off his

toga praetexta and had assumed his toga virilis. Only those young men who expected to devote their lives to a public career attended these schools, and the length of their training depended upon the ability and interest of the student, and upon the rhetor under whom they studied.

There was not a well defined demarkation between the school of rhetoric and the grammar school, and often one school infringed upon the instruction of the other. This happened because some grammatici were not satisfied to confine themselves wholly to the teaching of literature, but who wished to include also a superficial training in oratory in their schools that they might publicly display the talent of their pupils. It happened also because some rhetoricians had the idea that the rhetorical schools were merely to put on the finishing touches, and they neglected to include in their schools the preliminary training which belonged to them, but which they preferred to leave to the teachers of the grammar schools. Quintilian[1] presented as a solution for this difficulty that each teacher keep in his own province, and that the student in the lower schools take work under the rhetorician as soon as he was qualified, but continue at the same time in the grammar school until he had completed the requirements there. This would not increase the work of the student but merely divide that work among two masters which had been indiscriminately combined under one, and thus increase the efficiency of both teachers.

Although the rhetorical schools had not always been popular in Rome by the first century A.D. they had received state recognition, and in the case of the rhetor Quintilian, financial support had been given from the government. Quintilian was

[1] Instit. Orat. 11. 1. 12, 13

also awarded a consulship by the Emperor Domitian for his great success as a teacher, and for his influence on his time. While the position of the rhetorician was always more respected by the Romans than that of the lower teachers, yet Quintilian's standing was exceptional rather than usual.

More emphasis was placed upon the moral character and intellectual ability of the teachers of rhetoric, than upon that of any of the other teachers, especially because of the age of the young men whom they had under their care, and because of the importance of the profession for which they were fitting these young men. The first essential was that the rhetor should be a man of good character, with a good reputation, one who would be interested in the moral training of his pupils, and who would be a worthy example for them to imitate. Next he must "be as distinguished for his eloquence as for his good character, and like Phoenix in the Iliad, be able to teach his pupils both how to behave and how to speak." [1]

Discipline, at this period of a young man's life presented a problem. Quintilian[2] has given what he thought was the best way to handle the students, and to secure from them the desired intellectual and moral development. For the teacher; let him adopt a parental attitude to his pupils, and regard himself as the representative of those who have committed their children to his charge. Let him be strict but not austere, genial but not too familiar. Let his discourse continually turn on what is good and honorable; the more he admonishes the less he will have to punish. He must control his temper without however shutting his eyes to faults requiring correction; his

[1] Quintilian, Instit. Orat., 11. 111. 12

[2] Instit. Orat., 11. 11. 5-9

instruction must be free from affectation, his industry great, his demands on his class continuous, but not extravagant. He must be ready to answer questions and to put them unasked to those who sit silent. Praise must be free from sarcasm and abuse. If pupils are rightly instructed, the teacher will be the object of their affection and respect, and it is scarcely possible to say how much more readily we imitate those whom we like.

For the pupils;[1] they should love their masters not less than their studies, and should regard them as parents not indeed of their bodies but of their minds, come cheerfully and gladly to school, not be angry when corrected, rejoice when praised, and seek to win their masters' affection by the devotion with which they pursue their studies. For as it is the duty of the master to teach so it is the duty of the pupil to show himself teachable. The two obligations are mutually indispensable. Just as the seed is scattered in vain, if the ground is hard and there is no furrow to receive it and bring it to growth, even so eloquence can never come to maturity, unless teacher and taught are in perfect sympathy.

The aim of the rhetorical school was to furnish the state with a perfect orator. Monroe[2] says, "The orator included the teacher, the publicist, the religious teacher, as well as man devoted to legal, judicial or legislative activities. The orator was the educated man participating in public affairs."

Cato the Censor defined the orator as "the good man skilled in speaking." Quintilian accepted this definition but also added that not only must he be a good man, but no man unless he is good can be an orator. According to the Roman idea a

[1] Instit. Orat. 11. 1X. 1-3 [2] Source Book, p. 425

'bonus vir' was he who proved himself a good statesman, not by private discussions, but by taking an active part in public life. This definition excluded the philosopher from being a 'good man' and gave the orator a superior position, for oratory was a broader as well as a higher aim than philosophy.

In the schools of the rhetoricians the students continued the work they had begun in the grammar schools. The study of literature was still emphasized, but as a means to an end. The objective of these schools was proficiency in the art of oratory, or of rhetoric which was the term the Romans used for oratory.

The instruction included theoretical and practical training. "The theoretic study consisted in a careful analysis and memorizing of models of poetry and prose expression and of the modes of conveying, illustrating and enforcing ideas, passing thus into the study of formal rhetoric. The practical side of this study, which was vigorously pushed, consisted in declamations, in an admirably graduated series of exercises in composition, and in a course of lessons in extemporaneous speech judiciously graded to growing powers."[1] Their training also included regular visits to the forum and temples where they heard the daily speeches of judges and orators, and thus kept in touch with the problems of the day.

Much reading was done in these schools both from Greek and Latin authors, not only from the works of the poets but also from the writings of historians, orators, and philosophers. Quintilian submitted the following reading list as the one most suitable in his estimation for those to follow who were ambitious to become orators, including in his list only those which

[1] Williams, Ancient Educ., p. 219

he thought would be the most necessary and the most profitable to read.

G R E E K A U T H O R S [1]

POETRY

1. Epic	Homer	5. Old Comedy	Aristophanes
	Hesiod		Eupolis
	Antimachus		Cratinus
	Panyasis		
	Apollonius	6. Tragedy	Aeschylus
	Aratus		Sophocles
	Theocritus		Euripides
2. Elegiac	Callimachus	7. New Comedy	Menander
	Philetos		
3. Iambic	Archilochus	8. Comic Poet	Philemon of Soli
4. Lyric	Pindar		
	Stesichorus		
	Alcaeus		
	Simonides of Ceos		

ORATORY

Demosthenes
Aeschines
Hyperides
Lysias
Isocrates
Demetrius

PHILOSOPHY

Plato
Xenophon
Socrates
Aristotle
Theophrastus

HISTORY

Thucydides
Herodotus
Theopompus of Chios
Philistus
E phorus of Cumae
Clitarchus of Megara
Timagenes

[1] Instit. Orat., X. 1

ROMAN AUTHORS[1]

POETRY

1. Epic	Vergil
	Macer
	Lucretius
	Varro of Atax
	Ennius
	Ovid
	Cornelius Severus
	Serranus
	Saleius Bassus
	Rabinus
	Pedo
	Lucan
2. Elegiac	Tibullus
	Propertius
	Ovid
	Gallus
3. Satire	Horace
	Lucilius
	Persius
	Terentius Varro
4. Iambic	Catullus
	Bibaculus
	Horace
5. Lyric	Horace
	Caesius Bassus
6. Tragedy	Accius
	Pacuvius
	Varius Rufus
	Ovid
	Pomponius Secundus
7. Comedy	Plautus
	Caecilius
	Terence
	Afranius

ORATORY

Cicero
Asinius Pollio
Messala
Gaius Caesar
M. Rufus Caelius
G. Licinius (Calvus)
Sulpicius Rufus
Cassius Severus
Domitius Afer
Julius Africanus
Trachalus
Vibius Crispus
Julius Secundus

PHILOSOPHY

Cicero
Brutus
Cornelius Celsus
Plautus
Catius
Seneca

HISTORY

Sallust
Titus Livius
Servilius Nonianus
Aufidius Bassus
Cremutius Cordus

[1] Instit. Orat., X. 1

The same method of studying literature as was used in the grammar school was followed in the rhetorical schools. Students read with a critical attitude; they noted the merits and faults of the writers, discussed the outlines of the orations, and commented upon the appropriateness of the style, and upon the fittness of the metaphors and allusions. In addition to the information which this course afforded, there were at least three other results which the teachers hoped the students to gain from their reading: a knowledge of the best literature, a permanent habit of reading, and the ability to decide for themselves what was the best literature and why.

Writing was also continued in the rhetorical schools, but the students were allowed more freedom in expressing their own opinions. Originality in writing was encouraged to a greater extent. Quintilian[1] says, "The young should be daring and inventive and should rejoice in their inventions, even though correctness and severity are still to be acquired. Exuberance is easily remedied, but barronness is incurable, be your efforts what they may. ..... The years as they pass will skim off much of the froth, reason will file away many excrescences, and something too will be removed by what I may perhaps call the wear and tear of life." Students were expected to write with care. Correctness was the first requisite, and themes were often handed back to be rewritten if they did not meet the standard required by the teachers. If the student did not improve in rewriting a composition on some specified theme he was given another subject to write upon which might appeal to him more, and in this way he was kept from becoming discouraged.

Their first themes were chosen from history. They wrote

[1]Instit. Orat., 11. 1V. 6

about the deeds of famous men, about the founding of the city, and about the Roman exploits in war. There was a gradual and continual progress from these themes to those requiring a more technical knowledge, and a more mature judgment, such as questions of law and questions involving moral principles. Sometimes the students memorized their own compositions and delivered them before the class, after which the themes were criticized by the members of the class who were always ready to express their opinions upon the attempts of their fellow class-mates. This was not generally considered the best course to pursue, but rather it was thought that the students could spend their time to better advantage if they selected portions from the speeches of eminent orators whose style they especially liked, and memorized these selections.

This wide and liberal course of reading, and the careful, continued practice in writing was pursued, as has been stated before, with a special objective in view: that the young men might ultimately perfect themselves in the art of oratory. Accordingly, besides the study of literature and composition which were indirectly related to oratory, some time was given to a definite study of the theory of rhetoric. Quintilian, in his Institutio Oratoria, has given a comprehensive survey of the science of rhetoric; its origin, its development and the material which it includes. He defines it as the art of speaking well. There were some who objected to a theoretical study of rhetoric on the ground that the ability to speak well was a natural talent and not an accomplishment which could be achieved by study; that formal training would subtract from the effectiveness of oratory. Quintilian[1] met their objections by saying, "It must be confessed that learning does take something from

[1] Instit. Orat., 11. X11. 8

oratory, just as the file takes something from rough surfaces or the whet stone from blunt edges or age from wine; it takes away defects." He realized that nature was able to accomplish much without the aid of education while education was valueless without the aid of nature. "But," he said, "if they are blended in equal proportions, I think we shall find that the average orator owes most to nature, while the perfect orator owes more to education. ..... Nature is the raw material for education, without material art can do nothing. Material without art does possess a certain value, while perfection of art is better than the best material."[1]

Rhetoric was divided into its five component parts: invention, arrangement, style or expression, memory, and delivery. Each of these divisions received careful and thorough treatment. The different kinds of oratory, demonstrative, deliberative and forensic were studied, and the method for developing each but special attention was given to the forensic type, for this was the kind they used the most when they entered the courts as pleaders.

Special training was given in declaiming in the class room. Oratory did not have the dignity and sincerity at this time which it had when the art was first being developed. It had become artificial and unnatural, and there was a tendency in the schools to cater to the demands of the people who wanted to be entertained, and who cared little for the subject which was being discussed, provided only it was delivered with enthusiasm. Some thought declaiming meant to be able to attract attention because of the loudness of their voice, the vehemence

[1] Instit. Orat., ll. XlX. 2, 3

of their gestures, and the extravagance of their language. This standard was objectionable to Quintilian and he felt the place to correct it was in the schools, where the students should be taught that true eloquence was only found where truth was spoken with sincerity. When it came to choosing themes for class-room declamation Quintilian recommended that the subjects be as true to life as possible, and thus make the training preparatory for the actual work of the courts.

Some time was given to the study of philosophy. Quintilian did not believe it was necessary for the students to support the doctrines of any particular school, but thought that they should be informed about the philosophy of all the schools. Stress was placed upon the importance of having a thorough knowledge of Roman law, both civil and moral. If Romans were to be successful pleaders it was necessary for them to know what the laws were, and how previous cases had been settled by their ancestors, for the custom of their elders (mos majorum) was the standard by which subsequent procedure was governed. Some attention also was given to the study of science, though science at that time was limited. It included higher mathematics and astronomy, and what was then known of medicine.

V C O N C L U S I O N

After the work had been completed in the rhetorical schools, it was customary for those who wished to continue their education to enter the Greek Universities. These Universities developed from the Greek rhetorical and philosophic schools, and represented the highest learning and culture of that time. The University of Athens and of Rhodes were the most popular. Rhodes

was especially famous as a center for instruction in oratory, and many eminent Roman men studied oratory there. Later in the Empire the University of Rome developed, modeled after the Greek, which offered advanced courses in professional lines. Here as in the other schools, the instruction was becoming formal and artificial. This tendency which Quintilian and others had tried to prevent became more marked in the later days of the Empire, and resulted in a decline in education. There were many forces at work which were effecting a general change in the Empire, and it is hard to say how far the schools were responsible for this change, and how much they themselves were affected by it.

S U M M A R Y

The system of education which developed in Rome and in Roman territory was that which had been taken over from the Greeks. The Greeks contributed the content and the Romans furnished the organizing genius, and through this organization spread Graeco-Roman civilization throughout the Roman Empire.

The following table shows the three distinct types of schools which finally developed and formed the Roman educational system.

School of Rhetoric	I6-I8+	Rhetor	Rhetoric Literature composition declamation philosophy law science	Professional School
Grammar School	I2-I6	Grammaticus	Grammar orthography Literature writing geometry music oratory gymnastics	Secondary School
Ludus Litterarum	7-I2	Ludi Magister	reading writing counting	Elementary School

The home training was largely taken from the care of the parents and given to a nurse or private tutor or pedagogue, or often trusted entirely to the supervision of the public teacher. After completing the work of the rhetorical schools, if the students wished to study further they were sent to the Greek Universities.

Education in Rome was at no time compulsory; and though it has been called a public system of education, it was not public in the sense that every one of school age was found in the schools. The schools were attended chiefly by the children of the wealthy, and of those who had high social standing, while the great majority of Roman children grew up with little or no systematic training. The education of the slave class was utterly neglected. Nor was there any central organization of the schools, consequently there was no real uniformity of character. But since the schools were frequent they were influenced by each other, and the educational principles of one school were adopted by other schools and in this way certain standards developed which approached uniformity.

The teacher's position in Rome was not one to be envied, especially that of the elementary teacher. This was partly the fault of the teacher, for too often he was not properly qualified for his work, and taught only as a last resort to secure a living. The teachers of the more advanced schools were a better class of teachers and were more respected; they also received a larger income, though the salaries of all the teachers were small and uncertain, since they were met by private tuition

and by gifts from the students.

The aim of Roman education was to prepare men for political service. This partly explains why no systematic education for girls developed. Both boys and girls attended the elementary schools though the larger percent was boys. Girls might have attended the grammar schools but it is not likely that many did. No girls attended the schools of rhetoric. The education of the girls was carried on under the supervision of their mothers and of private teachers. It included training in domestic duties, and also some literary and musical training. There was some agitation at this time for the necessity of providing an education for girls comparable to that which was provided for the young men.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

CLARKE, GEORGE. THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN AT ROME
(Entire)

Macmillan and Company

New York; 1896

CUBBERLEY, ELLWOOD P. THE HISTORY OF EDUCATION
Chapters I - III inclusive

Houghton Mifflin Co.

Boston; 1920

FRIEDLANDER, LUDWIG ROMAN LIFE AND MANNERS UNDER THE EARLY EMPIRE
(Sittengeschichte Roms)
Authorized Translation of the Seventh Enlarged and Revised Edition by
Leonard A. Magnus. LL. b.
Selections on Education

E.P.Dutton & Company

New York; 1888

LAURIE, S.S. PRE-CHRISTIAN EDUCATION
pp319-436

Longmans, Green & Co.

New York; 1895

MONROE, PAUL. A TEXT-BOOK in the HISTORY of EDUCATION
Chapters III - IV

Macmillan & Company

New York; 1920

MONROE, PAUL. SOURCE BOOK of the HISTORY OF EDUCATION
Greek and Roman Period
pp. 327 - 509

Macmillan & Company

New York; 1901

QUINTILIAN. INSTITUTIC ORATORIO
English Translation by H.H.Butler
Books I - XII inclusive

G.P.Putnams Sons

New York; 1920, 1922.

WILLIAMS, SAMUEL G. HISTORY of ANCIENT EDUCATION
Chapters XIV - XVIII inclusive

C.W.Bardeen, Pub.

Syracuse, N.Y. 1903