

connection is the difficult problem of "culture-geography;" which, for working out all the most different influences of life and nature into a transparent and ingenious whole, requires the highest degree of mental power, and has its place, if anywhere, only at the end of geographical instruction. Several movements of the human race must be discussed previously, and a satisfactory understanding of them is probably in all cases very doubtful with scholars who are not sufficiently prepared for it.

IX. HISTORY. BY ABBENRODE.

1. *What are the material conditions requisite to make history an important means of mental cultivation?*

The material ought to be selected with reference to the intellectual standing and wants of the pupil, to be formed into a well-systematized whole, and to be so used in teaching that, by its vividness and truth, as well as by its attractiveness for the juvenile mind, it may arouse and strengthen, improve morally, prepare the pupil worthily for practical life, and nourish in him a Christian spirit. Of course, the character of the nation to which the pupil belongs, is prominently to be considered.

2. *What personal conditions influence the cultivating power of the study of history?*

As the totality of the pupil's individuality requires, in historical construction, great regard, and as very much depends on the tact with which his mental powers are nourished, so the effect of history on his mind depends even more on the ability and character of the teacher. Unless he possesses, together with the requisite external skill, a sufficient knowledge of history, true piety, and a noble heart; and unless, besides being a man of veracity, he has acquired conscientious impartiality and the circumspect calmness of a clear judgment, he can not hope that his pupils will experience the cultivating power of history.

3. *What are the leading characteristics of the proper material?*

The most essential of these materials are, a, the political, under certain modifications, particularly that of the native country; b, history of civilization, under some limitations, particularly that of the Christian church. Though the material chosen under either of these heads may be throughout kept asunder, and, in fact, has been so very often in historical works, yet an appropriate combination of the two for construction must be recommended, since they supplement one another usefully, and, in practice, admit quite well of this mutual compensation. Our German youth need, above all, the history of Germany, and where there is occasion, the attention should be fixed on the ecclesiastical, scientific, and artistical development, as well as on the formation of the character and manners of the nations. Which of the two sides, and in what proportion, is to predominate, depends on the particular wants of the pupils: still the history of the church is of especial value.

4. *What are the principles of teaching history in school?*

Historical instruction requires in all cases a narrative form. In proportion to age and ability, the narrative will have the character either of biography and monography, or will represent, in chronological order, definite groups of historical facts in their interior connection; without any exaltation of the authors of the events very high above the common level of life. In either case the teacher may choose an ethnographical, or a synchronistical order. The pragmatist method, rich and important in itself, has in most cases at school, an unsatisfactory result, even in higher schools; since even the well-prepared students of the gymnasia, (colleges,) want the maturity of life which must aid the pragmatist understanding. Finally, the method of universal history is quite unsuitable to schools.

5. *How have those principles been practically used and expressed hitherto?*

History has been, from the most ancient times, written and taught in all forms. It has been a monumental narrative of the exploits of whole nations and privileged individuals. Each ancient people has, out of a certain necessity, written and taught its own history, — some classically, — for all time. Besides, modern nations have taken hold of the history of other countries, particularly of old Greece and Rome, and reflected them in the mirror of their own perception; they have created the representation of a history of the world, — general history. This has led to teaching general history, either connected with that of the church or separate from it. The almost exclusively "scientific" method of treating the same in writing and teaching made it suitable only for such as wanted a "scientific," (collegiate, etc.,) education. Others neither could nor should learn it. But, since a common inclination to acquire historical knowledge has sprung up, in consequence of a more general education in better schools, it suffices no longer to confine this instruction to the disciples of science, nor to satisfy with general

notices from history. The people, even in the lowest classes, will — and should — partake of it. This has led to manifold and successful attempts to find a suitable way of treating history, and to give the common school a share in its profits.

Several popular and practical methods of teaching history have arisen, which, though differing in many respects, agree very much in their fundamental ideas. These methods may be distinguished first, as being chiefly restricted, the one to *biographical* and *monographical* narrations, the other to the *natural* and *temporal* connection of historical events. In the former case the chief persons and events to be spoken of are at first arranged by beginning from modern times and proceeding in a *retrograde* order to certain primary epochs, in order to review the whole afterward, from these points, more thoroughly, by descending in the natural order of time. Or, the most important phases of the development of national and political life are made the centres of an arrangement, by groups, which treats the facts and persons that are the types of that development, through all time, in definite periods, and only occasional side-looks are cast on contemporaneous events.

In the other case, either the historical material is arranged in chronological order, and divided, according to its nature in the different ages, amongst single nations, (ethnographically,) from their rise till their fall; or, all nations are treated side by side at the same time in periods, (synchronously,) in order, on arriving at each new epoch, to gain a general view of the development of the whole human race.

In both cases it is either the history of the native country or the general history of civilization, or that of the Christian church, by which the point of view is regulated, and on which the chief stress is laid.

6. *What are the advantages of the biographical method?*

As long as it is of consequence to arouse the historical sense of beginners, and while these are not so far advanced as to understand the general state of a nation, since their interest for individuals preponderates, so long it is quite natural and profitable to join all history substantially with the biography of the representative chief men, at the same time with which the outlines of the chief events may be surveyed. Even at a later stage, the biographical element has a high value, since it may give, along with narratives of individual experience, especial relations of the general development of events, such as facilitate their understanding and enlarge knowledge at the same time. Even the hidden motives of facts are not laid open to the historian, until he has looked sharply into the particular life of the leading and cooperating individuals, who either receive or help to give the character of their time. We may add the general human interest excited by personal experiences of life, and the moral influence exerted on susceptible minds. Dry generalities and outlines can of course never excite such a lively interest as good biographical narrations.

7. *What are the objections to the exclusive use of the biographical method?*

A mere succession of separate biographies will never show the real course of the general development of history; they are, even the best, mere fragments and portions, but not history itself in its inner moral connection. Moreover, the description of the outward life of historical persons, as sufficient for beginners, is indeed generally not difficult; yet it is so, in a high degree, to enter into their inner life and character, whence all their actions originate. It presupposes so much knowledge of the human mind, so much self-denial and impartiality, requires such an expanded and detailed knowledge of the material for understanding motives, that it is as rare to find good biographies, as it is rare to find those conditions combined in one man. The usual biographies swarm with generalities and partial judgments.

8. *What is the value of the regressive method?*

Strictly speaking, the regressive method is the preferable one for historical research. Facing the events, it inquires into their immediate causes, and goes back to the remoter ones, in order to reconstruct philosophically the history which has been developed according to a higher and divine plan. So far as the method of research is to be represented by the method of teaching, — as it sometimes has been required, — the regressive proceeding is correct; besides, it is formally practicable without difficulty. But it is contrary to the process of historical narration, and begins almost necessarily from characters and epochs of modern times, by far too complicated for beginners, and such as to prevent usually the combination of truth with popularity. Besides, this method could be applied only at the beginning, and would soon necessarily pass over into the chronological one.

9. *How far is the chronological method valuable?*

The historical events develop themselves in time; the natural