The American Revolution did not, as we might now think it should have done, usher in an educational revival. The war left the country too much exhausted, and there were too many other things to think of. Colleges at once began to multiply, but the new institutions failed to maintain the earlier college standard. No new ideas, inspirations, or enthusiasms marked the period.

In respect to public schools, Massachusetts continued on her downward course. The recognition of the school districts in 1789 left the powers of taxation and control still in the hands of the town: the districts served for supply only. If a district wanted a new schoolhouse built or an old one re-

more in the way of writing than rudely scrawl their names, could never read with reai ease or rapidity, and could keep accounts only of the simplest kind. As for arithmetical problems, the knowledge of them was limited to the elementary multiplication, division, addition, and subtraction. None the less, after a fashion and to a limited extent, the Braintree school child, like the school children of all other Massachusetts towns, could read, could write, and could cipher; and for those days, as the world then went, that was much."—Three Episodes in Massachusetts History. Boston, 1892, p. 781.

1 The Marquis de Chastellux, a member of the French Academy and a major-general in the French army under Count de Rochambeau, travelled extensively in the United States in 1780-1782. He states that he found Americans suffering not a little from the reflection which occurred frequently, that their language was the language of their oppressors. This feeling "they carried so far," the Marquis says, "as seriously to propose introducing a new language; and some persons were desirous, for the convenience of the public, that the Hebrew should be substituted for the English. The proposal was that it should be taught in the schools, and made use of in all public acts."—Travels in North America, etc. Translated from the French by an English gentleman who lived in America at that period. London, 1787, Vol. II., pp. 265, 266.