

# Harriet Finlay-Johnson and Henry Caldwell Cook\*

Manami YODA

## Abstract

The present study aims to examine the theory and practice of Harriet Finlay-Johnson's dramatic teaching and to compare her method with that of Henry Caldwell Cook. Finlay-Johnson and Cook have been regarded as two great pioneers of theatrical education in England appearing in the early 20th century. However, Finlay-Johnson's attitude toward theatrical teaching was fundamentally different from that of Cook's. Cook not only used acting as a means for language education but also saw it as an end. On the other hand, Finlay-Johnson had persistently used theatre as a tool for teaching all subjects. It is true that their difference in attitude came partly from their different educational orientations, but their fundamental distinction is also reflected in their view of theatre. While Cook embraced the traditional view of theatre, Finlay-Johnson clung to the realism view of theatre. Her view of theatre had much to do with her consideration of acting as a means to improving knowledge and eliciting self-expression. Her educational orientation and this realism view of theatre led Finlay-Johnson to use theatre as a tool for education.

## Two Pioneers of Dramatic Teaching and the Progressive Movement in Education

The purpose of the present paper is to examine the theory and practice of Harriet Finlay-Johnson's dramatic teaching with her book *The Dramatic Method of Teaching* published in 1912 as a clue and compare her method with that of Henry Caldwell Cook to clarify their essential difference.

Finlay-Johnson is considered as the first teacher who implicated drama activities in school education in England just before World War I. Thus Finlay-Johnson is recognized as a pioneer of drama education but she was not a solitary pioneer. Just after her, there was another pioneer, Henry Caldwell Cook who introduced theatre to English education for the first time in England. Finlay-Johnson and Cook shared the same educational thoughts in teaching in dramatic method, in children's autonomy, and concerning the partnership in education between pupils and teachers. As an example, in the introduction of her book, Finlay-Johnson, after insisting that the principle of game practice should be extended from kindergarten to junior school, emphasizes the necessity of children's autonomy in referring to the difference in conditions :

Why not continue the principle of the kindergarten game in the school for older pupils? I did so, but with this difference : instead of letting the teacher originate or conduct the play, I demanded that . . . the play must be the child's own. (7)

In the same way, Cook discusses the importance of autonomous learning (Beacock 12) in the second chapter of his book *The Play Way* published in 1917 describing his general method and by heading the following chapter "Self-government." He actually confesses his interest in those experimental schools that respected students' autonomy :

In those little communities which are entirely run on self-government lines, such as the Junior Republics in the United States and The Little Commonwealth down in Dorset, the driving-power which makes the citizens conduct their affairs seriously is real social necessity ; for what is not done by the citizens for themselves in the way of rule is not done at all. (58)

The “Junior Republics” was the George Junior Republic, a community for boys with troubled backgrounds founded by American philanthropist William Reuben George in 1909. “The Little Commonwealth” was a school founded in 1913 by an American who had been invited to go to England, Homer Lane, and the school eventually influenced Alexander Sutherland Neill’s Summerhill School, an independent boarding school founded in 1921 and run as a democratic community with the belief that the school should be made to fit the needs of a child. Cook emphasizes not merely the self-government of students as a group but also the individual students’ government of himself and his responsibility for his own learning.

Strictly speaking, Finlay-Johnson’s and Cook’s conceptions of students’ autonomy are not necessarily identical. We can easily note that under the superficial similarities there is a delicate difference concerning students’ self-government between the views of Cook and Finlay-Johnson. For Finlay-Johnson, as her use of the word “game” suggests, students’ self-government is only temporary in nature, whereas for Cook it has its own continuous independent identity (Bolton, *Acting* 32-33). Cook’s fundamental notion about school education is that “a school must be a little world in itself” (349). That is, he believes that school should function as a microcosm of society: in fact, as Gavin Bolton indicates, “any classroom dramatization had to submit to rules of procedure, election of officials, a system of rewards and punishments, and the right of free-speech” (Acting 32). Cook thinks about children’s autonomy in this context. After recognizing the difference concerning students’ autonomy between the two pioneers, now we should note that students’ autonomy, a common educational ideal which both Cook and Finlay-Johnson share, reflects the contemporary educational climate dominated by the new educational movement, the so-called the

Progressive Movement in Education.

The Progressive Movement in Education originated at the end of the 19th century with the main idea of child-centered learning (Abbs 38-39). Many psychologists and educators, including Jean Piaget, Lev Vygotsky, Carl Rogers, Maria Montessori and John Dewey contributed to the advent and development of the Progressive Movement in Education. Actually, the Progressive Movement itself is said to have started in Cecil Reddie's establishment of Abbotsholme School in Derbyshire in England. The movement rapidly spread worldwide. It was Ellen Key's book *The Century of the Child* published in 1909 that substantially popularized progressive education. The title of her book symbolically suggests that educational focus should be on children as the learners, and she actually stresses the importance of education in the natural and autonomous development of children, especially in the context of the home. At the beginning of the chapter of "Education," she quotes and actually shares Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's insistence that every child has a good nature at birth and clearly expresses her thoughts on education: "... allowing nature quietly and slowly to help itself, taking care only that the surrounding conditions help the work of nature. This is education" (Key 107).

We can trace the source of Key's views on education back to Jean-Jacques Rousseau's in the 18th century which is the same source she affirmatively refers to. Rousseau also believes in the natural goodness of children, whom he sees as innocent and vulnerable, quite different from adults.

In *Émile*, arguing about the proper education of children, he definitely denies the Christian concept of sinfulness of the human: "Let us lay it down as an incontrovertible rule that the first impulses of nature are always

right; there is no original sin in the human heart. . .” (Rousseau 56). Natural growth, according to Rousseau, motivates children’s learning and, as a necessary consequence, the teacher has to only accelerate their learning opportunities. We can also trace the origin of educational thoughts such as Key’s further back to Michel de Montaigne in the 16th century. Although Key does not refer to anything about Montaigne in the chapter on education, she actually names Montaigne along with Rousseau as noteworthy thinkers on education in the following chapter “The School of Future.” In his book *Essais*, Montaigne, like Rousseau, urges the necessity of natural education, putting emphasis upon developing children’s judgment and good sense rather than cramming knowledge into their heads. In addition to this insistence, Montaigne describes the place of education in daily lives and insists on the necessity of prohibiting corporal punishment in education (Montaigne 163-199). The fact that Key shares the same educational views tells us Montaigne’s far-reaching influence on her. We have to remember, too, that Finlay-Johnson and Cook were engaged in teaching in child-centered educational atmospheres similar to the Progressive Movement as was popularized by Key.

### **Finlay-Johnson’s Dramatic Method**

Finlay-Johnson and Cook shared a common element in their teaching environment: they taught pretty much the same aged group, children in the junior forms (aged 11-14) and children aged 8-13, respectively (Bolton, *Acting* 3). However, there was a great difference between Finlay-Johnson and Cook as to their academic positions. Unlike Cook who was teaching at an elite boys-only public school in Cambridge, Finlay-Johnson taught as a master-teacher at Sompting School, a primary school in East Sussex. It

was Finlay-Johnson's responsibility to teach all subjects and she was able to use her dramatic method of teaching across the whole curriculum. As an English teacher Cook, on the other hand, could give undivided attention to using his theatrical way, as an art and a language art, solely for language teaching (Courtney 42). Very naturally Cook's attitude toward dramatic teaching was fundamentally different from Finlay-Johnson's. Cook saw playing as "the one means that is an end in itself" (8). We can say that although they share the same qualification as pioneers for classroom drama in England, it is Finlay-Johnson, not Cook, that serves as a frontrunner for the leaders of Drama-in-Education (DIE) which, appearing in the late 1960s, aims at the development of children as a whole person by using drama mainly as a teaching medium.

The fact that Finlay-Johnson persistently used drama as an educational tool can be clarified further by examining how she picked out the dramatic method and placed it in the setting of her daily teaching. What she adopted first as the basis for every study was "nature study"(4). We should note that the reason why she chose "nature study" is that it has aesthetic aspects. In fact, Finlay-Johnson, after indicating that nature was the source of artistic inspiration, pays attention to the natural relationship of nature study with literature and the arts: "And since nature is the storehouse from which poet and artist draw their inspiration, it naturally follows that we found it but a short step from the study of the open book of nature into the Elysian fields of literature and the arts" (4).

Finlay-Johnson tried to put dramatization along the same position as nature study, a subject which she considered first as the centre of all learning. Dramatization came to completely supersede nature study as she reached to the latter part of her thirteen-year teaching career. Taking into

account this close relationship of dramatization with literature and other arts, we can understand that this was quite a natural development. In any case, Finlay-Johnson describes how every lesson was combined with nature study as its basis: "Nature study then became the basis of every possible lesson; and the school nature gardens and nature rambles supplied subject matter for lessons in singing, reading, writing, arithmetic, drawing, painting, recitation, composition, grammar, and much of the geography." In spite of the tremendous capacity of nature study, there was only one subject it could not cover; that was history. This was the very reason why Finlay-Johnson adopted dramatization and made it supply history's deficiency: "It was because the lessons in history could not be so well connected with nature study, and therefore lacked the living interest which the other subjects now acquire from nature, that the historical play in my school came to be evolved" (4). Thus she took in dramatic activities in her teaching of history because dramatic method, in the form of a historical play, could contribute to historical education. However, the process itself in which dramatic method was adopted shows the fact that, for Finlay-Johnson, dramatization was from the very beginning a means of education. To further clarify dramatization as an educational tool, we should examine how Finlay-Johnson concretely dealt with historical plays.

In the second chapter of her book *The Dramatic Method of Teaching*, Finlay-Johnson took up the historical play which was the "first attempt at drama" (18). Although it is labeled the second chapter, the chapter is actually the first one. This suggests that she attaches great importance to historical play. Yet while she gives to the chapter the title "The Teaching of Historical Plays," what she actually handles are not the historical plays themselves but educational by-products produced in the process through

which the plays are made. First, Finlay-Johnson, taking as an example students' performance of scenes from *Ivanhoe*, remarks that the production of the historical play stirred up their appetite for knowledge (20). Finlay-Johnson then reports that her students, through their engagement in the production of a historical play and its dialogue, developed their interest in the historical novel and even more so in the words and the sarcasm in it. This shows that she considered drama as a means to acquire knowledge. On the other hand, the performance of the play, actually of some scenes is handled in a very contrasted way. Needless to say, *Ivanhoe* is a historical play based on Walter Scott's novel of the same title, but what Finlay-Johnson does here is only to introduce, before and after this passage, her students' involvement in the production of the play. In particular, she writes at length about how earnestly students wrestled with substantiating the given part of "Friar Tuck" (19) and with the production of the stage and real costume (21). She never takes up the content of the play or the quality and level of the performance as a theatrical work.

Finlay-Johnson thus talks about the students' active engagement in producing a play and the improvement of their interest in knowledge and we should note that in doing so, by inserting the word "voluntarily" twice, she puts great stress on the fact that drama-making led to the development of the students' spontaneity. This has much to do with her unconventional view of the teacher as a partner, not as a dominator, to the students. In the introduction to her book, Finlay-Johnson touches upon the relationship of teacher and student:

There could be plenty of liberty without license, because the teacher, being a companion to and fellow worker with the pupils, had a strong



moral hold on them and shared in the citizen's right of holding an opinion, being heard, therefore, not as "absolute monarch," but on the same grounds as the children themselves. (9-10)

The idea of the students' spontaneity supported by this role of the teacher is closely connected with the respect for their autonomy as advocated by the Progressive Movement. Keeping this fact in mind, we can note that, as Bolton has also pointed out, the features Finlay-Johnson values in dramatic teaching, "integrated knowledge," "activity-method," "pupil-autonomy" (*Acting* 10) are those which also characterize the Progressive Movement. The only feature of her dramatic approach which the Progressive Movement does not embrace concerns students' mutual study. In relation to the preparatory stages of the historical play, Finlay-Johnson highlights students' teaching each other (26-27). Finlay-Johnson's notion of students' teaching each other reminds us of Cook's very similar idea. However, we have to note the difference between them in terms of how they regard the effect of the mutual teaching. Cook approves reciprocal teaching among students because it contributes to the promotion of collaboration and group responsibility, whereas Finlay-Johnson encourages students to teach each other because in doing so, they can share knowledge. Finlay-Johnson's attitude toward the mutual teaching also proves that she sees dramatization as an educational tool. What matters for her is not the performance of a play itself as a final goal but the preparation process and the educational benefits acquired through it.

Before putting forward our argument about Finlay-Johnson's views of dramatization, let us look first at her description of the preparation for the performance of the historical play *Ivanhoe* and of the development of the

students' desires for knowledge. In spite of her efforts to persuade us to believe that the preparation of the play went swimmingly, we are apt to feel some unnaturalness in her description. For example, Finlay-Johnson indicates that *Charles I* dealing with the trial of the king by Cromwell appearing in the fourth chapter "The Original Play" is "the play as copied from a pupil's notebook, with comments by [her]" (58). Actually the play is too well structured and its dialogues are too elaborate for a child to write single-handedly. However, if one makes an issue of the falsehood of the content of her book, one will fail to recognize what she is truly aiming at. It is a matter of no consequence whether the episodes in the book are true or not. What is of great importance is the fact that Finlay-Johnson tries to present in an ideal way the process of her students' production of plays and its final goal. As for her dramatic method of teaching, we have to mention Edmond Holmes who, in highly estimating her view of dramatic education, persuaded her to write her book and circulated her educational achievements in his own book *In Defence of What Might Be* published in 1914. At the beginning of the first chapter entitled "The Function of Education" where Holmes explains the reason why he takes up Finlay-Johnson's educational activities (1-2), Holmes refers to Finlay-Johnson as "Egeria" and her school as "Utopia." This is because while he tries to withhold the names of her and her school from the public, at the same time he seems to favor using terms of idealism meaning to reflect his view of ideal education as represented by Finlay-Johnson's dramatic method of teaching (Coggin 230; Bolton, *Drama as* 7, 9).

### **The Characteristics of Acting in Finlay-Johnson's Dramatic Teaching**

To further clarify Finlay-Johnson's use of drama as an educational

means, we have to examine the status and characteristics of acting in her dramatic teaching. Finlay-Johnson does not give us too many clues to her students' acting. However, the fifth chapter, "The Shakespearean Play" provides us with some images of her students' acting behaviour. She begins to write the chapter mentioning the fact that students themselves took interest in Shakespeare's plays. She reports in particular that students, writing their own historical plays and knowing the dramatic points of a play, naturally looked for good plays illustrating the history which they were studying and thus they discovered Shakespeare's works. Finlay-Johnson writes that "it was the children who drew the teacher's attention to the fact that, in the volume of Shakespeare which they kept on their library shelf, there were good plays which they could act"(77). It was a historical play *Henry V* that students began with. It is worth noting that the direction toward authentic theatrical work was prompted by students' production of historical plays introduced to stimulate their desire for knowledge. That is, behind the students' positive attitude toward study which Finlay-Johnson approved, there always lay concealed a practical educational purpose. What we have to note here is Finlay-Johnson's emphasis on the fact that students voluntarily gravitated toward the historical play among the Shakespeare canon, without following the teacher's instructions. Finlay-Johnson refers to children's liking for the first scene :

... They [children] quite understood the spirit of the thing and introduced a bit of swordplay and a quarrel, to which young "Prince Hal" put an end by striking up the swords of the combatants.

After this they followed the plan of Shakespeare's "Henry V," made the second of that play their first scene, and abridged the "Archbishop

of Canterbury's" speeches sufficiently to allow an explanation of Henry's claim to the French throne and his views on the Salic law. (78)

It is also here that she describes the spontaneity of her students in producing a play. That, closely combined with students' autonomy, shares the exact same nature with the spontaneity mentioned in the introduction (7) where Finlay-Johnson writes that whatever the students dramatically created was their own invention. In doing so, she remarks that the created drama does not always need to be "a finished product," indicating the importance of students' original creation, independently of adult's judgment, as "a vehicle of expression and assimilation." This suggests that she approves of not only students' spontaneity, but the value of the dramatic activities themselves. The view advocated by Finlay-Johnson here anticipates that of Austrian painter Franz Cizek who, ten years later in Vienna, had children drawing pictures freely, denying adult's judgment standard (Hornbrook, *Education and* 7-8). Cizek states that "Child Art was disregarded, ridiculed, and scoffed at. Even now people visit me who, when I show them real infantile work, only laugh. I estimate very highly those things done by small children. They are the first and purest source of artistic creation" (Viola 33). Finlay-Johnson's assessment concerning the students' production of plays also corresponds with her view on their actual acting behaviour. She places great importance on students' spontaneous theatrical acting experience, not the acting with the aim of a completed form, and on the by-products derived from the acting experience. She does take up students' acting when they performed the scenes created on the basis of Shakespeare's *Henry V* :

Next they (the boys) fitted in a little scene showing Southampton, the guilty Lords Scroop, Cambridge, and Grey, and their punishment by Henry. Mere writing cannot make my readers realize how well these little rural boys "lived" the parts. The dignity and restraint of "Henry" as he led up to the charge and sentence; the guilty starts and shamed demeanor of the culprits; the correct bearing of "Exeter" as he said, "I arrest thee," etc.; the way in which the last-arrested conspirator broke his sword before delivering it up, were all realistic in the extreme, and certainly had their share in improving the tone and bearing of the boys. (81)

Finlay-Johnson reports that the students' acting behaviour was "all realistic in the extreme." We can say that her impression of their acting, to some extent, reflects her realism view of theatre. More than that, Finlay-Johnson's report tells us about her belief that students must act naturally imitating their daily behaviour, and not merely following the directions of the teacher. It is here that she attempts to insist on the significance of her students' spontaneity and their natural self-expression in acting out the main roles. Her idea of acting is persistent and is adapted to the acting of minor characters like a group of people. In fact, she calls our attention to the naturalness of students' behaviour and their "*self-expression*" (82) in acting out a "crowd." What matters for Finlay-Johnson is not the objective value of students' acting, but whether the acting becomes natural expression themselves. We can easily guess that the importance of natural expression leads to the importance of the students' acting experience itself. That is, students' acting behaviour can become significant only when they are presented spontaneously. In other words, what is important for Finlay-Johnson is presentation, not representation, and thus showing the acting behaviour naturally loses its meaning. As a matter of fact, she

emphasizes on two occasions (first in the introduction and then in the second chapter) the necessity of doing away with the idea of an audience and “acting for display” (34). For students who have no parts to act out, Finlay-Johnson has them play a “crowd” of citizens, or an “army,” or a “crew,” or cast them as the role of “chorus” so as not to spend their time inactively. It is practically an educational strategy to involve all students in dramatic acting activity in the classroom.

At the same time, however, this strategy aims for the educational impact of acting, drawing out students’ self-expression and improving their knowledge. For Finlay-Johnson, the final purpose of acting is to produce such educational impact with all students in the class. Therefore the acting fulfills its role when it obtains the desired results. The participation of all students in acting naturally means the disappearance of the audience and the acting behaviour are not for display anymore because of the nature of their educational impact. Although from a certain perspective the acting in Finlay-Johnson’s classroom seems to be like theatrical acting, one of its indispensable elements is essentially different from the acting of theatre with an audience. However, this does not mean that in Finlay-Johnson’s personal view of theatre, the existence of audience is not essential. For example, in the fifth chapter “The Shakespearean Play,” after remarking that her purpose is not to teach stagecraft, she mentions the high value of students’ performance as pure art (107). Finlay-Johnson presents an authentic view on theatre, that is, acting finally aims at a performance to be displayed to an audience. She actually writes that “a great Shakespeare actor and actress who saw them waxed quite enthusiastic over their natural way of conducting themselves, and compared it with the “trained trickery” of many actors” (107). Needless to say, the “great

Shakespeare actor and actress” are placed in the position of audience. However, we have to note that in spite of her recognition of theatre, she thinks that acting for educational purposes need not be presented to an audience. This is symbolically shown in her report in the last chapter “After School Age.” Finlay-Johnson and older students organized a dramatic club to do dramatic activities during winter evenings outside school. The dramatic club also accommodated students’ family members and other people. Finlay-Johnson emphasizes the educational impact on the people participating in the production of a play more than the performance and the audience. Her strong consciousness of educational acting even changes the nature of the audience. She refers to the audience in “playing store” (172). Finlay-Johnson does not directly mention the existence of an audience. However, it is apparent that other students apart from the participants in the shopping game are seeing it since she writes “I hardly need say that, since all this [playing store] took place immediately in front of the class. . . .” (174). We can readily guess that the students who were watching the shopping game as audience virtually took part in it. The audience in this case is far from the traditional one who accepts the happenings on the stage objectively; it is an active audience.

In any way, as to the educational acting behaviours in Finlay-Johnson’s classroom, the behaviours themselves are significant and are not presented to the audience. The meaning of acting in Finlay-Johnson’s dramatic method is quite different from that of acting in Cook’s theatrical method which takes for granted the existence of audience. Christopher Parry, who was a student of the Perse School, describes the specific activities of Cook’s English class at the Mummery located within the school grounds (3).

Like Finlay-Johnson, Cook forced all students to participate in dramatic

activities, but in his case, students are made to engage not only in acting directly concerning the dramatic world but concerning dramatic activities outside the dramatic world, both of which are set in the theatrical framework. This characteristic difference is significant, more than expected, because what students are made to have as their object is the construction of the theatrical world, not self-expression or the acquisition of knowledge. In other words, Finlay-Johnson used acting only for educational purposes, as one constituent taken out of theatre while Cook always maintained the theatrical framework. Taking an example, in Cook's classes, students were divided into two groups, one group engaging in acting and the other given the role of audience.

We have to pay attention to the fact that the theatrical framework which Cook tried to maintain was not that of realism but of traditional theatre. Refusing the so-called proscenium stage, Cook tried to keep a distance from Social Realism, a new movement of theatrical world at the beginning of the 20th century, which had "content dealing with political and social issues, in style attempting a detailed and faithful reproduction of 'real life' with a life-like setting, life-like costumes and life-like (everyday) dialogue" (Bolton, *Acting* 45). Why then did Cook try to keep a distance from realism theatre? It is significant to take up this problem briefly. After remarking that "To make a drama out of a tale of adventure in modern times, or the school-life of everyday, is an exercise in realism," Cook asserts that, in teaching, the teacher should generally avoid "a conscious pursuit of realism" and he puts forth three reasons :

- (i) Because it is frankly beyond their powers, since realism implies a representation of things as they are, and boys have not experience



enough to go beyond impressions and appearances; (ii) because it would be outside the scope of our educational purpose, since true realism implies a certain sacrifice of conventions and the avoidance of *types* of character and situation, while our purpose as teachers is to ensure that by the exercise of playmaking the boys shall become familiar with these very artistic conventions, and with the dramatic situations and characters which have become typical from their frequent occurrence in the literature we are taking as our model; and (iii) the pursuit of realism by boys is inadvisable because it implies the abandonment of that tower of their artistic strength, the ready comprehension of a romantic theme, and a fitly imaginative treatment of it. (271-272)

The first and third reasons are practical ones according to Cook's judgment based on his teaching experience. Cook is afraid that realism is beyond students' abilities or has a bad influence on their imaginative power. On the other hand, the second reason directly concerns his view of theatre. He insists that realism victimizes conventions and the types of character. His insistence is significant because it is these conventions and types of character. His insistence is significant because it is these conventions and types of character that are the core of theatre. Thus Cook's avoidance of realism in teaching was derived not merely from his choice of educational strategy but from his view of theatre.

In contrast, as shown by her students' production of realistic costumes and properties in the historical play and their realistic acting, Finlay-Johnson was deeply affected by the new realism movement of theatrical world in those days. This tendency toward realism seems to greatly contribute, as a consequence, to her use of drama as an educational means. As Finlay-Johnson writes that "the plays in school brought forth an accompanying *handicraft* and *art* of their own" (88), the production of realistic

costumes and properties became virtually a part of the learning of handi-craft. Realistic acting was practical for self-expression in the real world, as well. The difference in theatrical view between the two pioneers naturally demonstrates a powerful effect on their theatrical use for educational purposes. Finlay-Johnson used a part of theatre as a tool for teaching different subjects whereas Cook used the whole theatre with its intrinsic nature as a means for teaching English as a first language.

As we stated above, Finlay-Johnson indicated in the second chapter of her book the improvement of her students' desire for knowledge in producing the historical play and also pointed out the importance of the by-products in the process of creating plays rather than the plays themselves. The same points can be found when she describes the students' involvement in Shakespeare's plays including historical ones. Before examining the details of her points, we have to recognize that the process of her and her students' approach to Shakespeare's works reflects Finlay-Johnson's intention to use drama as an educational tool. She initially had her students create a historical play to teach effectively. However, as students naturally became versed in theatre through their production of their own plays, they came to discover Shakespeare's works which actually represent the highest level of theatre. This meant that, going beyond the use of drama as an educational tool, students showed an inclination toward theatre as an independent entity. Finlay-Johnson reports on this as follows :

“Shylock” and “Portia” . . . realized their parts, and yet played in an original manner, because the action and gesture were their own, and were neither taught by an instructor nor copied from players seen previously. They had merely the text of Shakespeare to depend upon.

That they read this aright was proved by the fact that in such speeches as Shylock's, commencing "How like a fawning publican he looks!" the boy impersonator used a venomous kind of undertone; and when Bassanio enters next and Shylock has to say, "I am debating of my present store," etc., the boy changed his tone at once to a conciliatory, cringing one, although no such directions are given in the play. (101-102)

Finlay-Johnson makes an assessment that students reached the height of theatrical acting with their sensitivity. This description, as Bolton indicates, suggests that Finlay-Johnson also has a proper view of theatre in which drama is regarded "as classical scripts to be carefully rehearsed for showing to an audience" (*Acting* 17). However, she never made the attempt to have her teaching reflect such a proper theatrical view. Instead, she focuses on the by-products derived from the dramatic creation and on the spontaneous activation and improvement of their desire for knowledge. When drama that is first used as an educational tool began to show its intrinsic theatrical nature, Finlay-Johnson as a primary school teacher attempted to push drama back to its initial position. With this development, we can understand the nature of her treatment of drama in teaching in spite of her own view of theatre. Finlay-Johnson describes how students came to acquire practical benefits even after they were involved in Shakespeare's plays (83).

Finlay-Johnson remarks that, in performing Shakespeare's plays, students found out "a genealogical table" for themselves and obtained knowledge of historical facts concerning historical figures. Also here, Finlay-Johnson does not put stress on the performance of the historical play; she gives heed to the educational impact of dramatic activities that

heightened students' learning appetites and consequently expanded their knowledge. We must note the nature of the knowledge acquired by her students. Traditionally, knowledge is conceived as a thing which is given for students to passively absorb. Knowledge acquired through dramatic activities is the students' own knowledge which they spontaneously endeavor to obtain (Bolton, *Acting* 21).

Also as to her students' engagement in comedies, Finlay-Johnson always seemed to consider two levels, artistic and practical, at the same time. Finlay-Johnson asserts that Shakespeare's comedies, besides giving "delight" (85) as an entertainment, provide one with "profit" and "improvement" through one's acting or reading. Although she uses the abstract words, she thinks of "profit" and "improvement" as things concerned with the growth and expansion of students' knowledge as we examined in their involvement in historical plays. This means that Finlay-Johnson sees Shakespeare's comedies also as an educational means from which one can take out educational by-products. In fact, in the latter part of the same chapter, she regards Shakespeare's comedies such as *The Merchant of Venice*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *As You Like It* as dramatized literature, not as theatre to teach English: "This play [*The Merchant of Venice*] had, of course, no historical connection to teach, nor had "A Midsummer Night's Dream" nor "As You Like It," so we treated them as dramatized literature, under the general title of "English" (102).

In this way, Finlay-Johnson tries to use even Shakespeare's comedies as a means for practical education. Behind such a pragmatic attitude toward Shakespeare's comedies is her view of theatre, that is, her realism view of theatre that the dramatic world reflects the actual reality. The same sentiment is symbolically demonstrated by her insistence that Shakespeare's

histories, like other histories, are of great use for students to actually get acquainted with historical figures (100-101). Meanwhile Cook's view of theatre appearing in the following passage is in a marked contrast to Finlay-Johnson's realism view of theatre :

Well, these things can be learnt. One is not born with a working knowledge of playmaking and dramatic conventions. We have learnt all we know in this kind from Shakespeare. The best way to make a start in classroom acting is to take a play of Shakespeare and act it. The boys will there find that everything is set down for them in the book.

After having performed but one play they will be more at ease in moving about the classroom, and consequently more able to devise play-methods of studying matters which are not in themselves dramatic. (185)

Cook insists that students, in acting out one of Shakespeare's plays, can learn theatrical knowledge and techniques necessary for classroom acting, owing to its high quality as theatrical work based on conventions. While Cook, like Finlay-Johnson, used plays and their performance as an educational means, at the same time, he, unlike her, accepted theatre as having a fixed form.

On one hand, Finlay-Johnson admits, as Cook does, that the performance of Shakespeare's works can improve students' English ability or in other words, can become a substitute for English as a subject. On the other hand, she insists that Dickens' works, which are used also for English education, can be used as a substitute for moral education. This meant that she dealt with both Dickens' novels and Shakespeare's plays in the same way as substitutes for certain subjects. Finlay-Johnson deliberately ignored the theatrical nature to make it contribute to education according to

subjects. This same tendency is found in her treatment of the dramatized version of *Bevis*, a novel by Richard Jefferies :

In the story of "Bevis" we have an account of how two schoolboys "played" school ; how they played a Roman battle ; how they manufactured a gun, a raft, a boat, and went on a voyage of discovery round a small lake, finding a real island and living on it ; which may all sound commonplace enough as I have described it, but which is very far from commonplace as written by the pen of Jefferies in real "boy" language. Our boys, on reading it, were instantly fired with the desire to play it. (126, 129)

Here we see the possibility that the actual acting of the imaginative novelistic world can direct students to theatre itself. However, what is interesting is that Finlay-Johnson approvingly reports that her students' following action turned to the learning of geography, away from theatre (129-130). She describes how the dramatization of a novel can become a smooth introduction to the study of geography. In conjunction with this fact, Finlay-Johnson carefully calls the drama activities "game," avoiding theatrical terms, such as play or acting. On the other hand, she intentionally uses a theatrical term "chorus" and uses it for the students who are viewing the "game." Strictly speaking, as the word "chorus" suggests, they are participants in the game, rather than its audience. Their role is similar to the active audience already mentioned in the shopping game to teach arithmetic, completely different from the traditional audience (Bolton, *Acting* 19). This fact tells us that Finlay-Johnson is conscious only of the acting as an educational tool to teach subjects, not of theatre itself.

As we have mentioned from the very beginning, Finlay-Johnson hit upon the idea of dramatization to teach history which could not be covered by

nature study. Thus students were made to be engaged in the creation of historical plays and these were used as a means for education. In spite of this original intention, students came to be acquainted with the play world and naturally discovered for themselves the best of Shakespeare's historical plays. This presented the possibility that Finlay-Johnson and her students take the path to theatre. However, she actually chose the other way in which dramatization was used only as an educational tool. There must have been two reasons for this decision. For one thing, as a primary school teacher, she had a mission to teach all subjects. For another, she held the realism view of theatre. At the end of this paper let us look at Finlay-Johnson's male-and-female consciousness as another clue to her realism view of theatre.

A close reading of her book reveals that Finlay-Johnson has a strong consciousness of the difference between male and female. Her consciousness of the sexes appears for the first time in the second chapter "The Teaching of History Plays." The division of roles between male and female is forced by the situation. Historical plays consist mainly of male characters and therefore male students bear the role of acting. On the other hand, female students were given subsidiary roles. They were made to help male students in their preparation for acting or to take notes concerning each scene. The specific task of female students in helping with the preparation is in making costumes; although here the sharing of labour between the sexes is forced by the situation, Finlay-Johnson's awareness of the difference already appears in an unconscious way. Actually, writing that "the boys, of course, always enjoyed battle scenes. . ." (36), she shows acceptance of boys' naughtiness. That is, Finlay-Johnson has a fixed mindset about the sexes, the male-and-female stereotypes

established in those times. Finlay-Johnson believed that battle is suitable for boys, sewing for girls. This belief can be found in the eleventh chapter of her book, "Manual Work," where she refers to hard labour given to boys and handicraft given to girls (188). Her consciousness of the sexes determines even the content of the plays that female students created. In the sixth chapter, "A Girls' Play," she introduces the "scenes from the closing part of the life of Mary Queen of Scots" (109) which the girls wrote collaboratively. The scenes, consisting mainly of female characters, described the proud life of Mary Queen of Scots and were thought to have a suitable content for the girls to act. Finlay-Johnson readily assumed that female characters are acted out by female students. This reminds us of the fact that in historical plays, most characters were acted by boys. We note here that Finlay-Johnson's view of the sexes is closely connected with her view of theatre. In contrast, Cook has his male students of the Perse School act out even female characters. There is a clear difference between Finlay-Johnson's realism view of theatre and Cook's view of theatre. Finlay-Johnson's fixed mindset about the sexes blends together with her realism view of theatre and thus brought about her idea of dramatization for education. Whereas for Cook, the dramatic world for education is closed, for Finlay-Johnson, it was open to the reality.

The history of modern drama education was started by these two pioneers, Finlay-Johnson and Cook. However, they completely differed in their treatment of theatre in education according to their different educational orientations and their different views of theatre. Finlay-Johnson, a primary school teacher, with a realism view of theatre, persistently used it as a tool to teach all subjects. On the other hand, Cook, as an English teacher having a traditional view, used theatre as a means for language ed-



ucation and at the same time maintained a theatrical framework. It is significant that we recognize the fundamental difference in theatrical education between these two pioneers because in doing so, we correctly understand the later development of DIE (Drama-in-Education) and TIE (Theatre-in-Education), the two great theatrical programs of modern drama education appearing in 1960s in England: the former used drama mainly as a means for education while the latter was a program in which schools cooperated with theatre companies in education.

\* This paper is a revised version of the second chapter of my dissertation presented to the Graduate School of Human and Environmental Studies of Kyoto University.

### References

- Abbs, Peter. "Towards a Coherent Arts Aesthetic." Ed. Peter Abbs. *Living Powers*. London: The Falmer Press, 1987. Print.
- Beacock, D. A. *Play Way English For Today*. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1943. Print.
- Bolton, Gavin. *Acting in Classroom Drama*. Portland: Calendar Islands Publishers, 1998. Print.
- . *Drama as Education*. Harlow: Longman, 1984. Print.
- Coggin, Phillip A. *Drama and Education: A Historical Survey from Ancient Greece to the Present Day*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1956. Print.
- Cook, Henry Caldwell. *The Play Way*. London: William Heinemann, 1917. Print.
- Courtney, Richard. *Play, Drama and Thought*. Toronto: Simon and Pierre, 1968. Print.
- Finlay-Johnson, Harriet. *The Dramatic Method of Teaching*. 1912. Ed. Ellen M. Cyr. London: Ginn and Company, 2008. Print.
- Holmes, Edmond. *In Defence of What Might Be*. London: Constable and Company. 1914. Print.
- Hornbrook, David. *Education in Drama: Casting the Dramatic Curriculum*.

- London : Routledge Falmer, 1991. Print.
- Kelley, Louis G. *25 Centuries of Language Teaching*. Ottawa : U of Ottawa, 1969. Print.
- Key, Ellen. *The Century of the Child*. New York and London : G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1909. Print.
- Montaigne, Michel. *The Complete Essays*. Trans. M. A. Screech. London : Penguin Books, 1991. Print.
- Parry, Christopher. *English through Drama*. Cambridge : Cambridge UP, 1972. Print.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacque. *Émile*. Trans. Barbara Foxley. London : Dent, 1911. Print.
- Viola, Wilhelm. *Child Art*. 2nd ed. London : U of London P, 1944. Print.