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ABSTRACT

In the educational thought of Friedrich Froebel we are confronted with a panoramic view of the universe of knowledge and experience. Motivated by a profound grasp of the Creator-creature relationship in Christian theology, Froebel was able to provide a radical, holistic view of the task of Christian education. For Froebel, one’s relationship to nature was nothing less than a religious communion, a drawing close to the Creator.

Froebel’s conception of God is big, comprehensive and cosmic. All truth, all knowledge, all understanding, all reality is from God. Thus, in Froebel’s educational theory, knowledge and truth have an inherently religious aspect. Humanity is made in the image of God, not to pursue its own ends, but to pursue a course of development according to the rules and laws of God. Education is not confined to just one compartment of human life: it must be free to address every part of the pupil’s being, body, will, mind and spirit. Thus, education must span many subjects and embrace religion, science and art. The method of education must not be removed from real life but must engage the pupil at many levels of life and activity.

Because education is such a holistic activity it cannot be dealt with in a compartment labelled ‘school’. Parents are guardians of a sacred trust, responsible to God, to the child, and to all humanity. This is why Froebel placed such importance upon women. Upon women depends the welfare of the child, and thus the future welfare of the human race.

Education is the process of coming to a knowledge of and love for this Triune Creator through His creation, via His holy institution of the family. He has laid a most valuable foundation for Christian educational theory: now, his shortcomings must be corrected and the insights of the intervening century must be added to his seminal work.

(c) Sang-Wook Lee 1993
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## I. The main works of Froebel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>Autobiography of Friedrich Froebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWE</td>
<td>Froebel’s Chief Writings on Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Education by Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>The Education of Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK</td>
<td>Letters on the Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSGS</td>
<td>Mother’s Songs and Game and Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>Pedagogics of Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## II. Some Books on Froebel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHF</td>
<td>The Educational Theories of Herbart and Froebel (MacVannel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Froebel and Education by self-Activity (Bowen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>Friedrich Froebel and English Education (Lawrence (Ed.))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>Friedrich Froebel (Krieg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>A Child’s Work: Freedom and Play in Froebel’s Educational Theory and Practice (Liebschner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWAF</td>
<td>Friedrich Wilhelm August Froebel (König)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF</td>
<td>Herbart and Froebel (Cole)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>The Kindergarten System (Hanschmann)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Sketches of Froebel’s Life and Times (The National Kindergarten Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>Reminiscences of Friedrich Froebel (Marenholz-Bülow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFH</td>
<td>A Synthesis of Froebel and Herbart (Chalke)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>A Short Sketch of the Life of Friedrich Froebel (Shrieff)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"The things that hath been", says the preacher, "it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun." (Ecc. 1:9). Besides its real spiritual message, this passage reminds us, standing between the past and the future, of their own meaning and the importance of their relation. I think that it is one of the reasons why we need to study history. Carr gives his first answer to the question, "What is history?" like this: "It is a continuous process of interaction between the historian and his facts, an unending dialogue between the present and the past."  

I believe that the history of education also has been studied for a long time in order to improve and to develop current education for the better in the present and the future as the result of studying the past. In the circle of early childhood education, Froebel is certainly one of the unforgettable great educators. Although various studies of Froebel have been carried out as the result of his fame and his monumental work for young children, there have been few studies regarding Froebel and his religious education for young children. In this study, as one of continuous dialogue between the past facts and the present need, Froebel will be examined in the light of Christian education for young children.

1. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

There are two polar tendencies regarding appraising Froebel and his work in the history of education - one extreme is to despise him and his ideas, and the other is to exalt him and his educational work. Marenholz-Bülow heard Froebel by the name
of "the old fool" through her landlady in 1849. According to Hanschmann, Froebel was described as "a fool", "a fanatic", or "an imposter", whilst others looked upon him as "the prophet of a new development for humanity", "the law giver of a new education", "the apostle of women's freedom". These estimations were made about his theory and practice of education during his life time or after his death. Between these extreme estimations of Froebel, one must look into his life and his work as objectively as possible, and this I intend to do.

Concerning his religion and his religious ideas, there were similar reactions. He was attacked as atheist, anti-Christ, pantheist, and panentheist and on the contrary, he was called God's servant, the most devout man. It seems to me that Froebel's religious education has been interpreted and understood through these opposite views. Some misunderstanding of his religious education might estrange people from studying Froebel and his religious education. Nonetheless, in addition to Froebel's claim, some studies hinted that religious education was one of the educational areas to which Froebel contributed. I, therefore, would like to research Froebel in the light of Christian education for young children.

2. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The Kindergarten movement in the Republic of Korea has rapidly increased during the last ten years. It is true that Christian institutes for young children (4 to 6 years old) such as kindergartens affiliated to churches and Sungyowon have occupied important positions both in number and significance in the history of Korean Kindergarten, but as far as Christian education for young children is concerned, there are a number of things to consider. For example, it is necessary to develop the appropriate curriculum and methods for Christian education for young children.

I think that most kindergarten teachers involved in Christian education for
young children in Korea possess a missionary zeal for Christianity in the field of education. As Acland, the author of *We Teach them Wrong: Religion and The Young* indicates, we have to focus on both the children whom we teach and the Christian truth itself in Christian education for young children. It means that the missionary zeal is not enough to teach young children; what is needed is to know children themselves and devise proper methods for educating them in Christian education. I would like to express the hope that this study will help Christian educators in their task and lead to a better understanding of Froebel’s religious education for young children.

The purposes of this study are:

(1) to make known the excellence and the shortcomings of Froebel’s religious education in terms of Christian Education for young children;

(2) to discover merits in Froebel’s religious education in order to apply them to current Christian Education for young children;

(3) to see whether Froebel’s religious education contains any particular points which can be applied to current Christian education for young children;

(4) to try to place Froebel’s religious education in the history of Christian education;

(5) to explore whether Froebel’s religious education can be regarded as Christian education for young children.

3. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Some studies, doctoral dissertations and others, which have interest for the proposed study, were found. There is little disagreement that Froebel’s educational theory was related to his religious ideas and he carried out religious education. There have been, however, sharp divisions in interpretation and understanding over whether or not Froebel’s religious ideas are related to the Christian religion. Whilst some of them
are positive in judgement of Froebel's Christian life and his Christian education, others are negative in doing so. The following studies will show these two different opinions on this matter.

Thinking that various readers will read Mother's Songs, Games and Stories Frances Lord(1885) makes his comments to each reader in the preface. Those whom he addresses are the mother who knows all about it, the mother who knows nothing about it, the cottage mother, unmarried woman, religious people, the materialist, and university professors, learned men and women. Concerning the responses of religious people he writes like this:

Some will measure the book by the extent of its religious teaching. Some few will know that all religious forms never were more than steps towards the knowledge of infinite good, and arrest the soul's deepest yearnings, at least as often as they seem to satisfy them. Such readers will hardly disapprove Froebel's gentle recognition of a child's yearnings.6

Harris(1892), the editor of The Education of Man, called Froebel a religious teacher. He puts it like this:

Froebel is, in a peculiar sense, a religious teacher. All who read this book on the Education of Man will see that he is not only full of faith in God, but that his intellect is likewise illumined by theology.7

Hanschmann(1897), the author of The Kindergarten System Its Origin and Development as seen in The Life of Friedrich Froebel, expressed his conviction about Froebel's devout life. He related that it seemed extraordinary to those who had studied Froebel's life, to find he should ever had been accused of irreligion. He also put some instances of religious education and recommended a pamphlet published in 1821 for an understanding of the careful religious instruction given in Froebel's school.8

Bowen(1903), in Chapter IV of Froebel and Education by Self-activity, deals with Froebel's views on character, conduct, and religion. Introducing the fact that
more than one adversary called him pantheist and anti-christian during his lifetime, Bowen said that Froebel was undoubtedly pantheist or ideal-pantheist, but in no sense was he anti-christian. Alongside such a view he cites a number of examples supporting Froebel as a religious educationalist.

Cole (1907), in Herbart and Froebel, discussed Froebel's religious point of view, because he believed that Froebel's system of education was all bound up with religion. Developing the various philosophical ideas of God, he tried to clarify Froebel's position concerning the idea of God. Admitting the fact that divine transcendence and immanence exist in Froebel's view of God, he said that for Froebel, God is the absolute ground of all things.

Chalke (1912) explained that Froebel's whole career as an educator was illuminated by a distinct religious light. He also insisted that we should not err considerably if we stated that his whole contribution to the child-study movement was sound religious training. He characterized religion in Froebel in this way: "It was something more than dogma. It was acting, living, real, creative service in the great vineyard of life."

Fletcher and Welton (1912) concluded that Froebel was not in accord with the orthodox Christian doctrine that "God was high above all nations so high that the world with comparison with God cannot be said to be at all. ... The world was created out of nothing, and owes its continued existence to the mere good pleasure of its Creator. As God is above the world so the world is beyond and independent of knowing the mind of man." So they felt no surprise that Froebel's writings were condemned by the Lutheran clergy as unorthodox, and that his efforts to educate children according to this faith were prohibited by the Prussian Government as contrary to the public good.

Kilpatrick (1916) severely criticizes Froebel's religious terminology. He says:
Froebel undoubtedly had a strong religious bias, which would predispose him to use this popular terminology even if he felt that his interpretation was not the common one. Perhaps too the charge of atheism made during his later life inclined him to emphasize whatever he held in common with other religious people.¹³)

Hamilton(1952) wrote about the religious root of Froebel’s philosophy. He regarded Froebel’s religious opinions as highly individualistic. He argued that it was not possible to discuss Froebel’s philosophy of education without conceding that in his own mind its source and its vindication came from his religious belief. He said that Froebel’s approach to education was a religious one and that his religion, in spirit and in language, was Christian.¹⁴)

Froebel was discussed in connection with the psychology movement by Butler(1962) in his book. He asserted that Froebel became a strong influence in modern religious education by way of the kindergarten and because of the way in which the progressive education movement borrowed so heavily from Froebel and religious education in turn borrowed from progressive education. He also indicated that Froebel’s religious education was not so much redemptive in character, as it was a kind of reminder or reawakening, calling men to recognize the religious element in their lives.¹⁵)

Cohen and Garner(1967) put some part of The Education of Man in the section of moral and religious education of their book, Readings in the History of Educational Thought.¹⁶)

Developing religious education and heritage in the educational theories of Comenius and Montessori, Birchenall(1970) refers to Froebel in his dissertation, pointing to the different religious emphases among them. In his point of view religious education for Froebel was for the purpose of creating an inner realisation of a communion with the immanent divine being or unity in all existence. Birchenall said that it was highly personal and deeply mystical.¹⁷)
Focusing on Froebel in America, Shapiro (1980), in his dissertation, allocates one chapter to explain how Froebelianism influenced the kindergarten and the Sunday school in America, 1870-1890. His study shows us historical evidence of Froebelianism used in the Christian education.

Even though Gangel & Benson (1983) examine Froebel’s life and work in their book, *Christian Education: Its History and Philosophy*, they are very sceptical about his religious education. They think that the educational philosophy of Froebel was an attempt to bring together elements of idealism, Christianity, romanticism, naturalism, and science. But they said that his thinking was not really philosophical or scientific but rather mystical and pragmatic.

In her article titled *Froebel and religious education* Smith (1983) attempts to describe the background of Froebel’s religious ideas and to show how these influenced his suggestions for educating young children. Considering Froebel’s term ‘God’ and his view of the nature of man, she describes Froebel’s religious education for young children. She thinks that Froebel had managed to think out a religious interpretation of life along liberal lines and his conviction led him to avoid religious argument for he needed all his energies to put it into practice.

Kawk (1989) indicates that some Christian character, beyond romantic pantheism, can be seen in Froebel’s educational theory, even if he has been called not simply a pantheist, but a panentheist. God and the divine nature is clearly distinguished by Froebel. For Froebel nature created by God is in accordance with only the law of nature working as divine nature, but divine nature should be distinguished from God Himself who is the Source of divine nature and transcendent.

Liebschner *A Child’s Work: Freedom and Play in Froebel’s Educational Theory and Practice* (1992) tries to unfold the origins of Froebel’s philosophical and educational ideas. Exposing the fact that Froebel’s vision of God as manifest in nature
has led many writers to the belief that his religion is not a Christian one, but pantheistic, he argues that Froebel's concept of the nature of man was essentially a Christian one. He also indicates that Froebel's treatment of the Christian religion was selective. 

4. THE STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY

This study combines a philosophical approach with the biographical and begins with descriptions of various contemporary philosophers and their thoughts during the latter part of the eighteenth and the first part of the nineteenth century. Froebel's studies with the social and philosophical background (for example, of Rousseau and Kant) will be addressed, followed by a discussion of the influence of contemporary philosophers, on Froebel, and consequently on his later ideas and education theory.

It can be argued that the study of Froebel's principles and convictions, and its comparison with contemporaries through the biographical approach rather than the philosophical one, will aid us to recognize Froebel's status among his peers and to obtain a thorough understanding of Froebel himself. The deficiency which might happen as the result of employing only the philosophical approach in the study of Froebel will be dealt with the subsequent sections, by first considering his particular relationship with Pestalozzi and secondly, with his colleagues.

Various descriptions of the Pestalozzian method of teaching, along with its success and impact on German society during the mentioned period, will be outlined. In particular, an account of Froebel's two visits to Pestalozzian Institutes and how these encounters deepened his pedagogy, will be discussed. In the final section of Chapter II, Froebel's colleagues, friends and his family will be considered. This will seek to show the extent of their cooperation in connection with Christian education and establish the mutual trust and respect between Froebel and his colleagues.
In Chapter III, attention will be paid to Froebel's life in relation to Christian religion with reference to the biographical description and its link to Froebel's ideas on Christianity. Based on this, insights into how his life coupled with religion contributed to develop his educational theory and practice in clear perspective, will emerge. In particular, his views on God, man and nature will be discussed. Froebel will be assessed as to whether his conception of God is of the Biblical or the philosophical God, followed by a critique concerning his pantheistic tendency. There, it will be argued that the importance of the redemptive nature of Christ and the Holy Spirit should be stressed in Froebel's Christian education. Froebel's view of man will also be examined in the perspective of Christianity. The need to address man's sinful state and the absolute necessity of Christ's saving grace, will be rationalized. Finally, Froebel's conception of nature will be expressed. As with God and man, Froebel's love of nature and account of how these feelings contributed towards his education theory and practice, will be given.

In Chapter IV, attention will shift to Froebel's educational theory in terms of Christian education for young children. The chapter will examine the aims, the subjects and the methods of education and an explanation of how these various criteria are interwoven with his Christian religion. The chapter begins with the definition of an educational aim together with the differentiation between aims, purposes and objectives. After concluding that aims, purposes and objectives are synonymous in connection with Froebel, four approaches in which to categorize the aims of Christian education are examined. Then, a comprehensive account of Froebel's Christian educational aims is given, helping us to obtain a thorough understanding of Froebel's education for young children.

Froebel's subjects included Christian education, natural science, mathematics, language and art. His views on each of these subjects and in particular, their relationships with Christian religion, will be emphasised. Finally in Chapter IV, the methods of education will be discussed, which determine the basis of effective and efficient pedagogy for schooling of young children. Through the whole chapter, as
with the previous chapter, the need for the inclusion of Jesus Christ and His redemptive works as the fundamental foundation on which to base our life and the education, will be completed. Also, the importance of activity and experience in early childhood education will be discussed.

The final chapter of the main body continues the theme of the previous chapter by examining Froebel’s Christian education for young children in relation to educational practice. From this juncture will emerge a number of aspects of early childhood education and these, together with its close connection with Christian education, will seek to show the importance of Froebel’s pedagogy and his educational practice. This chapter is divided into three sections: parents and home education, the child and the church, and the teacher and the kindergarten.

Reasons as to why the role of parents, particularly the role of mother, is of utmost importance in early childhood education, will be advanced. The blessings, rights and duties towards their children, humanity, and God of parenthood will be characterized by their roles as the guardians, partner, mediator and educator in the home.

The account of how Froebel acknowledged the significance of early contacts with the church for young children, will be discussed. The relationship between Froebel’s life and the church will be introduced, followed by the use of Froebelianism and Sunday school movements, and their rise in both America and English Sunday school. Eventually, the unique role of the church and her ministry in terms of bridging the role of parents, family, school together, will be advanced.

The last part of Chapter V, will consider Christian education in the kindergarten. This account aims to establish the important and vital role of Froebel’s kindergartens and differentiate them from conventional infant educational institutes. It will be argued that the kindergarten was the Christian education for young children by presenting how the training of the kindergarten teachers had been carried out and
introducing four particular cases.

NOTES
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4. Comparing schools, teaching staffs, and pupils enrolled of 1990 to those of 1980, the number of kindergarten increased more than nine times, 5½ times in number of teaching staff, 6¼ times in the number of children enrolled. (*UNESCO Statistical Year Book*, UNESCO, Paris, 1991, 3-79).

5. Sungyowon literally means the garden(won) for mission(sungyo). It is the institute for preschool children established by the Korean church for the purpose of providing young children with Christian education as one of means of evangelizing children. While kindergarten is controlled by the Department for Education, sungyowon is governed by the Department for Culture.

6. MSGS p. xvi.

7. EM p. viii.

8. KS p. 103.
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CHAPTER II

FROEBEL AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES

As a great number of studies on Froebel have been carried out since his death (1852), so too many titles have been given to him - a prophet, an apostle of a new era, a reformer, a healer, a visionary, and a humanist educator - and to his thought - idealism, romanticism, symbolism, mysticism, and pragmatism.

Among these studies, there have been two main trends; the biographical approach and the philosophical analysis. The biographical approach means the studying of Froebel through the biographical description of his life and achievement. The philosophical analysis means a way of study in order to analyse his ideas and compare them with others.

Emily Shirreff is one of the examples of following the former course according to Alexander Hanschmann’s advice. Hanschmann, a fervent disciple of Froebel, felt that he could not so well analyse his theory in any other way than by analysing his life - looking back over all the circumstances which helped to make him what he was and step by step prompting or facilitating the growth and gradual unfolding of his educational theory.

Alongside this kind of study, however, as time has passed, philosophical analysis became more popular and common. In a sense, a philosophical approach to Froebel may help us to understand him more deeply and draw our attention to him. The educational ideas of Froebel have been compared with those of Comenius, Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Herbart, Schiller, Dewey and Montessori. But we cannot overlook the fact that this approach has some defects as it may fall into fragmentary and unessential points without seeing the subject’s idea as a whole. In my view, the deficiency of this approach might lead one to ignore the fact that Froebel’s education is closely related to religious education for young children. I, therefore, would like
to examine his relationships with his contemporaries in order to see what circumstances went to form his character, what peculiar impulses or purposes shaped his ideas.

One more reason to follow this approach can be added. It is Froebel’s ambiguous speech. Henrietta Schrader, who was one of the students at Keilhau, puts it in this way:

We feared for his peculiarities of his speech; so many new thoughts surge up while he is speaking, and his sentences often grow lengthy and tangled and his meaning grows involved and indefinite and who would presume to make his meaning clear to others when he himself failed.¹⁰

This statement justifies the comment of John Champman saying that the terminology revealed in Froebel’s works can be translated into the language of metaphysics, of Christian theology, or of modern science.⁶ These remarks give us warning to deal with Froebel carefully. Without knowing his life, struggles, studies, labours, relations to others through and through, how can we fully understand and grasp the point of his idea and achievements?

1. FROEBEL AND HIS CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHERS

As already has been mentioned, many ‘—isms’ attached to Froebel’s work are derived from the many studies which attempt to analyse and compare his ideas to others. Admitting the fact that his educational theory and practice are not things which arise out of nothing, we have to bear in mind that there is a danger in plotting Froebel’s thought too precisely without looking at his life and his own statements.

Following this methodology in examining Froebel and his contemporary philosophers, the following points should be considered in this section: What were
the main thoughts in Germany at that time? Which subjects did he study and what kind of books did he read? Who were his contemporary philosophers and what were their thoughts? Was there anything else which helped to form Froebel's educational ideas other than the thoughts of philosophers?

(1) FROEBEL AND CONTEMPORARY THOUGHTS

Born in 1782 Froebel grew up in the period of early German romanticism when the main line of his thought was established. From the latter part of the eighteenth century onwards art, literature, philosophy and even politics were influenced by and indeed partly constituted the "Romantic movement". According to Russell, in spite of owing its origin to Rousseau, the "Romantic movement" is characterized, as a whole, by the substitution of aesthetic for utilitarian standards.7)

He also lived in the world of German enlightenment. *The Critique of Pure Reason*, Kant's most important book, was published in 1781 one year earlier than Froebel's birth. In the winter semester of 1799, Froebel became a student of philosophy at the University of Jena. At the turn of the century Jena had become the great capital of the German intellectual revolution. It was a centre of Kantian studies. Schelling(1775-1854) had succeeded Fichte(1762-1814) and Schiller(1759-1805) was lecturing there. What was his impression of this philosophy? He says:

My matriculation certificate called me a student of philosophy, which seemed very strange, because I had set before me as the object of my studies practical knowledge; and as to philosophy, of which I had so often heard, I had formed a very high idea of it. .... it gave, however, higher and unexpected relations to my studies.8)

He did not hear philosophy lectures, for he took lectures which promised to be useful in his career such as applied mathematics, algebra, arithmetic, geometry, mineralogy, botany, natural history, physics, chemistry, accounts, cultivation of forest trees and management of forests, architecture, house building and land-surveying at Jena. He continued topographical drawing. He heard nothing purely theoretical except
What did he learn about philosophy at Jena, a centre of Kantian studies? He gives an answer like this:

Of philosophical teaching and thought I learnt only so much as the intercourse of university life brought with it; but it was precisely through this intercourse that I received in various ways a many-sided intellectual impulse.\(^9\)

Having left Jena in 1801, he did not stop studying for himself. He writes:

As yet I had busied himself but little with German literature, and the names of Schiller, Goethe, Wieland, and the rest I now, for the first time, began to learn. In this, too, it was with me as in so many other things; any mental influence that came before me I had either to fully interweave with my inner life, or else altogether to forego its acquisition.\(^10\)

He continues to say of his study life between 1805 to 1810:

Although I still always lived in isolation as to my personal inner life, yet I was at many points in full contact with the vigorous mental effort and activity of that stirring time, as regards teaching, philosophy, history, politics and natural science.\(^11\)

He was still continuing with his own education. His reading on education extended to include not only Arndt's *Fragments* and the writings of Pestalozzi and his followers but also Fichte's *Reden an die deutsche Nation* and other works.\(^12\)

In the beginning of July 1811, he went to Göttingen, where he studied linguistics, languages (Hebrew, Arabic, Sanskrit, Persian, Hindustanee, Greek) philology, physics, chemistry, mineralogy, natural history, history, politics, political economy, organic chemistry and geology. During this student life at Göttingen, he tried to see his way towards harmonising his inward with his outward life, and reconciling his thoughts with his actions. He described what in the current half-year's
In those days, he regarded natural science as the foundation and cornerstone which served to make clear and definite the laws and the progress of the development, the culture and the education of mankind. This was because he found these two groups of studies to fit in with his own longings and endeavour. What he says is this:

Just at this time those great discoveries of the French and English philosophers became generally known through which the great manifold external world was seen to form a comprehensive outer unity. And the labours of the German and Swedish philosophers to express these essentially conditioned fundamental laws in terms of weight and number, so that they might be studied and understood in their most exact expression, fitted in exactly with my own longings and endeavour.

He confessed that he received much benefit from the lectures on natural history at Göttingen university.

He moved to Berlin to study with the famous Professor Weiss, originator of crystallography and the application of mathematics to the subject. He says that though the splendid lectures he heard on mineralogy, crystallography, geology, etc., led him to see the uniformity of nature in her working, yet it was always most unsatisfactory to him to see form developed from a number of various ground-forms.

He continued to pursue the law of unity and simplicity of human development and human education. To make good a deficiency in these lectures he studied language and its development, as it appeared to him to underlie the universal laws of expression. While studying these subjects, he was excited by some keen lectures on the history of ancient philosophy. He said that these again afforded him a clear conviction of the soundness of his views of nature and of the laws of human development. After his discharge from the Lutzow regiment he resumed his work at the mineralogical museum and continued his studies especially by visiting
Schleiermacher’s lectures.

Besides these studies at three universities, some more books he had read can be added. Froebel was a man of wide and deep reading. He had read eagerly as a boy and a student. The following books took great hold upon Froebel: Proeschke’s *Fragments on Anthropology*, Novalis’ works, Arndt’s *Germany, Europe, Fragment on education*, and *Fragment on Human Culture*, educational writings by Georg Seiler and Jean Richter, Schelling’s *Bruno*, the works of Pestalozzi, Krause’s *The Ideal of Humanity*, and *The Journal of Human Life* and Jacob Boehme’s *Auroa*.

By tracing Froebel’s life through three universities and his independent self-study, the important period when the main line of his thought was established has been examined. In order to get a deeper understanding of German thought from the latter part of the eighteenth century to the first half of the nineteenth century, some philosophers will have to be discussed in the next section.

(2) FROEBEL’S CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHERS

There are two reasons for this section. First, before discussing Froebel’s ideas in Chapter III, a wider knowledge of his contemporaries’ thoughts should be presented. This will help us to situate him among philosophers and understand him more accurately. Second, it will make it easier for us to compare and separate his original ideas from those of others. With regard to Christian education, his ideas concerning God, man, and nature will be discussed in detail in Chapter III comparing them with contemporary philosophers.

The following ten philosophers can be chosen as his contemporaries: Goethe, Schiller, Fichte, Schleiermacher, Hegel, Novalis, Schelling, Herbart, Weiss, and Krause. They are all Germans with whom Froebel had relationships through their lectures, books, or close personal contact and they are numerous and varied enough to allow us to place his thought.
1) Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832)

Having come back to his parents' house "with a heavy heart, overclouded soul, and oppressed mind" because his financial difficulty had forced him to quit his academical career at the University of Jena in 1801, Froebel, as indicated above, had the chance to read the works of Goethe with those of Schiller and Wieland. He had also heard of Marenholz-Bülow's reading of Goethe's *School of Regions*, where the author spoke of the manner of greeting of children of different ages. Froebel commented, "How well Goethe understands the nature of man in childhood." He continued to applaud Goethe who had found the connection of human history and the importance of gesture for childhood.

Goethe had studied law in Leipzig and Strasburg. While in Leipzig, and during his friendships with Herder at Strasburg, he conceived a passion for Shakespeare, nature, and German folk poetry. His formative years coincided with the *Sturm und Drang* movement. At Weimar, in addition to his work as Chief of State and his continued literacy activity, Goethe's interest in the sciences developed. König insists that Froebel's study of the natural sciences at the university of Jena had been directly influenced by Goethe in his function as Minister of State. His aesthetic theories were sharpened by his friendship and correspondences with the poet Schiller. He wrote *Wilhelm Meister's Wanderjahre* and completed his greatest drama *Faust* in his last years.

He held that God, being the inexorable order of nature, cannot have any personality or be in any sense outside the natural world. Thus God does not cause or control the world in the way that theists have believed. The ambiguity of Goethe's theology may be seen in what is perhaps his most famous remark on this topic: "We are pantheists, when we study nature, polytheists when we poetize, monotheists in our morality." *(In Maximen und Reflexionen No. 807)*

John MacVannel summarizes Goethe's ideas about man in this way:
Some of the more fructifying ideas may be enumerated as follows:

i) The concept of life as fundamentally and essentially personal, positive and significant;

ii) Everything that man undertakes to produce, whether by action, word, or in whatsoever way, ought to spring from the union of all his faculties;

iii) The conception of development through activity, opposition, struggle, aspiration. Life is essentially progressive;

iv) Individual isolation, selfishness, agnosticism are self-destructive. Reconciliation with reality is won by actual experience and faithful work in the loving service of man;

v) The divine immanence in all nature and human life.

Goethe's view of nature was deterministic and nonteleological and his mystical feeling for nature was more akin to Schelling. He maintains that everything in nature is in some sense animate. The universe consists of an infinite number of unique beings each alive and harmonious with all others.

In his great works, *Faust, Wilhelm Meister's Wanderjahre, the Elective Affinities* which can be considered in the widest sense as educational treatises, he discussed how to secure adjustment to the collective life of humanity without interfering with the fullest perfection of the personality of the individual. Faust is a glorification of individual culture consecrated to the service of humanity. *Wilhelm Meister's Wanderjahre* is a record of the incidents in the development of a soul from immaturity to a conscious recognition of a world order. The elective Affinities deals with the conflict between instinct and moral order of the world.

We can notice that some well-known theories of Froebel's education such as union of faculties, development through activities, education as a progressive process, and anti-isolation are linked with some ideas of Goethe. Because of his main concern about the importance of 'union of one's faculties', he tries to explain the development of the senses, the use of the body, of the limbs of children at their earliest stage. I think that this idea provides us with well-balanced education not just for the infant but for all the life of man. Froebel writes:

As soon as the activity of the senses, of the body and the limbs is developed to such a degree that the child begins self-actively to represent the internal
outwardly, the stage of infancy in human development ceases, and the stage of childhood begins.\(^{23}\)

2) **Friedrich Schiller (1759-1805)**

Apart from the phrase *"Come, let us live for our children."* Froebel also had Friedrich Schiller's phrase, "On the true meaning of children's play." printed in many works.\(^{24}\) The festival on the Altenstein was arranged by Froebel in 1850. The motto of the occasion in the middle of a large crown of flowers was a quotation from Schiller: "Deep meaning often lies in childish play." These are undoubtedly the consequence of his readings of the works of Schiller.

Born in Marbach near Stuttgart, Germany, in 1759, the son of an army officer, Schiller first wanted to prepare himself for the ministry, but he reluctantly gave up his original desire to study theology and, after a false start in law, turned to medicine. He practised as an army surgeon for a time, until the success of Die Rauber (The Robbers) in 1781 decided his vocation as a dramatist.

Despite the poverty and chronic sickness that led to his death at the age of 45, Schiller expanded his range to produce major histories of the Dutch rebellion against Spain and of the thirty years' war. The bitter struggle for existence began for him the moment he devoted himself fully to a literary career. It is said that this struggle was softened only by the two great and lasting friendships, with Koerner and Goethe. Goethe did not meet Schiller until late 1794, but had read some of his works, and when in 1788 some mutual friends told him of Schiller's precarious existence he recommended his appointment as professor of history at the University of Jena.

After studying Kant's *Philosophy of History* and *Critique of Practical Reason*, he felt more and more attracted to the study of history and the development of mankind in art, culture, and statehood. Herder's ideas on *the Philosophy of the History of Mankind* and the birth of his first son may well have made his decision to write *The Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man* at that time (1794-1795),
although they were originally addressed to his benefactor, Prince Friedrich Christian von Augustenbury, Schleswig-Holstein.\(^{25}\)

He was not a systematic thinker, yet it is believed that he made significant contributions to aesthetic and comparative philosophy. Schiller had attempted an objective aesthetic theory in the spirit of rationalist philosophy. However, after some notable encounters with Kant, Goethe, and Fichte, his aesthetic theory became an integral account of life and the indispensable role played in it by what Schiller called the aesthetic impulse. He explains, in his *Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Mankind*, that human nature comprises three impulses: the material, the formal and the play or aesthetic impulse. He regards the play impulse as the crucial one to mediate and reconcile the other two impulses in an integral unity. He says:

> The play impulse also, in which both act united, becomes simultaneously our formal and our material constitution, and simultaneously makes accidentally for a perfection and our happiness... The plays of children often have very deep meaning, for, to speak plainly and concisely, man plays only where he is a human being in the fullest sense of the word, and he reached full humanity only where he plays.\(^{26}\)

His theory of aesthetic education has as its objective the harmonious balance not only of the individual’s faculties but also of society.

Shiller’s idea of play/aesthetic impulse can be regarded as one of the direct and strong influences which made Froebel build up his educational theories. Froebel highlights the role of play in the education of children. He writes:

> Play is the highest phase of child development - of human development at this period: for it is self-active representation of the inner - representation of the inner from inner necessity and impulse. Play is the purest, most spiritual activity of man at this stage, and at the same time, typical human life as a whole - of the inner hidden natural life in man and all things. It gives, therefore, joy, freedom, contentment, inner and outer rest, peace with the world. It holds the sources of all that is good.\(^{27}\)

As a matter of fact, the value and importance of play has been emphasised by many
educators such as Plato and Aristotle. Although the theory of play was not originally from Schiller himself, Froebel's quotation of Schiller shows us that Froebel was certainly stimulated by Schiller to build play theory for children's education.

3) Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814)

According to König, Froebel broadened his philosophical and pedagogical knowledge with a study of the works of Fichte and Herbart. Among them, there was Fichte's famous work *Addresses to the German Nation.* Giel also says that Froebel was present at the lecture of Fichte.

He was born as the eldest son of a Saxon ribbon-maker in Lusatia. Aided by a local landed proprietor, a Baron von Miltitz, he studied theology, philology and philosophy at Jena and Leipzig. He met Kant in 1791 and became his close student and disciple. In 1794 the 32-year-old Fichte received and accepted a call to a professorship at Jena but was dismissed in 1799 on a charge of teaching atheism. An ardent patriot, he delivered his addresses to the German Nation in Berlin in 1807-1808 and was largely instrumental in the rebirth of Prussia after her defeats at the hands of Napoleon. He was appointed in 1810 as dean of the philosophical faculty at the newly established University of Berlin.

Fichte held that there were two possible methods in philosophy, dogmatism which deduces the idea from the things or idealism which deduces the thing from the idea. He preferred idealism. He wrote:

The kind of philosophy which one adopts depends upon the sort of man one is: for a philosophical system is not a lifeless piece of furniture that one might take or discard.... but it is animated by the soul of the man who has it.

The philosophy of Fichte is characterised by his ethical views and a mystical and theological theory of Being. His ethical views were developed in his *Theory of*
Morals (1798). Moral action must spring from the conscience not from obedience to authority. The basic ethical demand is that we should act according to our conception of duty. This is the conception of the action which we would acknowledge as ours without reservation through all time. Moral evil arises from our lazy incapacity to think out our action to the full.

In On the grounds of our Belief in a Divine Government of the Universe, he defines God as the moral order of the universe, the eternal law of right that is the foundation of all man’s being. The cry of atheism was raised by this idea. After publishing two defences, Fichte was forced to leave the university in 1799. His The Vocation of Man (1800) defines God as the infinite moral will of the universe who becomes conscious of himself in individuals.

In his last-named work The Way Towards the Blessed Life (1806) he treats the union between the finite self-consciousness and the infinite ego, or God in a deeply religious fashion reminiscent of the Gospel according to John. The knowledge and love of God is declared to be the end of life. God is the All; the world of independent objects is the result of reflection or self-consciousness, by which the infinite unity is broken up. God is thus over and above the distinction of subject and object; man’s knowledge is but a reflex or picture of the infinite essence.

Fichte’s concept of 'the union between the finite self-consciousness and the infinite ego, or God' can be found in Froebel’s idea of the unity of life, even if there is no entire agreement in their idea of God. Hailmann says that the unification of life with reference to God means perfect faith as Froebel finds it realized in Christianity. To the Christian, Fichte’s chief end of life 'the knowledge and love of God' and Froebel’s ‘living in the unity with God’ has the same crucial meaning.

Another aspect of Fichte’s influence on Froebel is German nationhood. Froebel expressed his earnest hope to have a free and united Germany as a Fatherland. With such an enthusiasm he joined the ranks of the German army in
1813. He hoped that his educational efforts would be evermore performed both for
the benefit of the whole human race and for his own country. This manifestation of
this desire appears through the name of his first school, 'An Educational Institute for
the Whole Germany' (Allgemeine Deutsche Erziehungs-Anstalt). He says:

Although I was not perhaps then capable of putting my convictions into
words, I at once realised this work in my own mind as comprehensive and
world-embracing in its nature, as an ever-lasting work to be performed for
the benefit of the whole human race; yet I nevertheless linked it, and for this
very reason, to my own personal life; that is since I had no children of my
own, I took to me my dear nephews whom I most deeply loved, in order
through and with them to work out blessings for my home and my native
land, for Schwarzburg and Thuringia, and so for the whole wide Fatherland
itself. 32

4) Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher (1768-1834)

In the same way that his two colleagues Middendorff and Langethal had attended
Fichte's and Schleiermacher's lectures, Froebel, after his discharge from the Lutzow
regiment, resumed his work at the mineralogical Museum and continued his studies
especially by visiting Schleiermacher's lectures. 33

Friedrich Schleiermacher, widely known as theologian, preacher, classical
philologist and shaper of Prussian church life and culture, was born in Breslau, the
son of parents both from families of clergymen. He attended a school of Moravian
Brethren at Niesky from 1783 to 1785 and the Moravian Seminary from 1785 to
1787. After studying Kant’s philosophy, along with his theological studies at the
university in Halle, he served briefly as a private tutor.

In 1796 he settled in Berlin as a preacher, became a close friend of Friedrich
von Schlegel, and emerged as an interpreter of religion to the romantic world view.
By 1804 he was teaching philosophical ethics, theology, New Testament, and
hermeneutics at Halle. By 1810 he was lecturing as professor of theology at the
University of Berlin, where for the remainder of his life he taught dogmatic theology,

According to Schleiermacher, the person, as the subject of the activities of thinking/knowing and of willing/doing, is more than a being composed of mind and body, individuated by time and space. He also claims that man is a religious being. He describes sin as the failure to maintain a clear distinction between that upon which men are entirely dependent, i.e. God, and that upon which men are only relatively dependent, namely, objects within the world.

In the Christian Faith, he stated that religion is a determination of the feeling of absolute dependence. This feeling, he believed, is at one and the same time, also a consciousness of being in relation with God. He insisted that religion always appears in a particular social and historical form. He defined Christianity as a monotheistic faith of the teleological variety in which everything is related to the redemption accomplished by Jesus of Nazareth.

Why did Froebel, in his educational theory, take a romantic world view as Schleiermacher had? Before facing Romanticism through literature and lectures, Froebel had the feeling of beauty, aesthetic appreciation of nature through intimate relation with nature. He also had the Christian view of nature. Some narratives and poetry in the Bible represent romantic elements (Gen. 1:21,25, Ps. 19:1-6). Since Froebel's romantic view of nature is linked with his Christian belief and understanding of the Bible, he seemed to have embraced the contemporary thought of Romanticism. As Schleiermacher defined religion as a determination of the feeling of absolute dependence, Froebel emphasized the entire dependence on God.

5) Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831)

Born the son of a civil servant at Stuttgarter in 1770, Hegel went from the typical Latin school of his native city to the university at Tübingen to study theology. One of his
very early works was *The Life of Jesus* (1795), stressing the ethics of Jesus’ teachings while discarding the miracles. These studies culminated in *The Spirit of Christianity* (1791), in which he speaks as a mystic who has had a vision that he expresses in philosophical rather than theological terms. After being a resident tutor for aristocratic families, he joined Schelling at the university of Jena as a lecturer in philosophy in 1801 when Froebel left Jena. At Jena he also wrote *The Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807). In 1808 he became headmaster of the Royal Gymnasium in Nuremberg, where he set forth his logic and ethics as he had formulated them. In 1816 he began teaching philosophy at the university of Heidelberg for four semesters. Finally, in 1818, he became a professor of philosophy at the university of Berlin, where Froebel studied before he came. There he became famous and influential. His other writings are *Science of Logic* (1812-1816), *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences* (1817), and Philosophy of Right and Law (1820).

According to DeVeries, in Hegel’s view, only mind is real; everything else is the expression of mind. Philosophy became a kind of theology for Hegel because he saw all reality as an expression of the Absolute, who is God. All that exists is the expression of divine mind, so that the real is rational and the rational is real. It is generally understood that Hegel’s God is an absolute, eternal and dynamic Idea, a process of thought consisting of three stages or moments. Concerning them Harris explains:

In the first moment God is infinite Spirit, not a static unity but a thinking process which must come to self-consciousness. To this end the Spirit, in the second moment, descends (dirempts itself) into finite forms of social expression - art, literature, religion, science, etc. - where it becomes conscious of itself as part of the Absolute Spirit to which it is compelled to return from its ‘diremption’. In the third moments this separation is abolished and the Spirit returns to itself, being reconciled to itself within its own unity as the Absolute Spirit. These three-fold process of being (thesis), descent into finite forms (antithesis), and reconciliation (synthesis) lies at the basis of all Hegel’s thoughts, including his theology.

Harris concludes that Hegel’s interpretation of the Christian faith thus dissolved away the traditional understanding of Jesus as the Son of the God who was
and is a person, the designer and creator of the universe. Historical Christianity belongs to the third stages of Hegel’s four stages of religion. The fourth as the highest is Hegel’s reformulation of Christian beliefs into a conception of speculative philosophy. Thinking that Christianity is not compatible with reason and human dignity, he maintains the possibility of a wholly rational religion which would help us to attain a harmonious personality and higher level of morality. Hegel says that the revelation of the spirit is the world order, and that its highest stage is the idea of God in the world.

In fact, Hegel revives the Greek idea of children’s growth. Aristotle’s famous pronouncement is that man is a political animal. Hegel insists that the child becomes a person gradually through the interaction in the life of the home and other social interactions. Froebel also developed this idea. MacVennel puts:

“For him each one of the various human institutions constitute at once a system of control, and a medium for activity of the individual, specific in function yet rendering to other complementary and necessary service. "Thus enriching his (the individual’s) own life by the life of others, he solves the problem of development." According to Froebel, moreover, the values, habits, norms, or ideals which interpret, organize, and enrich the experience of the individual are socially mediated. ... To put it briefly, the individual can be educated only in the presence of the other human beings." 3 (5)

In a letter to Krause in 1828, Froebel states that he saw the simple course of development progressing from analysis to synthesis, which appears in pure thought, also in the development of every living thing. Obviously he used Hegelian terms. He designates this idea ‘the law of the connection of contrast’ variously as ‘the law of development’ and as ‘the law of unification’. In 1850, Poesche and Benfey in his presence compared this law with Fichte’s law of the idealistic constitution of things, and with Hegel’s dialectic method, he said, "It is both of these, and yet has nothing in common with either of them; it is the law which I offer to children to guide them in their development." 37)
6) Novalis (1772-1801)

In his autobiography, Froebel put into words his deep impression of Novalis’ work in this way:

The second book lay before me the most secret emotions, and intentions of my inmost soul, clear, open and vivid. If I parted with that book it seemed as if I had parted with myself; if anything happened to the book I felt as though it happened to me, only more deeply and with greater pain.\(^{38}\)

The real name of Novalis is Friedrich Leopold Freiherr von Hardenberg. Novalis, a lyric poet and leader of the early German Romanticists, was born of Pietistic parents on the family estate, Oberwiederstedt in Saxony. In preparation for a civil service career, jurisprudence, philosophy, chemistry, and mathematics were studied at Jena, Leipzig and finally at Wittenberg where he completed his studies in 1794. With Friedrich Schlegel, Novalis is the most characteristic spokesman of early romanticism. Through his early work he furnished the age with a poetic description of the poet. Thinking about his own situation the poet tries to answer the more general question of the destiny of mankind; the poet is a seer who leads man home.

According to Novalis, the Middle Ages was a time of unity. He attacks the Protestant Reformation and the Enlightenment for having destroyed medieval unity. Also, he proposes that the most important reason for the homelessness of man which manifests the modern age as fragmented is simply that he is a finite being. To be finite is to be in search of the infinite, which can be recovered in the depths of the human soul.

Novalis declares himself a believer in Pantheism in the sense that he wishes to understand by it the idea that everything can be the organ of the Godhead. He rejects monotheism. Religion for him is a work of man. He says:

There is as yet no religion. First of all a lodge for training in true religion must be founded. Do you believe that religion exists? Religion must be made
and put forward by the union of people.\textsuperscript{39}

Novalis saw nature as a cipher writing which is to be found everywhere - "in wings, eggshells, clouds and snow, in crystals and stone formations, of plants beasts and men... or in iron filings round a magnet".\textsuperscript{40} When the adept in \textit{Novices of Sais}(1798) lifts the veil of \textit{Isis} which hides the meaning of human existence, he discovers only his true self. At the same time, this discovery is an escape from all that separates man from nature and from others. The poet, through knowledge of his true self, is intuitively able to grasp the meaning of the meaning to others. He says that we shall understand the world when we understand ourselves.\textsuperscript{41}

While we can see the unity of nature and humanity in terms of Romanticism both in Novalis' idea and Froebel's, we can say that there are quite different views of religion and God between them. Froebel's view of God, as will be discussed in Chapter III, is far from Novalis' viewpoint.

7) \textit{Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling (1775-1854)}

Schelling was introduced to Froebel by a landowner, a young doctor of philosophy, who had also studied in Jena, and leaned towards the new school of Schelling. He lent Froebel Schelling's \textit{Bruno or concerning the Over-Soul} to read. Froebel expressed that he thoroughly understood it and that he had been profoundly moved by it.\textsuperscript{42} This important event happened to him when surveying work on a small estate held by the joint owners, one of whom induced him to read Schelling, and secured him a living for a short time in 1803.

Schelling, a German idealist philosopher, was born at Leonberg in Wurttemberg, the son of a learned Lutheran pastor. He was educated at the cloister school from 1790 to 1792 and at the theological seminary at Tübingen. After holding a position as tutor of the sons of a noble family, he was called to a professorship at Jena in 1798. As he became a friend of Hegel and Hölderlin at Tübingen, so he
became a colleague and friend of Fichte and Schelling at Jena. He also met Goethe and Schiller and became friendly with Goethe. He was struck by the death of his informally engaged fiancee. Three years later he married her mother, Caroline, who divorced his friend, August Scholegel in 1803. When Caroline died in 1809, he was grief-stricken. In 1812 he married Pauline, a friend of Caroline’s.

From 1803 to 1806 Schelling taught philosophy at the new University of Wurzburg, and in 1806 he was called to Munich as an associate of the Academy of Sciences and as secretary of the Academy of Arts. He later became secretary of the philosophical section of the Academy of Sciences. These positions afforded him abundant leisure and also allowed him to lecture at Stuttgart and at Erlangen from 1820 to 1827. In 1827, he became a professor at Munich. In 1841, he was appointed a Prussian privy councillor and a member of the Berlin Academy and he lectured for the next five years at the University of Berlin.

Unlike Fichte’s conception of the world as the construction of the self, Schelling insists that the world of nature is just as real and just as important as the world of the self, although he posits the self as the supreme, unconditioned element in human knowledge. The essence of the self is spirit, and the essence of nature is matter, but the essence of matter is force, that is, attraction and repulsion. In force, Schelling finds the common ground of nature and self. As attraction it is objective, it is nature, it is matter, as repulsion it is subjective, it is self, it is spirit. He saw nature as an infinite self-activity, realising itself in finite matter but forever unexhausted, forever short of completely realising itself. For Schelling the system of nature is at the same time the system of our spirit. Nature is visible spirit, spirit is invisible nature.43

Nature is inseparable from God, but distinguishable from him. God is not to be comprehended rationally, because his essence is will and he can be apprehended only through the will, in action. He distinguishes between God as ground of being and God as perfection. The root of existence is found in nonbeing, in God as the
ungrounded, the abyss, the eternal nothing. Only against the ungrounded can the ground arise, because nothing can become evident without resistance. Thus God for him is eternal contrariety, forever alienating himself from himself. He considers man as the crown of creation and the most interesting and rewarding object of philosophic attention. Man is free creative activity, the essence of the world.

In Froebel's basic idea of educational philosophy, we can easily find some of Schelling's terms such as free creative activity, visible spirit (nature), and the relationship between human beings and the external world. As nature, for Schelling, is more than subjective and more than moral, so, to Froebel nature is visible spirit. But nature to him is also objective and real, because he believes that the whole world was created by God and that nature is a manifestation, a revelation of God.

8) Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776-1841)

As already has been mentioned earlier, according to König, Froebel broadened his philosophical and pedagogical knowledge with a study of the works of Fichte and Herbart. Froebel's relationship with Herbart was through his works and his work on Pestalozzi.

Herbart, German philosopher, psychologist and educational theorist, was born in Oldenburg. Before entering the University of Jena in 1794 he had already gained some acquaintance with the system of Wolff and Kant. In the university he came to know Schiller and Fichte, but he could not accept the idea of the ego and its psychology of Fichte, to whom he handed a critique of two of Schelling's treaties, in which it was clearly shown that he had already broken with Idealism.

In 1797 he took a post as tutor in Switzerland and held the position for three years. After taking his doctorate at Göttingen in 1802, he remained there until 1809. General Theory of Education, Main Points of Metaphysics and General Practical Philosophy were major fruits of this period. In 1809 he moved to Königsberg to
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occupy Kant’s former chair, where in 1810 he established and conducted a seminary in education until 1833. He returned to Göttingen in 1833 and remained there until his death.

Rejecting an idealistic metaphysics with its philosophy of being, Herbart accepts a pluralistic metaphysics and philosophy of being. He declares that being is absolute position; its concept excludes all negation and all relation and the soul is simple substance not only without parts, but with plurality whatever in its quality. Analysis of what is given in experience forced him to believe that we must rest content by positing many simple existences, ‘reals’ - the ultimate ground of things. Such a real was God, such the soul, such the elements of matter. He says:

Man’s worth does not, it is true, lie in his knowing, but in his willing. But there is no such thing as an independent faculty of will. Volition has its roots in thought; not, indeed, in the details one knows, but certainly in the combination and total effect of the acquired ideas.

According to Herbart, ideas spring from two main sources - experience and social intercourse. Knowledge of nature is derived from experience. But he does not depend on nature as much as Rousseau. He said that to leave man to nature, or even to wish to lead him to, and train him up in, nature, is mere folly,... His view on education is closely linked with ethics. He puts it in this way:

Virtue is the whole of the educational purposes. The good will is the steady resolution of a man to consider himself as an individual under the law which is universally binding. The ultimate purpose of instruction is contained in the notion, virtue, morality.

He sums his pedagogy up in this way:

Instruction will form the circle of thought and education the character. The last is nothing without the first; herein is contained the whole sum of my pedagogy.

He makes use of the term ‘apperception’ to designate the general process by which
individual perceptions, ideas or complexes of ideas, are brought into relation to our previously existing system of ideas, and assimilating with them, are raised to greater clearness and distinctness.

Studies comparing Herbart and Froebel were undertaken by three scholars - MacVannel(1905), Cole(1907), Chalke(1912). They agree in holding that for Herbart, the aim of education is morality or virtue, but for Froebel it is more than morality. As will be seen in chapter IV, Froebel aims to bring children the knowledge of unity of all things so that in due time he may be able to act and live in accordance with this insight. It is closely liked with Christianity.

9) Christian Samuel Weiss (1780-1856)

Having heard of the natural history lectures of Professor Weiss in Berlin, Froebel moved to Berlin to study mineralogy, geology and crystallography under him. He puts the results of these studies under Weiss at Berlin in this way:

Geology and crystallography not only opened up for me a higher circle of knowledge and insight, but also showed me a higher goal for my inquiry, my speculation, and my endeavour.50

That is the reason why Weiss should be considered in this influential company.

Weiss’s grandfather and father were archdeacons of Nicolai church. He began a classical education at the age of twelve under the philologist Bauer. In 1796 he returned to Leipzig to study medicine at the University; but after receiving his first degree he switched to chemistry and physics, in which he was awarded the doctorate in 1800 and was then admitted to the faculty. From 1803 he taught chemistry, physics, and mineralogy at Leipzig, and 1808 he was appointed professor of physics. Weiss occupied the chair of mineralogy at the University of Berlin which was newly organised. He also became curator of the mineralogical museum. He served as Rector of the university in 1832-1833.
By 1815 Weiss had developed the idea of crystallographic axes, which were at once a direction of growth and a basis of classification. He traced back the manifold formation and variations of crystals to a primary structural unit - the sphere. Though recognising that the crystalline world presents no spherical form as such, he used the concept of a sphere to classify the progressive complexity of shapes, and showed that, the more complex its surface, the more closely does the crystal approximate to a sphere. Moreover, he used the concept of inherent spherical structure to explain the evolution of successive changes in crystals.\(^{52}\) In addition to his major contributions in crystallography, Weiss published a number of papers in geology.

Through geology and crystallography, Froebel gained a higher circle of knowledge and insight and realized that nature and man mutually explain each other through all their numberless various stages of development. Through his investigation among his crystals and other natural objects he discovered much. He seems to have found the excitement of science through Weiss' lecture. He says:

> I read here more clearly than ever the divine in small as well as in great things. The smallest crystal form serves as a mirror of human development.\(^{53}\)

10) **Karl Christian Friedrich Krause (1781-1832)**

As a matter of fact, Froebel’s autobiography comprises two long letters; one to the Duke of Meiningen and the other to philosopher Krause. In return Krause sent Froebel his books. The latter part of his autobiography proves a warm friendship between Krause and Froebel. Krause also made him acquainted with the work of Commenius and introduced him to the whole learned society of Göttingen.\(^{54}\) Through his readings of Krause’s works, correspondence, and his personal acquaintance(1828) Froebel had a deep relationship with him.

An interesting study about some personal affinities of Froebel and Krause has been done by Cole. He describes them in this way:
Both were Thuringians, both sons of clergymen, both inured to a certain poverty and hardship, both lovers of nature from their youth, both wanderers according to the standard of their period and nation.55

Krause, born at Eisenberg in Thuringia, studied at Jena. He taught music in Dresden for a time. His many efforts to secure a professorship were all unsuccessful owing to his internalist leanings in Göttingen, and the opposition of Schelling in München. In 1805, he joined the Freemasons to further his ideal of a world society. Just as he finally obtained a position at München, he died of a heart attack.

The system of essence invented by himself was intended to mediate between pantheism and theism. Hence Krause called his position "Panentheism" to suggest the idea that God or Absolute Being is one with the world, though not exhausted by it. In his most important work, _Das Urbild der Menshheit_ (Dresden, 1811), Krause speaks of God, man and nature. The self-consciousness as an organic, self-sustaining whole is, according to Krause, the clue to the nature of other beings and God. Considering its own finitude and that of other beings which it encounters, the self-consciousness is led to the idea of an absolute, unconditioned principle upon which it and other creatures and organizations are dependent. This principle is God. God is primordial being, the being without contrariety; he is unity of all that exists. Though he contains the world, he is nevertheless other than and superior to it. The distinction between God and the world is that of whole and part.

Krause regards man as the supreme unification of reason and nature, for man possesses the highest sort of mind joined to the highest sort of body. The main goal of man is the imitation of the divine life both in his inner life and in his social life. He had claimed that finitude is no evil, limitation not an imperfection; and that it is just in order that men may participate with individuality in the being and all-perfectness of God, that they come to exit in determinate form, bound and limited.56

He did not see nature as a blind, mechanical system without consciousness;
for its infinite perpetual activity, which is a pure self-determination, is free. Nature is the divine work of art, at the same time it is itself the artist, fashioning itself. Concerning education he puts like this:

Education consists in such a scientific training of man's powers and inner life as will enable him to express his spirituality. The art of education consists in bringing the subjective and objective conditions of life into one organic, harmonious whole. ... The child must be trained through his self-activity to control himself and his surroundings, and thus to make the world his own, himself being a harmonious part of it. The harmoniously-developed man is the most lovable creature in the world, and at the same time the most striking image of the divine.57)

The unity of life which Froebel had always insisted on, is clearly described by Krause. Hanschmann put their agreements on educational thoughts. He says:

Krause and Froebel were at one in their demand for an education such as would strengthen and bring out the spiritual nature of man. They also agree in placing the Pestalozzian principle of self-activity at the very basis of their educational systems. Froebel's social scheme was simpler and more practical than Krause's, being based solely upon Pestalozzi's three-fold relationship of man, i.e., his relationship to God, to nature, and his fellow-man.58)

Among a number of Froebel's contemporary philosophers in Germany, only ten have been discussed, not because of their excellent ideas over others but because of their remarkable relationships with Froebel. There are, however, plenty of ideas in their thoughts to enable us to understand the main thoughts of the time such as Romanticism, Idealism and Pietism. Their chief concern was to conceptualise their views of God, man and nature and to pursue the right relationships between them and the meaning of the religious life.

What is the position of Froebel among these thoughts? MacVannel points out that Froebel's position may be characterised as a humanized Idealism, or a spiritualized Naturalism. I think that Froebel basically kept his own Christian belief in choosing some ideas among Romanticism, Naturalism, Idealism and Pietism. In my view, his educational aims and his ideas of Christianity, as will be discussed in the
following chapter, are fundamentally tied to Christian teachings. I think that he took some ideas developed by his contemporary philosophers with his Christian belief for his educational theory.

Even under this intellectual climate the subjects which Froebel was interested in and the knowledge he wanted to get were entirely dependent on his goal of life. Even though he admitted that philosophy gave him a higher and unexpected relation to his study and intellectual impulse, he did not think that philosophy was an important subject until 1805 when he became a teacher. His goal of study, therefore, at Jena, although he was a student of philosophy, was to get practical knowledge to be useful in his job.

Now, as an educator, his objectives were strikingly changed. In accordance with his claim that the educator must himself be educated, he made all his efforts to try to find a scientific way of educating human beings\(^5\) and to lay a basis of education in harmony with the nature of man. He wrote to his brother:

> Pedagogy, though independent of philosophy, is closely connected with it. Philosophy indicates the principles of all science, and proceeds from the destiny of man back to the education he requires to fulfil it, and thus enlightens the views, and ennobles the work of the educator.\(^6\)

Froebel’s life and studies have been placed in the context of romanticism and idealism. He made contact with people who had such ideas and studied them through books. But I think that this attempt to examine Froebel’s study life and his relationships with his contemporary philosophers is not wide enough to get a thorough understanding of Froebel himself. In addition to this, his meetings with some educators, especially Pestalozzi, his whole educational activity in cooperation with his colleagues and his Christian life should emerge in the subsequent section.
2. FROEBEL AND PESTALOZZI

Froebel’s life from 1805 to 1816 was called ‘the path to becoming a teacher’ by König, for he became a teacher and was influenced by many progressive educators, and tried to establish his own educational principles and methods through his experience, observation and studies during this period. Therefore it is very natural that most studies of Froebel have not omitted to put great emphasis on this period of his life.

While Froebel’s life and relationships with philosophers have been dealt with in the former section, the following will be discussed in this section so as to extend the understanding of Froebel: his sudden career shift, his meetings with some educators, his two meetings with Pestalozzi and their deep significance, and Pestalozzi’s religious education.

(1) FROEBEL AS NEWLY APPOINTED TEACHER

Intending to become an architect, he moved to Frankfurt am Main. Froebel had still not thought at this stage of becoming a teacher. How did he become a teacher, then? His Czech friend, Kulisch had made preparations for him to work as an architect. Meanwhile he tried to give Froebel the chance of earning a living by giving classes. He introduced him to Gottlieb Anton Gruner (1778-1844) who was one of the most enthusiastic disciples of Pestalozzi and his young teachers. Gruner had worked with Salzmann as well as with Pestalozzi in Burgdorf and had many acquaintances among progressive educators.61)

Gruner had been chosen as the principal of a most successful Pestalozzian Institution called the Model school. Having often had many lively discussions about education and heard of Froebel’s new ideas and aspiration, Gruner said to Froebel:
Give up your architecture; it is not your vocation at all. Become a teacher. We want a teacher in our school. Say you agree, and the place shall be yours.  

Even though he had once thought, comparing his friend's life and his own, "You give man bread; let my aim be to give man himself," he was much startled by so sudden a proposition. Realising that his friend was for accepting Gruner's proposal, he began to hesitate.  

At that critical time, Gruner helped him in his decision. Hanschmann puts it like this:  

Gruner gave Froebel a pamphlet he had written entitled *Letters from Burgdorf* about the Pestalozzian methods and institution. He informed Froebel that he had gone to Switzerland for a holiday and rest after his training as tutor and class teacher, and had made his visit to Burgdorf with the idea of refuting the newfangled, much-vaunted Pestalozzian methods, which appeared to him to be a relapse into barbarism. But lo! he had found that this very method was the best cure for existing evils in education; so that the intended scoffer had become a most enthusiastic disciple. He had come to curse, but remained to pray.  

Why did many people come to see Pestalozzi and his school? Which principles attracted wide attention to Pestalozzi and what brought him great fame at its height? He had found out three terrible things in the school practice of his time: the children of the poorest excluded from education, a superficial verbosity and the unmerciful corporal punishment on children for their failure.  

The following six principles employed by Pestalozzi as he sought to redirect school's aims have been summarised by Kilpatrick:  

i) Personality is everywhere sacred. This constitutes the "inner dignity" of each individual, for the young as truly as for the adult;  

ii) As "a little seed... contains the design of the tree," so in each child is the promise of his potentiality. "The educator only takes care that no untoward influence shall disturb nature's march of developments";
iii) Love of those we would educate is "the sole and everlasting foundation." in which to work. "Without love, neither the physical nor the intellectual powers will develop naturally." So kindness ruled in Pestalozzi's school: he abolished flogging-to the amazement of all outsiders;
iv) To get rid of the "verbosity" of meaningless words Pestalozzi developed his fundamental doctrine of "Anschauung," direct concrete observation. In his school no word was to be used for any purpose until adequate Anschauung had preceded. The thing or the distinction must some how be seen or felt or otherwise observed in the concrete;
v) To perfect the perception got by the Anschauung, the thing must be named, and appropriate action must follow. "A man learns by action... have done with words!... Life shapes us and the life that shapes us is not a matter of words but action";
vi) Apparently out of this demand for action came an emphasis on repetition - never blind repetition - repetition of action following the Anschauung.

In addition to these, religion, moral training, preparation of a child for actual duties were the greatest of Pestalozzi's ideals.

In spite of the fact that Froebel's determination to become a teacher meant the loss of his college certificates and testimonials and the cutting of himself adrift from his past, he was glad to accept the post of assistant in the Model school after hearing Gruner's own experience. What initially happened to Froebel as a newly appointed teacher? I think that two striking points are worthy of presentation at this juncture: his expression of happiness from his first meeting pupils in the classroom and his eagerness to see Pestalozzi.

He writes of his feelings about his first teaching experience in the classroom consisting of thirty or forty boys of nine to eleven years of age in a letter to his brother dated the end of August, 1805. In this letter his pure joy and oneness with his pupils are clearly expressed:
I felt like a fish in water, a bird in the air, perfectly at home in my work, and as if I had always been a teacher. Indeed, it was as if I had never wished for anything else, and yet, before I entered that schoolroom I had never dreamed of such a thing as possible for me. Now I know I am in my element in the classroom; I cannot tell you how quickly and pleasantly the time flies; I love the children, and they love me, and we quite look forward to the lessons.

It was Froebel’s interest in Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746-1827) and his work that had been awakened by the story and essays of Gruner and others. Gruner gave him Pestalozzi’s Essays on the Progress of Education in Switzerland, and a Biography of Pestalozzi. Froebel, therefore, felt that he must see Pestalozzi with his own eyes.

(2) FROEBEL WITH PESTALOZZI

No one can deny that Froebel’s two meetings with Pestalozzi enriched his educational career. Froebel says that before seeing him:

The watchword of teaching and of education was at this time the name of Pestalozzi. It soon became evident to me that Pestalozzi was to be the watchword of my life.

We cannot miss the significance of his meetings with Pestalozzi if we were to understand Froebel and his educational activities.

I would like to elucidate the importance of his visits to Pestalozzi in this section. What did he observe and learn during his stays at Yverdon? What were his impression of Pestalozzi? How did he understand Pestalozzi and his educational activities? What are the results from his two meetings with Pestalozzi? Why did he visit him again three years later? By answering these questions we shall be able to trace the developing maturity of Froebel as a teacher and his deep affinity with Pestalozzi.
1) His first visit to Pestalozzi

It was at the end of August in 1805 that Froebel went to Yverdon to see Pestalozzi. Yverdon Institution had been established in the first day of July 1805. Pinoche explained that this period was the most glorious and at the same time the most troublesome for Pestalozzi - glorious because of the triumph of his ideas in Europe, troublesome because of the difficulties doubtlessly inseparable from every educational establishment.69)

Gruner and his colleague’s letters of instruction obtained him a most hearty welcome. The classes were freely opened to him like other visitors and Pestalozzi and his teachers were always ready to give him help and information. But he was not able to conduct a rigorous examination into details of method and into the way they were connected to form a whole system, for he was still very inexperienced both in the theory and practice of teaching.70)

He wrote about several subjects of teaching after his fortnight stay with Pestalozzi. The results of the arithmetic teaching by Krusi astounded him by its rapidity and apparent success. But he felt that he could not follow it into its larger applications and wider extent. He mentioned that the teaching of drawing was very incomplete. He was not pleased with seeing the beginning of the physical geography course, which began with an account of the bottom of the sea, although the pupils could have no conception of their own as to its nature or dimensions. "Nevertheless the teaching by Tobler, an active young teacher, aroused astonishment."71)

Of natural history Froebel only heard Botany undertaken by Hopf who had prepared the plan of instruction in this subject for all the school. Hopf would let the pupils discuss all the forms they knew at every discoverable point in the lesson, e.g. the position of the leaves or of the flowers. This principle interested Froebel very much, but he thought there was something almost disturbing in its application. Froebel thought that the language-teaching in the school was, at that time, conducted
in an arbitrary and non-productive style. Singing was taught from figures. Reading was taught from Pestalozzi’s well-known "A,B,C".

Froebel remembering his stay with Pestalozzi some twenty-two years later, makes it clear that his impression of Pestalozzi was deep and outstanding:

I saw the whole training of a great educational institution, worked upon a clean and firmly-settled plan of teaching. I still possess the "teaching plan" of Pestalozzi’s institution in use at that time. This teaching-plan contains, in my opinion, much that is excellent, somewhat also that is prejudicial. Excellent, I thought, was the contrivance of so-called "exchange classes". In each subject the instruction was always given through the entire establishment at the same time. Thus the subjects for teaching were settled for every class, but the pupils were distributed amongst the various classes according to their proficiency in the subject in hand, so that the whole body of pupils was redistributed in quite distinct division for each subject. The advantage of this contrivance struck me as so undeniable and so forcible that I have never since relinquished it in my educational work, nor could I now bring myself to do so.73

Froebel says that Pestalozzi himself seemed to be almost bewildered by the mental machinery of the place. Instead of giving any account of his methods, Pestalozzi used to say "Come and see, it goes grandly."73 At that time Prince Hardenberg, commissioned by the Austrian Government, had come to examine thoroughly into Pestalozzi’s work. This occasion made his stay there more vivid. He says:

The life there was especially vigorous; internally and externally it was a living, moving, stirring existence.76

Froebel’s short visit came to an end about the middle of October, 1805. He felt very sorry not to stay with him as long as he desired. This is one of the reasons why he visited him once more. When he returned to Frankfurt, he carried away the following few words in the handwriting of Pestalozzi:

By thought and speech is your road prepared, but silent action alone will enable you to reach the goal.75
Here is König's comment on the result and meaning of Froebel's first visit to Pestalozzi:

Froebel used these two weeks to the full and nothing is better witness to this than the words Pestalozzi addressed to Gruner: We are pleased to have made the acquaintance of Mr. Froebel. He took part in everything we were doing with great enthusiasm and I am hopeful that he will dedicate himself heart and soul to furthering our common cause.76)

Coming back to Frankfurt, Froebel concentrated on continuing to build up the model school and completing his own general and pedagogical education.

There was a noteworthy experience for Froebel during the period between his first visit to Pestalozzi and his second visit (1805-1808). He taught children aged nine to eleven as a permanent teacher at the Model School for two years and three boys as a private tutor for four years. As these different teaching experiences led him to see Pestalozzi again, some brief explanation about them is required.

Froebel was given the task of reorganising the Model school. He took up his task with the utmost spirit and resolution. He says:

This period of my life became full of zeal, of active development, of advancing culture, and in consequence, of happiness. And my life in the Model School also, with my boys and with my excellent colleagues, usually clever men, was very elevating and encouraging.77)

He had to show his teaching to the public, for his class became the show class of the school. He won not only the unanimous approval of the parents present but also the special commendation of his superiors, although he felt that his first attempt was full of imperfection. The subjects he taught were physiography, arithmetic, drawing and orthography. According to Hanschmann, Froebel applied the Pestalozzian system in his own way to all these subjects.

Despite this successful outcome of his teaching at the Model School, he was
determined to resign his post in order to develop his life and his mind for the sake of education. In those days he spoke of his aims in the following way:

I desire to educate men whose feet shall stand on God’s earth, rooted fast in nature, while their head towers up to heaven, and reads its secrets with steady gaze, whose heart shall embrace both earth and heaven, shall enjoy the life of earth and nature with all its wealth of forms, and at the same time shall recognise the purity and peace of heaven, that unites in its love God’s earth with God’s heaven.\(^7\)\(^8\)

But his circumstances did not allow him to go straight forward and do what he planned.\(^7\)\(^9\) Frau von Holzhausen and her three sons pleaded with him to become their family tutor. Notwithstanding Gruner’s strong retorting and his unsuccessful previous teaching experience for them, his affection for the lads and his endeavour to look at things from the point of their parents brought him at last after much conflict with himself to the determination to become their teacher.

The following conviction and questions occurred in Froebel’s mind when he began to apply his thoughts vigorously to the subjects of education and instruction. He says:

The first thing that absorbed me was the clear conviction that to educate properly one must share the life of one’s pupil. Then came the questions, “What is elementary education? and of what value are the educational methods advocated by Pestalozzi? Above all, what is the purpose of education?\(^8\)\(^0\)

What Froebel regards as the most pregnant thought was this:

All is unity, all rests in unity, all springs from unity, strives for and leads up to unity, and returns to unity at last.\(^8\)\(^1\)

He tried to make the three boys free from the trammels of convention and old association and to get complete control over them. He shared their life by living, lounging, strolling in the open air and going for walks. They were encouraged to take
an interest in natural objects by Froebel during rambles. They enjoyed growing new plants, vegetables, fruits and flowers and caring for them in a piece of meadowland which their father gave them. Their activities consisted in outdoor exercises (rambles, skipping, walking on stilts, and playing at ball), indoor exercises at the Winter time, drawing and designs on chequers, perforating paper or cardboard, cutting and weaving paper, geometrical cardboard work and woodworking.

2) His second visit to Pestalozzi

Feeling his inability to fulfil his intention and the necessity of some regular plan of study for the boys before entering a public school, Froebel once more turned his attention to Pestalozzi. He wrote:

To sketch my first attempt as an educator in one phrase, I sought with all my powers to give my pupils the best possible instruction, and the best possible training and culture, but I was unable to fulfil my intentions, to attain my end, in the position I then occupied, and with the degree of culture to which I had myself attained. As soon as this had become fully evident to me, it occurred to my mind that nothing else could be so serviceable to me as a sojourn for a time with Pestalozzi. I expressed this conviction with great determination; and it was accordingly decided in the summer of 1808 that I should go there with my three pupils.8

Hanschmann explains the mood of Yverdon school and Froebel’s plan in this way:

The school at Yverdon was at this time at the very height of its renown; pupils were flocking to that place from all parts of the world; and Froebel conceived the plan of placing the education of the boys in the hands of the great teacher, and, whilst superintending their studies, of perfecting himself in the Pestalozzian methods.83

What was the expectation of Froebel himself? He writes:

If I attempt to put in one word what I expected there, it was a strong and a vigorous spiritual life of boyhood and youth, manifesting itself in all forms of creative activity and so finding satisfaction for all human cravings, and
employment for all bodily and spiritual capacities,... There was no question troubling me to which I did not expect me to find an answer at Yverdon.  

Their daily routine is revealed by Blochmann. The pupils rose at five and the teachers at four, or even earlier. The pupils prepared their lessons from six to seven; then Pestalozzi conducted morning prayers. These were attended by everyone. After prayers the children washed in the courtyard, the stronger of them standing, even in the winter, naked in the frozen stream. Both teachers and pupils went about with bare heads and uncovered necks.

The attendance was called immediately after breakfast, and then followed lessons on scripture, language, number and form. At noon teachers and pupils hastened to the lake to play, bathe or swim until dinner time. The dinner was simple and short, and lessons began again at two o'clock. Four to five was devoted to gymnastics, recreation, and refreshment; then there was work again for three hours, after which came supper and prayers. The pupils went to bed at nine o'clock, after which the teachers attended teachers’ meetings or lectures on pedagogy, or Pestalozzi would have interviews with any boys the teachers brought him as deserving of praise or remonstrance.

Apart from these daily activities, they would have special activities enjoying the beautiful environment around them. Hanschmann writes about them like this:

On Saturdays they would wander, after school, into the Jura mountains, or visit the neighbouring shepherds’ huts.... On festival occasions pilgrimages were made to some beautiful spot on the Lake of Geneva; sometimes they would venture as far as the Canton of Valais and in the summer holidays they would even penetrate as far as Mont St. Gothard, in the Bernese Oberland.

Beside attending all the lessons with his pupils, Froebel had made this opportunity to reason out with Pestalozzi each branch of instruction from its first point of connection with the rest and to study it from its very root. What, then, are Froebel’s impressions and estimate of Pestalozzi’s system? They can be found in his...
autobiography and his report to the Duchess of Rudolstadt.\textsuperscript{87} According to Froebel, while the forcible, comprehensive, stimulating life stimulated him and seized upon him with all its comprehensiveness and all its force, he saw many imperfections and deficiencies. He says:

The want of unity of effort, both as to means and aims, I soon felt; I recognised it in the inadequacy, the incompleteness, and the unlikeness of the ways in which the various subjects were taught. ... I could see something higher, and I believed in a higher efficiency, a closer unity of the whole educational system; in truth, I believe I saw this clear, though not with greater conviction, than Pestalozzi himself.\textsuperscript{88}

He considered this period as a time of great danger to the school, for neither Pestalozzi nor his friends, neither any individuals nor the whole community could give him what he wanted. He describes his chaotic state in this way.

Now it was exactly at such a time of supreme crisis that I had the good or the evil fortune to be at Yverdon. All that was good and all that was bad, all that was profitable and all that was unprofitable, all that was strong and all that was weak, all that was empty and all that was full, all that was selfish and all that was unselfish amongst Pestalozzi and his friends, was displayed openly before me.\textsuperscript{89}

Even though this expression is quite ambiguous, it seems to me that his experience of Yverdon with which he was not satisfied may have forced him to take up further study at Göttingen and Berlin University later. After two years' stay with Pestalozzi he tells us in this way:

On the whole I passed a glorious time at Yverdon, elevated in tone, and critically decisive for my later life. At its close, however, I felt more clearly than ever the deficiency of inner unity and interdependence as well as outward comprehensiveness and thoroughness in the teaching there.\textsuperscript{90}

In the short summary of the Pestalozzian system sent to the Dutchess of Rudolstadt, he speaks of the early training of the child, mother's book, mother's duty to develop sense-impressions by repetition, the role of the father and the teachers for
over seven year old children, how to develop children’s thinking power and the study of the earth, rivers and numbers and forms and so on. According to Hanschmann\(^9\), Froebel indicates three grades for Pestalozzian schools; an infant class, for which the *Mother’s Book* is sufficient and a first school class and a second class, in which lessons in form, number, reading, writing, signing, scripture and nature are given.

(3) RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF PESTALOZZI

In Froebel’s criticism of the lack of comprehensiveness in Pestalozzi’s teachings he emphasizes religious instruction. He stated that Pestalozzi’s devotional addresses were very vague, and as experience showed, were only serviceable to those already in the right way.\(^9\) On account of Froebel’s deep interest for religious education for young children and his ardent concern about Pestalozzi’s education, Pestalozzi’s ideas of religious education need to be examined. Besides the various deserving titles for Pestalozzi such as author, father of the orphans, social educator, psychologist, and methodizer, one of the great religious educators can be added to them as Robert Ulich did in *A History of Religious Education*. I would like to present his Christian home background, his ideas on Christianity, and his religious education for children in brief.

Zurich, the birth place of Pestalozzi, had been the centre of Ulrich Zwingli’s(1484-1531) labours and the Reformation had been firmly established there in 1522. In 1567, Anthony Pestalozzi and his wife, settled in Zurich, having been exiled from Italy for having adopted the reformed faith. Andrew Pestalozzi, the son of these refugees and grandfather of Henry Pestalozzi was a pastor of Hongg, near Zurich. The son of Andrew was called John Baptist Pestalozzi. He was a good surgeon and eye doctor. His wife’s name was Sussanna Hotz.

When Pestalozzi spent his holidays with his grandfather, the minister at Hongg, he saw him visiting the sick and the poor in the parish. From this time at the age of nine he wished to be a village pastor. In order to become a minister of the Gospel he studied theology and went to the length of preaching his trial sermon; but
It was not a success. He, therefore, gave up the idea of entering the church and determined to study law.\textsuperscript{93} Having changed his mind many times in choosing his job, he, at last, became an educator.

It is not difficult to find out Pestalozzi's ideas on Christianity from his writings. He believes in God as the Father of his house, as the Source of all happiness, as his own Father, the Creator. He said that religion is nothing else than the endeavour of the spirit to keep flesh and blood in order by attachment to the Creator of our being.\textsuperscript{94} He tried to explain the meaning of faith in God in many ways. He says:

Man's relationship to God is the nearest of all his relationships. ... Faith in God is in accord with the highest human feelings... Faith in God gives the peace on which social order depends, on which, again depends that undisturbed use of our power which is essential to its increase and its development towards wisdom, ... Faith in God is the beginning of wisdom and blessedness... Faith in God is graven deep in man's nature. ... Faith in God is ever the people's portion. Faith in God is not the consequence of training and education; it is the consciousness of the pure and the simple, who with innocent ear listen to Nature's voice that God is their Father. Childlike obedience is not the result of a finished education; it is the very beginning, the foundation there of.\textsuperscript{95}

He believes that salvation is not the power of man, but of the power of God.\textsuperscript{96} Pestalozzi considered Christ the personified ideal of the highest perfection of human nature and repeatedly referred to Christ the son of God. He also mentions Christ's Divinity.

According to Kate Silber his humility was based on Christian belief. Silber shows how the life of Pestalozzi was tightly woven into Christian faith:

He accepted his success not as his due but as a gift and he regarded himself not as its creator but as a tool used by a great hand. He states, "It is not my works; it is God's work. Mine was the love with which I searched for what I did not know, mine the faith with which I hoped for what I did not see. I praise the Father in heaven whose strength was made perfect in weakness, and human nature appears to me in a praiseworthy light, since I now know
from experience that it is given to man to unite all his powers in love for the service of his fellow-men." A new relationship with God speaks from his letters and addresses. 

When Pestalozzi propounds his educational aims, he links education to God. A higher aim to which education leads man is to qualify the human being to the free and full use of all the faculties implanted by the Creator and to direct all these faculties towards the perfection of the whole being of man. He says:

I lay the keystone of my instruction upon the early development of a natural motive to fear God; for though I am thoroughly convinced that religion is badly used as an exercise for the understanding and as a subject of instruction for children, yet I am equally convinced that as the affair of the heart it is a necessary for my nature even at the tenderest age; that as such it cannot too early be awakened, purified or elevated. From Moses to Christ all the prophets have tried to connect this sentiment with the innocence of the childlike mind, and to develop and nourish it through sense impression of all nature. ... through an eye, opened by infinite preparation of the art, I show the child the world, and he no longer dreams of God, he sees Him; he lives in contemplation (Anschauung) of Him. He prays to Him.

He also explains through his writings how a child is led to God through maternal love. He emphasizes the role of the pious mother in religious education for children like this:

As her love towards God is reflected in her child, and develops into assurance of His love and His power as he sees it in her, so his receptiveness for all good grows correspondingly.

He believes that just as the mother gives her child the first material food, so is she ordained by God to give it its first spiritual food.

In Leonard and Gertrude he sets forth in simple language his views on religious instruction, which are in opposition to religious instruction based merely on many words apart from their real life situation:

He united his efforts to those of Gluphi and Margaret, striving to lead the
children without many words to a quiet industrious life, and thus to lay the foundation of a silent worship of God and love of humanity. To this end he connected every word of his brief religious teachings with their actual everyday experience, so that when he spoke of God and eternity it seemed to them as if he were speaking of father and mother, house and home, in short, of the things with which they were most familiar. ... He no longer allowed the children to learn any long prayers by rote, saying that this was contrary to the spirit of Christianity and the express injunctions of their Saviour. 103

He also gives us the importance of examples in religious education. When the child sees his mother praying to her heavenly Father, and when he notes how she is moved by the spirit in the words of Scripture, he will want to pray with her because he also believes in God. He puts it in this way:

In this manner, the child with the help of the mother elevates himself from natural and sensual love and confidence, to human love and trust; from these he raises himself to true Christian faith and Christian love. 102

Pestalozzi, in the Swan Song, speaks of the importance of mother’s prayer and other examples for her child like this:

When the mother says, ‘I have a Father from whom all the good things come that you and I possess’, the child believes his mother’s words and trusts in this Heavenly Father. And when she, as a Christian, prays to Him, when she reads the message of God’s love in the Bible, and is quickened by its spirit the child likes pray with her; he also believes in the word of Him whose spirit he has already learned to recognize in her mother’s own doings. In this way the child’s simple love for his mother is naturally extended to the love of his fellows, and from this to the ideal faith and love of true Christian. 103

As a matter fact, there are some people who have feeling of uncertainty whether Pestalozzi was a Christian. 104 But according to a testimony given by one of Pestalozzi’s first pupils at Yverdon, Pestalozzi’s education was Christian one. He puts it like this:

He prepared many souls for the discipline of the Gospel and the ways of God for their salvation. I have often been struck with the number of the old pupils of Pestalozzi, who, later, reached the faith for which they seemed to have
been prepared.\textsuperscript{105} ... I can add to the praise of this excellent man, that if he did not develop in me the fear of God and faith in the Saviour, I learned under him to do my work as a scholar from a feeling of duty rather than from the dangerous motives of praise and reward.\textsuperscript{106}

Undoubtedly, Pestalozzi devoted himself to education for the poor and orphans on the basis of Christianity. Hayward comments on this matter in this way:

His religion is a matter of dispute; but though he had no sympathy with any form of dogmatic theology, there is no clear evidence against the substantial orthodoxy of his views. If love of mankind is good evidence of sound religion, he was one of the most religious man that ever lived.\textsuperscript{107}

Ulich gives an explanation on labels such as orthodox and liberal when applied to Pestalozzi:

Pestalozzi was liberal only in his protest against the social injustice and ecclesiasticism of his time and in his insistence on organic as against verbal and artificial education. But in his Christ-centred religiosity he remained in the orthodox tradition.\textsuperscript{108}

I think that this presentation concerning Pestalozzi's religious education will help us to see if Froebel's religious education for young children is related to Pestalozzi. Pestalozzi's conviction, confessions of faith and ideas on Christianity are easily found in his educational works. Pestalozzi who believed God as the Father, the Creator and the Source of all happiness lived his life based on his belief. As was indicated earlier, the aim of his education is closely liked to Christianity, too. He emphasizes the importance of the role of the pious mother to lead a child to God and a mother's prayer. Giving some examples of religious instruction, Pestalozzi insists that religious instruction must be based not on many words but on their real life.

As Froebel wrote books with the same titles of Pestalozzi's \textit{The Education of Man}, \textit{Mother's book}, as will be demonstrated in Chapter IV and V, so there are many similar things in Froebel's religious education. I agree with Chalk who indicates that Pestalozzi and Froebel agreed that all educational progress, to be lasting and real,
must be founded on the religion of Jesus Christ.\textsuperscript{109)

3. FROEBEL AND HIS COLLEAGUES

It is essential to consider Froebel's colleagues among his contemporaries in the last part of this chapter because many insights and information concerning Froebel and his works will emerge. It may also have a side effect of making known, in the history of education, their contributions and devotion to teaching children. In order to meet such purposes, the following points will be discussed: Froebel's relationships with his colleagues, how they worked with Froebel, and the significance of their cooperation in connection with Christian education. In dealing with them, I will divide them into three groups: his friends, his family and the others.

(1) HIS THREE FRIENDS

Froebel says, in a letter to Adolf Frankenberg:

\begin{quote}
After fifteen years' work at Keilhau, I left it in the care of my three friends. Then I worked at Willisau for three years, one of the same trio taking up my work. Here (at Burgdorf) I have hardly been one year, when I must leave it to another of this faithful trio to continue.\textsuperscript{109}
\end{quote}

Froebel's trust and their faithfulness can be seen through this statement. Who are these faithful friends of Froebel? Where did they meet and how did they develop their friendship? What did they do with and for him?

1) Wilhelm Middendorff (1793-1853)

After the death of Froebel, Middendorff, as the fellow-worker and fellow-sufferer, regarded himself as the natural representative of Froebel's system and the
When Froebel joined the volunteer corps of Lutzow's "Black Reiflemen" he was introduced by Jahn to a young Thuringian named Heinrich Langethal who introduced Froebel to his great friend Wilhelm Middendorff. Thus two most remarkable friendships were formed at camp in 1813. They were both Froebel's juniors by ten years and students of Berlin University. After the disbanding of the corps Froebel did not know where they were. It was therefore an unexpected pleasure when he eventually found them all at Berlin again.

The two young men returned and continued their theological studies in earnest and Froebel went on with his natural science. Middendorff and Langethal found work in Berlin as private tutors. They brought their difficulties to Froebel, who gave them, twice a week, instruction in mathematics. Middendorff shared Froebel's lodging for a short period. The two friends became deeply attached to one another through these events.

Middendorff was born at Brechten, near Dortmund in Westphalia. He had four sisters, but was the only boy, the youngest and the favourite of the family and the one great wish of his parents had been to see him pastor in his native place. Having completed his theological studies he decided to join Froebel. Hanschmann says:

Had it not been for his utter belief in Froebel's genius, he would never have been able to resist his parents' entreaties, nor to listen unmoved to his father's parting words of submission. We have been richly blessed. One must be offered up as a sacrifice.

Middendorff arrived at Griesheim on the 14th of April in 1817 bringing with him, as pupil, Langethal's young brother, Christian, who later became the Jena Professor of botany. From this time to the end of his life Middendorff devoted himself to the service of Froebel and his ideas.

What was Middendorff like? Froebel said that he was a childlike man who understood him with his heart. According to the Baroness Marenholz, he has a good,
honour-bright, steadfast, genuine character with an innocent, child-like good nature. She continues to say:

A beautiful simplicity, the inheritance of a by-gone generation, characterized Middendorff. Great tenderness of nature gave him an almost feminine stamp. To conquer all opposition with love; to harmonize discords; to cloak faults when they could not be avoided; to see the better side, even in the darkest days; with pious devotion, to trust that the all-powerful providence would bring all things right: all this, with a child-like warmth of feeling, indicated the ideal spiritual guide that, in past times, was often found in the village pastor\textsuperscript{14)}

He worked as a teacher at Keilhau\textsuperscript{15)} and stayed at Willisau for years without visiting his family once. He had various journeys with Froebel to promote the Kindergarten movement. He was in charge of the college at Marienthal and removed to Keilhau with the assistance of Madam Luise Froebel, Froebel's second wife, after Froebel's death. Middendorff sent to the German Parliament, in 1848, a carefully-written essay in defence of the Kindergarten as a necessary part of modern education.\textsuperscript{16)} He was received enthusiastically by the Congress at Salzungen, when addressing it on Froebelian methods.

Interesting comparisons between Middendorff and Froebel made by Hanschmann help us see how Middendorff worked in combination with Froebel:

Froebel's attitude towards nature was perhaps rather that of a scientist and investigator, whilst Middendorff's approached nearer to that of the poet or artist. Middendorff possessed the gift of eloquence which was lacking in Froebel. ... Middendorff loved to stimulate the children's imagination, whilst Froebel sought rather to develop their reason and intelligence.\textsuperscript{17)}

In a conversation with the Baroness Marenholz in the presence of Froebel, he expressed his deepest conviction like this:

The spirit of Christianity, so very much misunderstood and mistaken at present, will awaken to new life in children, and appear in a new and a higher light when Froebel's idea of education has been practically applied, this is my deepest conviction.\textsuperscript{18)}
Here is one statement about Middendorff's religious instruction stated by his pupil:

I have the privilege of attending his class in religious instruction, and have there learned to know what is his most profound religious sentiment. I am sure that he is a Christian; he meets my whole ideal of a true Christian and yet can he be mistaken in his belief? \(^{(119)}\)

He has undoubtedly done his best in working with Froebel as a faithful co-worker, teacher, spokesmen, defender, propagandist and successor. Baroness Marenholz described Middendorff as Froebel's "good angel" during his earthly pilgrimage. \(^{(120)}\)

2) Heinrich Langethal (1792-1879)

Langethal, Middendorff's friend and comrade in arms, was born at Erfurt in 1792. When very young, his father entrusted him with the education of a younger brother and the boy's progress was so rapid that other parents had requested to have their sons share the hours of instruction. After completing his studies at the grammar school he entered Berlin University where he studied theology and philosophy. He became acquainted with Middendorff at Schleiermacher's lectures.

As indicated in the previous section, Langethal met Froebel at camp in Dresden. He enjoyed his private tutorship while studying at Berlin after the war. Even though three pupils were offered to him as the result of passing the last examination with the greatest distinction he did not accept any of them, because he longed for rest and a quiet occupation. \(^{(121)}\)

It was five months later than Middendorff that Langethal joined Froebel at Keihau. Much more information about him is given by his pupils. \(^{(122)}\)

Langethal was at that time a very handsome man of five and twenty with kindness of heart, gentleness and benevolence. The dignity of his whole
bearing was enhanced by the sonorous tones of his voice and his whole manner revealed manly firmness. He does not fear death, because he knows that God who leads all to the goal allotted by nature destined him also for no other.

When Froebel asked Langethal what goal in life he had set before him he replied:

Like the apostle, I would fain proclaim, the Gospel to all men according to the best of my powers, in order to bring them into close communion with the Redeemer. Froebel answered, thoughtfully: If you desire that, you must, like the apostles, know men. You must be able to enter into the life of every one. - here a peasant there a mechanic. If you cannot, do not hope for success; your influence will not extend far.

He was an excellent teacher in teaching the classics and ancient history. Langethal was the means of making the institution more widely known. His position as a scientific man and his connection both with Berlin and with Erfurt brought several pupils to the school. His sympathetic manner won all hearts, and exercised an excellent influence over the boys. He tried to teach them to become true German knights by many activities. He was also a gifted musician.

Langethal succeeded Froebel at Burgdorf with Ferdinand Froebel when Froebel took his wife to Berlin because of her illness. But later he left Froebel and undertook the management of a girls’ school at Bern. He became a minister in Schleusinger, returning eventually to Keilhau. He was then quite blind. Frankenberg adds a fragment about Langethal’s work:

We next went to Leipzig, where the idea had already been introduced by Langethal. ... Vogel says Froebel’s apparatus is so simple that it wants demonstrating, and that this was excellently done by Langethal.

3) Johannes Arnold Barop

It was Barop who wrote Critical Moments in the Froebel Community. He was
born in 1802 as a son of lawyer in Dortmund and studied theology at Halle. He was a son of Middendorff's sister. He was so attracted by Froebel's spirit that he determined to join Keilhau with the exception of a year's military service in Berlin and the time he helped Froebel in Wartensee and Willisau. Keilhau was headed by Barop after Froebel's death. As the result of this, he could not inherit his portion until his father's death.

Georg Ebers, one of Barop's students, speaks of Barop in this way:

Barop's voice sounded so sincere and cordial that it banished every thought of fear, otherwise his appearance might have inspired boys of our age with a certain timidity, for he was a broad-shouldered man of gigantic stature, who like Middendorff, wore his grey hair parted in the middle, though it was cut somewhat shorter. ...Earnest, thoroughly natural, able, strong, reliable, rigidly just, free from any touch of caprice, he lacked no quality demanded by his arduous profession, and hence he whom even the youngest addressed as "Barop" never failed for an instant to receive the respect which was his due, and moreover, had from us all the voluntary gift of affection, nay, of love. He was, I repeat, every inch a man.1 2 9)

When he proposed to Emilie, third daughter of Christian Froebel, his future parents-in-law asked him whether he surely would not remain longer in Keilhau. He answered:

Yes, I do intend to remain here. The idea for which we live seems to me to be in harmony with the spirit of the age, and also of deep importance in itself; and I have no doubt but that men will come to believe in us because of our right understanding of this idea, in the same way that we ourselves believe in the invisible.130)

A striking event happened at Willisau. There was a serious persecution of Froebel, his nephew and Barop owing to their Protestant belief. They were accused as heretics by the Catholic clergy who awakened a bad feeling among the people gathering at the annual church festival in Willisau. Thenceforth their lives were not safe. Feeling very uneasy at their insecure condition, Barop was sent to the authorities of the canton. On his way, he was recognised by a priest as he rested a moment in
Having received glances of hatred and the contempt of the people and his violent denunciation, at last Barop asked him, "Do you know sir, who Jesus Christ was, and do you hold Him in any particular esteem?" He stammered out, "Certainly He is God the Son, and we must all honour Him and believe on Him, if we are to escape everlasting damnation." He continued, "Then perhaps you can tell me whether Christ was a Catholic or a Protestant?" The priest was silenced and the crowd began to applaud.\(^\text{131}\) This event tells us one scene about their life in relation with Christian life. Barop, according to his pupil, was very strict in the observance of religious duties, but he never demanded anything for the sake of mere appearances.\(^\text{132}\)

After all, these three friends all became Froebel’s relatives by their marriage. Middendorff was Barop’s uncle, but they both became sons-in-law of Froebel’s brother, Christian Ludwig Froebel. And Langethal married Eruest Crispini, Froebel’s foster daughter in 1826. As far as Froebel’s colleagues are concerned, he was very happy. Shirreff says that it was a loving family, as Froebel had desired it should be.\(^\text{133}\) Kriege rightly evaluated Froebel’s friends saying:

They all lived, like the first Christians, in brotherly love and community of goods.... the devotion of his friends was truly wonderful. Middendorff, Barop, Froebel’s brother were his faithful companions through a life time and shared all his privations and struggles; theirs was truly a faith that removed mountains.\(^\text{134}\)

(2) HIS FAMILY

The place of his family in Froebel’s educational career is of major importance. There are three groups in his family to consider in this study: Christian Ludwig’s family, Henritte Hoffmeister and Luise Levin.
1) Christian Ludwig Froebel (1770-1851)

Among his five brothers, only two elder brothers\(^{135}\) families are involved in Froebel's educational work. Christoph, his second elder brother who had always sympathised with Froebel throughout life, had died of typhus fever while performing his pastoral duties of ministry to the sick in 1813. He left a young widow and four children - a little girl and three boys - Julius, Karl, Theodor.\(^{136}\) Their mother with perplexity about their future education wanted to get Froebel's advice. Hanschmann says:

> Friedrich, on his side, feeling his nephews to be a sacred trust, looked upon this as a call from heaven, and felt that his hour had come.\(^{137}\)

He undertook to teach her sons with those of his third elder brother, Christian Froebel. Thus the first school at Griesheim, later Keilhau by Froebel was founded in 1816. His brother's sudden death made him put his idea of education into practice.

Nine years before, in a letter to Christoph, Froebel had said:

> My plan is extremely simple; what I want is a happy family school, and a peaceful life with nature around me.\(^{138}\)... Not to be announced with trumpet tongue to the world, but to win for itself in a small circle, perhaps only among the parents whose children should be entrusted to his care, the name of a happy family institution; ... and then at last he would live in the country the self-ennobling life which had been his earliest, brightest, dearest wish.\(^{139}\)

Thus under the sad circumstance of his family, Froebel's dream came true.

In what aspects could we regard Christian Froebel as Froebel's colleague? As Kriegs called Christian his faithful companion through a life time, three manifest reasons can prove him to be one of them.

First of all, Christian, like his sister-in-law, gave Froebel his two sons - Ferdinand and Wilhelm - when they were eight and six years old. He whom Froebel
made his confidant as far as that was possible was at that time a cloth-maker at Osterode in the Harz district. This is the first step through which he became involved in Froebel’s work.

Secondly, he moved with his wife and daughters—Albertine, Emilie and Elise to Keilhau in order to give moral and material support to the community in 1820. According to Barop, he had placed his entire fortune unconditionally in the hands of Froebel, but even this sacrifice was not sufficient to satisfy the need for money. In this way, he substantially supported the educational system.

Thirdly, his children became the support of their uncle Froebel. Ferdinand was the director of the Orphanage founded by Froebel in Burgdorf. Albertine married Middendorff and her sister Emilie married Barop. The help of Christian’s son and his giving two daughters in marriage to Froebel’s friends made the community more steady and more solid. It is true that the contributions of his brother’s family were vital for Froebel to keep his school throughout his life. Karl, the second son of Christoph, played an important role as a witness. He made known his uncle’s work by publishing his *Recollection of Keilhau in 1872*. He gives many examples of the language lessons and religious instruction of Froebel. He also shared his uncle’s view on the importance of a woman’s influence as the first educator of young children.

2) Henrietta Wilhelmine Hoffmeister (1780-1839)

Froebel frequently heard about this lady and her family from Middendorff and Langethal; he met her once in the mineralogical museum at Berlin, and was wonderfully struck by her, especially because of the readiness in which she entered into his educational ideas. In spite of his father’s objections, she became his wife at the age of thirty eight in 1818.

She was born in Berlin and was an old war office official’s daughter. She was so remarkable and highly cultured that Middendorff and Langethal both admired and
respected her. She was a pupil of Schleiermacher and of Fichte. Her marriage with Froebel was her second one, because she had been separated from her first husband, an official in the war office, on account of his misconduct.

When she came to Keilhau, they faced privations and hardships of all kinds that were abundantly connected with their educational ambitions. By her willingness to make sacrifices and her cheerfulness under privations, she soon rose to great honour within the little circle and was deeply loved and most tenderly treated by Froebel himself.\textsuperscript{142} Froebel's affection and respect toward his wife can be found in his letters from Dresden and Leipzig to her.\textsuperscript{143} Kriege puts her contribution in this way:

Although she has no children of her own, she loves children dearly, had further always cherished and nurtured the children of Froebel's mind, and helped him faithfully to carry out his ideas. Many lovely songs in his plays for children owe their origin to her.\textsuperscript{144}

She did her best as Froebel's help mate until her death in 1839. Froebel expressed his feeling about her death showing how grateful he was for her love and help:

Since my great sorrow, it has been very hard for me to recommence my work. In my wife, I have lost the most sympathetic companion, and the cause the most faithful friend. Her devotion to the welfare of little children was untiring, and it was only amongst the children she loved so well that I have been able to find my life again. The happiness of the little ones at Keilhau, the fidelity of my friends, the approval of the authorities, and the interest of the students in my work, have all helped to rekindle within me the life which she so heartily shared.\textsuperscript{145}

3) Luise Levin

Luise, Froebel's former pupil, became Froebel's second wife in 1851. She was born in Osterode in the Harz district in 1815. For some years she had taken great interest in Froebel's educational ideas, visited Keilhau in 1845 as a friend of Christian Froebel's family. Her father, a tanner, died of consumption when she was thirteen
years old. Other deaths of her two brothers and brother-in-law followed in quick succession in her family, darkening her young existence. Her education was neither better nor worse than that of most girls at that time.

At the age of thirty, she entered the Keilhau as a working member of the household. Two years later she determined to take Froebel’s course of training in company with Alwine Middendorff. She felt in a new world under Froebel’s instruction. She finally received an appointment from him as directress of his kindergarten Training college for ladies at Liebenstein, in 1849. When her marriage took place, Froebel was sixty-nine, and she was thirty six. The children at Liebenstein always called Froebel the playmaster and her the playmistress.¹⁴⁶)

After the death of Froebel and Middendorff, she continued to spend her whole energy in forwarding the kindergarten system. The teachers at Keilhau were too busy to help her. She assisted Dr. Marquardt in his kindergarten and training college at Dresden. She went to Hamburg as directress of the public Free kindergarten and kindergarten in Berlin, under the management of two of Froebel’s best pupils, and with Diesterweg, founded a kindergarten Union, of which she became the president.¹⁴⁷) She went on with what Froebel left behind him. As a successor, she had also been a great colleague of Froebel.

(3) OTHERS

1) The Baroness von Marenholz-Bülow (1810-1893)

Hanschmman introduces the Baroness von Marenholz-Bülow in this manner in his book:

Whilst Froebel’s work was being thus successfully carried out in Hamburg by his widow, another woman, perhaps the most able and influential exponent of his work, was busy elsewhere. This was the Baroness of Marenholz-Bülow. It was she who now stepped forth, and, in her turn, picked up the threads of the Froebel work.¹⁴⁸)
This woman wrote *Reminiscences of Froebel* in which she recorded Froebel's conversations with others on various occasions and the last years of his life. From the time when she met him in 1849, she tried to understand Froebel's pedagogic ideas. She devoted herself entirely to the Froebel propaganda with her ability to express herself in several languages, and in a pleasing manner.

She went to London in 1854, and started several kindergartens, which attracted a certain amount of public attention. Among those who were favourable to the system was Charles Dickens. The following year, she went to Paris, where she delivered over one hundred lectures and succeeded in bringing about a reform in the infant schools. Her lectures were a great success everywhere, and by her tact and intelligence she always won the support of the authorities. She also went to Switzerland to deliver her lectures at various cities in 1860. She became the president of the women's Union in Berlin where she took up her abode. Hanschmann reported that her influence reached as far as the Austrian Government and Italy.\(^{149}\)

At first meeting Marenholz-Bülow said to Froebel, "You are occupied, I see, in the education of the people".\(^{150}\) She was also absorbed herself in the same job some years later. She publicised Froebel's teachings throughout western Europe by delivering lectures, founding kindergartens. She had performed more than what Middendorff once said that she must take his place in the instruction if he leaves the world.\(^{151}\) I therefore think that she deserves to be called one of Froebel's faithful colleagues.

2) *Wichard Lange*

Dr. Wichard Lange, the son-in-law of Middendorff, has edited Froebel's work. Through Lange's editorial work on Froebel's writings, we can easily approach him. He says:

> Froebel had no worldly wisdom; but the world wants such men as he to scatter seeds and keep up its ideals.\(^{152}\)
Froebel struggled to make him give up the school career that he had chosen and devote himself entirely to the cause because Froebel believed that he was the most able man to illustrate and work out the philosophical and psychological side of his own teaching. There was a violent conflict between them over this, but Middendorff succeeded in persuading them to settle their disagreement. Here is an account of Dr. Lange's relations with Froebel and service to his causes given by the Baroness von Marenholtz-Bülow.¹⁵³)

My later friendly relations with Dr. Lange have made me understand that he could not allow him at that time to be bound completely, when his individuality and circumstance drew him in another direction. It is known how he has nevertheless given his weighty support to Froebel's cause, and how he has done the most important service by editing his works. His relation to Froebel and his cause is explained by himself in the preface to that edition, therefore I need say no more about it than the course of these remarks inevitably involves.

In this section, we have seen those who were involved and to what extent they helped Froebel. Froebel, even though he had insufficient money to keep his institution, had faithful and trustworthy friends, family and followers. Froebel was greatly indebted to his two brothers's family and his two wives. It seems to me that their devotion and sacrifice gushed out not only from their kinship but also from their conviction and agreement with Froebel's educational ideas and zeal. Is this not sufficient to be set an example for all educators irrespective of the time and the place in which they operate?

In this chapter we have examined Froebel and his contemporaries in order to see which kind of thoughts prevailed during Froebel's time. In short, Froebel faced romanticism, idealism and pietism through lectures, books, and personal contacts. As far as philosophical ideas are concerned, it seems to me that Froebel did not choose any particular circle of idea to follow. As he said, he was not absorbed in Kantian ideas even though he was a student of philosophy at Jena which was a centre of Kantian studies. He acknowledged that he got the intellectual impulse through philosophical teaching and thought at Jena.
Froebel and His Contemporaries

As he also stressed that the educator must study his subject from a philosophical as well as from a practical point of view, I think that he held the same attitude in his study life. In my view, Froebel did not build up his educational idea after taking a particular line of philosophical thought. As already indicated above, he rather sought various ideas through many subjects to solve his main educational problem such as the law of unity, the progress of human development and the education of man. The range of ideas which Froebel faced and studied are very wide and different. In this context, I argue that it would be best not to categorize the idea of Froebel as a whole even in a broad sense although his particular thought can be categorized.

Pestalozzi appeared to have a great effect on Froebel. Pestalozzi was introduced to Froebel by Gruner who had worked with Pestalozzi in Burgdorf. Froebel also read the works of Pestalozzi. Furthermore, he visited Pestalozzi twice to observe the educational activities at his school with his own eyes. I think that we can see Pestalozzi’s influence upon Froebel’s education in two aspects; general education and religious education.

Of Pestalozzi’s general education Froebel set a high value on the early training of the child, *Mother’s Book*, mother’s duty to develop sense-impressions by repetition, the role of the father and the teachers for over seven year old children, how to develop children’s thinking power, teaching plan and exchange classes. In spite of these good things he criticized Pestalozzi’s education the want of unity both as to means and aims, because he believed that he could see something higher and a closer unity of the whole educational system. Concerning Pestalozzi’s religious education Froebel criticized his vague devotional addresses. As will be seen in the following chapters, I think that Froebel owed Pestalozzi very much in developing his religious education for young children.

The purpose of the last section of this chapter is to show who were Froebel’s colleagues and how his working team for education helped him. Apart from his
family circle all his three friends were Christians who studied theology. Langethal even became a minister. They also expressed their Christian faith and conviction for their work with Froebel. In my view, if they did not agree with Froebel regarding his religious education, they would not have worked for him so faithfully and devotedly throughout their life.
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CHAPTER III

FROEBEL AND CHRISTIANITY

While the most part of the former chapter is filled with Froebel’s biographical description in relation to his studies and educational efforts with his colleagues, this chapter, being a crucial bridge, will be occupied with his Christian life and with his ideas on Christianity which have contributed to the development of his educational theory and practice.

1. HIS LIFE AND CHRISTIANITY

Showing concern about religion and life, Froebel once said:

Religion without industry, without work, is liable to be lost in empty dreams, worthless visions, idle fancies. Similarly, work or industry without religion degrades man into a beast of burden, a machine. ¹

His life thus cannot be considered apart from religion. In other words, it is meaningless to look over his ideas and work without understanding his life in relation to religion. I should like, therefore, to present his Christian life from birth to deathbed. In dealing with it, it is reasonable to divide his life into two periods: his childhood and his adult Christian life which are divided from each other by his confirmation. As a matter of fact his adulthood, unlike that of his two brothers, began at the age of fifteen when he had to find a job after leaving school.
(1) HIS CHILDHOOD AND CHRISTIANITY

The descriptions about his early Christian life appear in the first part of his Autobiography. They are enough to provide us with his Christian home background and atmosphere, his religious duties in and outside home, his activities in church and in school and his impressions of them. He grew up in two contrasting homes; his own home for ten years and his maternal uncle’s home for five years.

His home was extremely religious and serious. According to Froebel, his father, Johann Jacob Froebel, was the principal clergyman in Oberweissbach. He was very conscientious in the fulfilment of his duty as minister and was completely absorbed by this work. Even though he belonged to the Old Lutheran Protestant Church, he tried to keep pace with the times by subscribing to publications and examining information about new ideas. His busy ministerial job kept him from his home and his children. His family, however, assembled twice every day even on Sunday, for morning and evening family service. What he recollects of this family worship is this:

Zollikofer, Hermes, Marezo, Sturm, and others, turned our thoughts, in those delightful hours of heavenly meditation, upon our innermost soul within us.

He had many experiences of hearings the lessons given by his father in his home in preparation for confirmation. Through them, he came to know great joy when he proved to his own satisfaction that he was not destined to go to hell. He also gained some religious knowledge from the subjects which his father discussed with people who came to seek advice and consolation. He was constantly attracted from the outer to the inner aspects of life through his father’s pastoral counselling. He says:

Life, with its inmost motives laid bare, passed before my eyes, with my father’s comments pronounced upon it; and things and words, act and symbol were thus perceived by me in their most vivid relationship. I saw the
disjointed, heavy-laden, torn, inharmonious life of man as it appeared in this community of five thousand souls, before, the watchful eyes of its earnest, severe pastor.9

He had a very difficult problem for his age through his father's grave condemnation and rebuke of matrimonial infidelities and sexual difficulties. He felt a deep sorrow that man alone, of all creatures, should be doomed to these problems and differences of sex. When his eldest brother taught him that there is a similar sexual difference in plants by showing him hazel buds, his conflict on this matter soon disappeared and he was awakened to realise the existence of similarity between human being and nature. He wrote:

From that time humanity and nature, the life of the soul and the life of the flower, were closely knit together in my mind; and I can still see my hazel buds, like angels, opening for me the great God's temple of Nature. I now had what I needed: to the Church was added the Nature-Temple; to the religious Christian life, the life of Nature; to the passionate discord of human life the tranquil peace of the life of plants.60

The following three events given by Froebel?are worth noting, for he said that they have touched his inner life up to his tenth year in relation to his Christian life. The first was his attitude toward the eschatological idea that the world would soon come to an end. But his mind remained still and peaceful, because he had his own belief that mankind would not pass from the world, nor would the world itself pass away, until the human race attained to that degree of perfection of which it was capable on earth.

The second was his ability to learn from the disputes between his father and his eldest brother about religion and church matters. He found that the truth is usually found by listening to both sides. He also thought he understood something of the subject in their dispute. His early life was not estranged from religious and church matters so he was able to gain wisdom and develop a way of life.

The third is of relatively deeper religious significance than the others. He was
in agony about the impossibility of fulfilling the demands made upon the members of his church. They are to enter the service of Christ, to show forth Christ in one's life, to follow Jesus, etc. Even if he repeated them so often and was convinced of their intense importance, he had difficulties with them. Here is his statement on this:

The inherent contradiction which I seemed to perceive herein threw me into great depression, but at last I arrived at the blessed conviction that human nature is such that it is not impossible for man to live the life of Jesus in its purity, and show it forth to the world, if he will only take the right way towards it.

Such a religious conviction resulting from conflict could be the foundation of his Christian education. Needless to say, his religious feelings and convictions originated in his home.

What about his life in his school as well as in his church? The following illustration is given by Froebel himself. At that time church and school generally had a mutual relationship. His father was the village school-master and the master of the girls' school. The school children had their special places in church; and not only were they obliged to attend church, but each child had to repeat to the teacher, at a special class held for the purpose every Monday, some passage of Scripture used by the minister in his sermon of the day before, as a proof of attention to the service.

He heard the passage "Seek ye first the kingdom of God" (Mat. 6:33) which made an impression upon him such as none had ever done before and none ever did after, when he came into that school first. This impression was so vigorous and permanent in his mind even forty years later. Two of many hymns he had to learn line by line especially light up the gloomy lowering dawn of his early boyhood, like two brilliant stars. They are -"Arise, my heart and spirit," and "It costs one much to be a Christian." He found his own little life expressed therein; and they took such a hold upon him that often in later years he found strength and support in the message which they carried to his soul.
These experiences were so intense that he kept them in his mind until he wrote his autobiography. The religious education he received served to comfort him in moments of perplexity and trouble. He seemed to see no conflict arising from the different values requested by school and home, for his home life became in complete harmony with the discipline of the school.

He was supposed to attend Sunday service twice, sitting in the choir, and hearing his father's sermon with great attention, although his language style was mystical and symbolic. But Froebel made a statement on his apprehension about his father's sermon and his enjoyment of it.

Even for such a youth, the treasure is to be gained only after long examination, inquiry, and reflection. If ever I found that for which I so longingly sought, then was I filled with exceeding joy. It suggests his concern and zeal for religious teachings. Thus was he brought up in his home until the age of ten.

In spite of these happy religious feelings and experiences, Froebel's early life in his home was never bright and happy. Fortunately, he could have remarkably different surroundings to spend his next five years as the result of Pastor Hoffman's request to turn Froebel over to him and his father's acceptance of the proposition. Froebel compared his own home to his uncle's home in this way:

In my father's house severity reigned supreme; here, on the contrary, mildness and kindness held sway. There I encountered mistrust; here I was trusted. There I was under restraint; here I had liberty. Hitherto I had hardly ever been with boys of my own ages; here I found forty schoolfellows, for I joined the upper class of the town school.

For Froebel, his uncle's home was the place for compensation for his loss in his home. He could do and get there what he could not do and get in his home.

We do not need any evidences of his Christian instruction and life in his
uncle's home other than Froebel's expression, because he explained it in detail. His stay with his uncle had three aspects: i) the religious life developing and building up his moral being; ii) the external life made up of boyish play, into which he threw his whole energy; iii) and the life of thought quietly showing itself within his uncle's peaceful home. Both in the church and in the school, he found himself as before quite at home. In the latter he especially enjoyed the hours of religious instruction. He says:

The religious instruction of our own school teacher responded best to my needs; all that I had worked out for myself was placed by him in a fuller light, and received from him a higher confirmation. Later in life, when I had grown to manhood, I spoke with my uncle on the excellence of this teaching, and he made reply that it was indeed good, but was too philosophical and abstruse for those to whom it was addressed; "for thee", continued he, "it may have been well suited, since thou hast already received such unusually good instruction from thy father.

How does this teaching influence him? Let us hear the answer from him:

This teaching enlightened, animated, and warmed me, - nay, glowed within me till my heart was completely melted, especially when it touched upon the life, the work, and the character of Jesus. At this I would burst into tears, and longings to lead in future a similar life took definite form, and wholly filled my soul.

His religious life in home and in church was under his uncle who was a gentle and affectionate man. His impression on the sermons delivered by his uncle is this:

As with my uncle himself; with his life, so was it also with his sermons; they were gentle, mild, and full of loving-kindness. I could follow them quite readily, and in the Monday repetition at school I was able to account of them.

In the religious education, the image of the teacher or leader is so enormous to children. The following description of the characters of two ministers in Stadt-Ilm, his uncle's town, may have helped him to construct his image as an educator. He puts it in this way:
My uncle, the principal minister, was mild, gentle, and kind-hearted, impressive in daily life as in his sacred office or in the pulpit; the other minister was rigid even to sternness, frequently scolding and ordering us about. The first led us with a glance. A word from him, and surely few were so brutish as to refuse that word admittance to their heart. the long exhortations of the other went, for the most part, over our head, leaving no trace behind us.

His confirmation, and the preparation for it, was conducted by his uncle. It remained as a momentous event in his life. He wrote:

I had received from it the most impressive and the most far-reaching influence in my whole life, and all my life-threads found in it their point of union and repose.

He believed that his uncle, like his father, was a true shepherd of his flock, but a gentle loving-kindness to all mankind reigned in him. His father was moved by the conviction of the rectitude of his actions; he was earnest and severe. It is no exaggeration to say that Froebel’s early Christian life mostly depends on these two ministers. Liebschner gives us what he has learnt from them:

While his father taught him about the justice of God, his uncle revealed to him the love of God, not only in discussion, but also by the way he treated young Froebel.

(2) HIS ADULTHOOD AND CHRISTIANITY

It is time to look into Froebel’s Christian life after his confirmation. Catching a glimpse of his autobiography and other works, there seems to be little evidence about it. In addition to that, he has been accused of being atheist, anti-Christian, irreligious and pantheist in his life time. But there are a number of sources with evidence enough to prove the accusations false and to support the fact that he kept Christian faith until his death. In order to demonstrate this, I would like to present his devotional life, belief and confession and how his contemporaries spoke of his
Christian life. König speaks of his attendance at church service:

The year of 1802 when he became the forest actuary in Markt Baunach, part of a small, strict Catholic state, was of great importance regarding his later religious tolerance. Three hours walk away lived a distant relative who was a doctor in the Evangelical Rentweinsdorf. Here Froebel attended religious services.

In the letter in 1851, one year before his death, he wrote about his conviction on the benefit of church life like this:

In this joyful way, amidst this peacefulness, with all this freedom of soul, mind and life, am I to be regarded as cut off from my mother church? .... and this all the better within the mother church than without, as I truly believe; and I have all the experience of my seventy years to convince me of it.

In another letter to Lisette in the same year, he wrote:

You, my dear Lisette, have never left your mother church, you have remained in it, like myself.

Even though he did not follow the church's pattern of teaching Catechism to children in his school, he did have them to attend church services. On the Gutenberg festival, they had service at the little church of Eichfeld, where a sermon was preached by one of the Keilhau teachers, the text being, "There are many gifts, but one spirit. (I Cor.12:4)"

He mentioned several times how to understand and teach the worship of God. Here is one of his conceptions and teachings about the true worship of God.

The connection between church-life and everyday life, carrying out religious thinking into doing and acting, having God before our eyes in everyday life, is not alone to be taught to children by words in a church, but outside of the church by practising them. The worship of God is only one-sided, is only a temporary social edification, which deserves not the name of worship, if it proves fruitless for the inward and outward life of man.
He identifies himself a Christian by using a phrase like "we, as Christians". When he felt his solitude, God was the only one upon whom he could depend. He says:

In truth, as regarded my future, I stood quite alone. I had no one to lend me a helping hand, so I made up my mind to go forward, trusting only God and destiny.26

When the small inheritance which came through the death of his uncle gave him the means of fulfilling the dearest wish of his heart, he says, "So wonderfully does God direct the fate of men."27 Thus he believes in the guidance and providence of God. He also believed himself led by heaven to be an educator when he was asked to teach his nephews. What did he really hope to do in his educational job? He puts it like this:

We wish to create for children a practical school in which they shall learn to act according to the description of pure Christianity, that is, according to commands of God.28

Marenholz-Bülow once commented on his devotional life, looking at him at his marriage ceremony. She says:

Whoever saw Froebel at this moment of inmost concentration, when with the deepest devotion he rose in prayer to God, could surely never doubt his religion, and must have received the fullest impression of his true and lofty piety. At that moment one could see his heart overflow in thanks and praise to Him who "had always guided him like a father," as he frequently expressed it.29

When we look at his letters to his wife, we can see a lot of expressions which sprang from his deep faith. The examples are as follows;

"My mind and soul go out joyfully towards the future, in confidence and trust in God."

"The Spirit alone can work now - and the Spirit of Truth."

"May God have given you a peaceful and refreshing night."
"praying to God for good fruit from my work."
"If God gives His blessing to the general use of these occupations and games,"
"May almighty God, who can do all things, who mighty even in the weak, strengthen you in your weakness. O God, hear my prayer!"
"Thank God with all my heart!"30)

These were not phrases or complimentary words as ordinary people use them, for he disliked to separate words from deeds, thought from action. Each expression is intended to be significant.

How should we understand him quoting so many verses from the Bible and interpreting them? He believed the Bible to be the Holy and Sacred Writing and book of God and as the revelation books of God.31) As Jesus tells us in John 16:12-13, Froebel believed that under God's lead, the human mind shall go on from faith to sight. In Christian education, there is nothing more important than the belief and understanding of the Bible, for it is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness, so that the man of God may be thoroughly equipped for every good work. (ITim. 3:16-17) How did Froebel use his own copy of the Bible? Marenholz-Bülow says:

Whoever doubts Froebel's deep understanding of the Bible and the Christian ideas, should see a Bible which he possessed from childhood, whose leaves are worn quite thin by constant use, and all whose margins are written over with remarks testifying to his earnestness and deep spirit of inquiry.32)

I think that he had tried to apply what he learnt from the Bible to his daily life and teach this knowledge to the following generations throughout his life.

He said in the Teachers' Convention at Rudolstadt, "I work that Christianity may become realised." Another time he said, "Who knows Christ? But I know him, and he knows me. I will what he wills. But we must hold to his testament, the
promise of the Spirit." He was convinced that all his efforts in the cause of education were in harmony with the highest and ultimate aim of Jesus, who says, "I and my Father are one" (John 10:30), and "I listen to the voice of my Father." (John 8:28.47) These are his confessions of his work as a Christian. In 1852, he recollects his religious life in a letter:

I know him in whom I trust, I have put my trust in Him from my youth up, and I am without fear or trembling, without nervousness or apprehension as to personal concerns, therefore.

He also thinks that his unchanged religious thoughts, convictions, and endeavour, all moulded by the spirit, teaching and example of Jesus are a source of pride to him, bring calm, security, and permanence to his mind, peace and joy to his soul, freedom to his actions. His happiness is fully expressed here. Before he died, he asked Barop, "Remain true to God." and then repeatedly admonished the friends around him in Keilhau, "to preserve unity, concord, and peace;... Have trust in God; be true to life!" He finished his journey of pilgrimage without a struggle and a death-pain.

Before closing this section, I need to add the statements of his contemporaries about his Christian life. Poesche says:

There is evidence that he never lost the Christian faith, nor separated himself from the Protestant Church, in which he had been brought up.

Karl Froebel, his nephew, says:

My uncle was truly pious in the Christian sense, through and through. His whole life has left this distinct impression upon me. Certainly it was rather the spirit than the form of Christianity with which he was penetrated in so remarkable a manner.

Middendorff said of him that it was evident that Christianity was the root from which his life proceeded. As to his understanding of Christianity as "following of
Christ", he loved God and worked for Him during his life time.

His own confession and life itself, as indicated above, show us that he has kept his Christian life from birth to death. He publicly presented his trust in God and managed his life according to it. Besides it, his work and people around him proved that he was a Christian. I think that he has tried to live and work in accordance with the teaching of God. So far his life has been examined in connection with Christian religion. His main ideas on Christianity, therefore, ought to be searched in the following section.

2. HIS IDEAS ON CHRISTIANITY

In a sense, education is a matter of practice. Nonetheless it has its own theory. We cannot think of any system of education without its own motivating theory. When Froebel started his educational institution, he had already had his own educational ideas and continued to build them up. To what principle did he cling concerning his theory of education? He says:

All my efforts in cause of education are in harmony with these words of Jesus, and rest, as Jesus command, upon the basis of unity of life.40)

Nobody can deny that his ideas on education were closely woven with Christianity alongside his Christian life.

Among his many ideas and beliefs on Christianity, his views on God, man and nature will be mainly discussed in this section for two reasons. Firstly, they are crucial points for the foundation of Christian education as well as general education. Secondly, Froebel himself dealt with them as essential matters in his theory and explained them thoroughly in his main works.
On account of the importance of Froebel's conception and belief of God in his theory, there have been various comments and understandings in the history of education. The following issues will be discussed here: How was his concept of God understood by others? Is he a pantheist or a monotheist? Which kind of God is he talking about and putting his trust in, a philosophical God or the God in the Bible? Is his conception and belief of God firm enough to be a ground for Christian education?

There are four opinions about his view on God; atheist, anti-Christ, pantheist, and monotheist. Liebschner says:

The charge that Froebel was an atheist was of long standing. Froebel mentioned attacks of this kind as far as back 1840. They probably originated from Froebel's refusal to tolerate the teaching of church dogma in the kindergarten. But this refusal was again based on his philosophy of the nature of man and his knowledge of children.

This accusation is indeed far from the fact. Nevertheless, the Prussian Government prohibited the High schools and kindergarten system for the reason that they were socialistic and atheistic in 1851. This event would be an historic example of the mistreatment of victims brought about by the misunderstanding of their cause. Froebel once set forth his opinion about being an atheist:

In my opinion there is no such thing as an atheist, for the deniers of God make out some kind of a God for themselves in their own fashion, even to making themselves one in their miserable self-confidence.

Here is one more critical remark against atheistic culture. Froebel, clearly showing how deeply theistic his convictions were, states:

Thank God that you have not been led to imitate the presumption of certain highly cultured circles who deny their Master, whereby you would have falsified your whole principles and denied the eternal law which lies beneath them,... for your escape from this snare you cannot thank God too
Besides the Catholic priest's persecution and accusation, as I have mentioned in the previous chapter, some of his opponents exclaimed that his teaching was anti-Christ when he explained that a man's highest duty is to live out that law here on earth by unceasing outward and upward activity; to develop and promote the realization of God's idea of humanity. Froebel answered:

By no means; it is the teaching of Jesus Himself, whose meat it was to do the will of Him that sent him (Jn4:34); who was ever about his Father's business. He it was who taught us to call upon His Father as our father, and to pray that God's kingdom may come, and His will be done here on earth, even as it is in heaven. And you will find that Holy Writ in no way contradicts me.  

Anti-Christ means an opponent of Christ or one who falsely claims to be the Christ. According to this meaning of anti-Christ, this term of anti-Christ does not fit his life and teaching at all, for he declared that he worked so that Christianity might become a reality.

Some scholars regarded Froebel as a pantheist, but others suggested to consider it carefully. Even if these views have continued to persist since his life time, Froebel himself completely denied it. He replied to Diesterweg who accused him of pantheism in this way:

But I do not say, like the pantheists, that the world is God's body, that God dwells in it as in a house. But the Spirit of God dwells and lives in nature, produces, fosters, and unfolds everything, as the common life-principle. In like manner the Spirit of God dwells in his work, produces, fosters, and preserves it. As the spirit of an artist is found again in his masterpieces, so must we find God's Spirit in His works.

Although the first part of his saying is too unclear to manifest his intention about the relation between God and the world, it is also true that there may be a logical contradiction and the expression in the latter part of his remark is too obscure
to understand what he meant by it.

His expression "the Spirit of God dwells and lives in nature" and "the Spirit of God dwells in his works" cannot accord with the first part of his remark unless we interpret that they mean that the Spirit is everywhere present and everywhere active in the external world. There are two possible reasons for interpreting them in that way. First of all, as we shall see it in a later section, Froebel has never identified God with the world. Secondly, it cannot be assumed that he has made his statement containing an apparent logical contradiction in order to protect himself by expecting that it would be understood literally as it was without interpreting its real meaning. In fact, Froebel's statement could be interpreted as being pantheist despite his denial.

Bowen defines pantheism as follows:

If they hold that this first cause has no existence apart from the universe in which it works we call them pantheists. But numberless others, like Browne and Wordsworth, for instance, while recognizing and even insisting upon, the constant presence and operation of God in the universe, hold that God has also a separate existence of His own. This was Froebel's view. It does not contradict Christianity. We may call Browne, and Wordsworth and Froebel pantheistic Christian.

I think that Bowen, according to his definition of pantheism, could not have called Froebel a pantheist. Bowen, in 1893, using the phrase "we may call", gave a name to Froebel in a strong sense in the later section like this:

so more than one adversary called him pantheist and anti-Christian. Pantheist he undoubtedly is, or ideal pantheist, as I have called him; but in no sense is he anti Christian.

In Froebel's chief writing on education rendered into English by Fletcher and Welton in 1912, there is a claim that Froebel does not recognize that his statements are often pantheistic in their essence and implications. Kilpatrick (1916), after examining Froebel's religious terms, concluded that the general background of
Froebel’s conscious theory is decidedly pantheistic, if not pantheism itself.\(^{50}\) He, however, made another statement:

While the term pantheism seemed appropriate to Froebel, there were nevertheless departures from such a position in the direction of a more popular belief.\(^{51}\)

On the contrary to the statement made by Fletcher and Welton, Cole(1907) maintains that for Froebel the Absolute was the Christian God, regarded as there is reason to believe theistically, rather than pantheistically as was alleged against him in his lifetime. He also mentions that there seem to be suggestions of the divine transcendence as well as immanence in Froebel. In my view, he has relatively prudently dealt with Froebel so that his comment on Froebel’s view on God is worthy of note:

Froebel may have been pantheistic to the extent of an ample breadth of realization of the divine immanence in nature, without sacrificing much of the intensity of the Christian notion of a personal God.\(^{52}\)

From my point of view, his explanation is a quite integrated and impartial one, coming from his extensive knowledge of Froebel.

Beatty(1922) said that Froebel founded his system on a basis of pantheism and mysticism.\(^{53}\) Power(1970) explained that although Froebel was an idealist and a pantheist, he did not go so far in his idealism as to deny or ignore the facts of the world.\(^{54}\) Boyd and King(1975) also believed that Froebel is a pantheist.\(^{55}\) These are the scholars like Bowen who assert that Froebel is a pantheist.

McCromick(1950) says that many of Froebel’s expressions appear to have a tinge of pantheism.\(^{56}\) Monroe(1970) has the same idea. He writes:

Froebel was devoutly religious, but, influenced by his philosophy and his love of nature, his religion was almost pantheistic in thought, and in expression bordered on the ecstatic.\(^{57}\)
Curtis and Boulwood speak of Froebel's pantheistic attitude. Gengel and Benson (1983) just express a general view. "It is generally accepted that his concept of God was pantheistic." All these scholars, like Kilpatrick, regarded Froebel's concept of God in his educational theory as pantheistic one. Curtis and Boulwood (1966) suggest the need to qualify such a statement that Froebel leaned towards pantheism, for his philosophy has a deeply religious foundation, maintaining, as it did, that all material things were expressions of God's creative will.

In order to consider whether Froebel is a pantheist or not, I have to present the definition and characters of pantheism in the perspective of biblical theism before setting forth which God Froebel believed in. Pantheism literally means 'All (everything) is God.' According to Clark,

> It affirms two things; the unity of all reality and the divineness of that unity. Pantheism like theism recognizes that the world depends on God, but unlike theism, it does not hold the world's existence to be separate from God's.

That is the reason why Biblical Christianity in particular finds pantheism unacceptable, for it blurs the distinction between the Creator and His creatures. From this point of view, Froebel has nothing to do with pantheism, for he says that Nature is God's work, not God Himself. For Froebel, God is the eternal self-existing being and the world is one of the means of his revelation.

Two deficient points of pantheism from a Biblical standpoint are well explained by Feinberg. First, pantheism generally denies the transcendence of God, advocating his radical immanence. The Bible presents a balance. God is active in history and in His creation, but he is not identical with it to either a lesser or greater degree. Second, because of the tendency to identify God with the material world, there is again a lesser or greater denial of the personal character of God. In Scripture, God not only possesses the attributes of personality in the incarnation, He takes on a body and becomes the God-man. God is pictured supremely as a person. In other words, theists believe in the personal character of God and the transcendence of God as well as the immanence of God.
When Froebel’s concept of God is examined by these criteria which enable us to discriminate theism from pantheism, it is not difficult to clarify Froebel’s real position in connection with the pantheism label. Many have failed to do so, for they do not see his general position and thereby use some of his statements out of context. To avoid such a mistake, I would like to put together as many of God’s attributes as I can, which Froebel mentioned in his works and conversations. Every philosopher has his own concept of God. Cole gives us some illustrations.

For Schelling the Absolute was a ground of identity of mind and things, an almost esthetic unity. For Fichte it was rather a universal moral order, for Hegel unifying will or personality, and Froebel the Christian God.65)

How can we be convinced that Froebel’s God is the Christian God? How does Froebel speak of God in his works? What God did he believe in throughout his life? In trying to present his relevant statements on God, I would like to answer these questions. Among a number of his references to the Trinity, it would be wise to include a synthetic statement here.

The manifestation and revelation of the One eternal, living, self-existent Being-of God- must from its very nature be triune: that God manifests and reveals Himself in His oneness as the Creator, Preserver, Ruler, the Father of all things; that He manifests and reveals Himself,... who was His only begotten and His first-born Son; that in all the diversity of created things, in all things that are and move, in the life and spirit of all things, He has manifested and revealed Himself, and continues without interruption to manifest and reveal Himself as the One life and Spirit, the Spirit of God; and that He does all this ever as the One living God.66)

In this quotation, his view and explanation of the Trinity are fully described in an analytic and synthetic way. Liebschner points out that Froebel’s diaries (1818-1819) show him becoming increasingly occupied with the Christian teaching of the Trinity until about 1820.67) Froebel firmly believes in the Trinity; the Father, the son. and the Holy Spirit.

Froebel designates Jesus Christ as the God-man revealing God to man,68) as
the incarnation of God,\(^6\) the Mediator between humanity and God,\(^7\) and as the Saviour.\(^8\) He also sets Jesus as our highest ideal. He introduces Jesus to us both as the great friend and lover of children and as the greatest friend and loftiest teacher of mankind.\(^9\) Concerning the Holy Spirit, he says:

Thus, the Spirit of God, having gone forth from God, lives and works in and through nature as independent Spirit, yet at one with God.\(^7\)

Apart from the role of Holy Spirit for nature, Froebel also believes that the Spirit of God as the Comforter and the Spirit of truth (Jn.14:16,17) is leading us to all truth.\(^7\) Froebel’s belief and presentation of the works of the Holy Spirit in and through nature is almost related to the immanence of God. That is one of the reasons why he is called a pantheist. But he never lost his balance and saw God’s transcendence as well as immanence.

For instance, Froebel believes in the only One living God. Froebel calls God the following names; the beginning and end of all created things, omnipresent being, a higher and supreme Being, eternal self-existence Being, the everlasting Being, the ultimate Cause, the absolute Unity, and almighty God.\(^7\) These names for God designate the truth that God in Himself is infinitely exalted above all creation(Ps.90:2) and neither the earth nor the highest heaven can contain Him(1Kgs.8:27). These are some characteristics of the transcendence of God which Froebel expresses in his works and believed throughout his life.

Two more most prominent titles for God most repeatedly used by Froebel are ‘the Creator’ and ‘the Heavenly Father’. In Christian belief, these are most basic and profound conceptions of God. God, for Froebel, is the Creator of man, nature, and all things.\(^7\) Consequently he also believes in God as the working God,\(^7\) the Preserver of all things,\(^8\) and as the Ruler of all things.\(^9\)

Indeed, there is no doubt that the Christians believe that God is the Originator of the universe.(Mt.19:4, Mk.13:19, Acts 17:24, Rom.1:20) Creation shows
something of the characteristics of God, for example, His eternal power and deity. There are specific assertions that all things were made by God. (Rom. 11:36, 1 Cor. 8:6, 11:12, Eph. 3:9, Col. 1:16) If anybody believes in God as the Maker or the Creator of all things, it means that God, for him, is the source of all that there is and the sovereign Lord over all things. God as sole Creator means that there is, for the believer, no thing or no one else to worship but God. It also means that all reality and truth belong to God and nothing can exist apart from God. Thus Froebel’s belief in God as the Creator has a very deep meaning so that it cannot be imprudently overlooked in any sense.

What about his belief in God as the Heavenly Father? He insists that we should know what we are and ought to be and to live in that which is our Father’s…. We should know that we are to be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect (Mt. 5:48). He encourages us to pray to our Heavenly Father for fatherly protection and loving care. As God is Father, He is the Provider for His children. He says, "God feeds and keeps them." Elsewhere he says, "God gave him understanding, reason, language." 

What is the significance of this profession of Christian faith? Packer explains it in this way:

God’s fatherly relation to Jesus implied four things. Fatherhood implied authority (Jn. 6:38, 17:4, 5:19, 4:34), affection (Jn. 5:20, 15:9f), fellowship (Jn. 16:32, 8:29) and honour (Jn. 17:1, 5:22f). All this extends to God’s adopted children. In, through and under Jesus Christ their Lord, they are ruled, loved, accompanied with, and honoured by their Heavenly Father.

Froebel admits that he is a child of God. As Froebel’s belief of God as the Heavenly Father contains these elements, it is needless to say that he believes in the personal God in the Bible. I have discussed Froebel’s view and belief in God and the definition and character of pantheism from the biblical standpoint. In dealing with this argument for Froebel’s pantheistic tendency, Brehony denies that Froebel is a pantheist.
Froebel, however, believed that the Spirit of God works on and through nature, but God Himself does not dwell in nature. This Froebel’s position fell short of a fully pantheistic view.

Surely the name of pantheist for Froebel, as Liebschner pointed out, is related to his thought of the relation between God and nature. Froebel, as have been shown above, definitely admits the fact that there is a clear distinction between the Creator and creatures and certainly believes in the personality of God and the transcendence of God as well as the immanence of God. I would, therefore, argue that the name of pantheist is not suitable to Froebel, even though there may be some components to lead one to think as such this is only a partial understanding.

In the perspective of Christian education, there is a more important point to add to Froebel’s view on God. Compared to the role of the Spirit of God for nature, the redemptive work of Christ and The Holy Spirit for men is not raised enough in his works. I think that an attempt to strengthen this weak point of Froebel for Christian education is more important than arguing about his pantheistic tendency.

(2) MAN

As Liebschner says, Froebel’s philosophy of education was closely linked to his philosophy of man. It is necessary to explore his view of man and child in this section. In dealing with this, I would like to present several views of man which Froebel’s contemporary philosophers put forward, how Froebel understood the nature of man and child, discussion on his view of man in the perspective of Christian education and his explanation of human development.

What did his contemporary philosophers say of man? Goethe maintained that everything that man undertakes to produce, whether by action, word, or in whatsoever way, ought to spring from the union of all his faculties. He saw life as personal, positive, significant and progressive. Schiller explains human nature as comprising three impulses; the material and the formal and the play or aesthetic
impulse. Schleiermacher claims that the person, as the activities of thinking/knowing and of willing/doing, is more than a being composed of mind and body. He also sees man as a religious being.

According to Novalis, to be finite is to be in search of the infinite, which can be recovered in the depths of the human soul. Schelling considers man as the crown of creation and the most interesting and rewarding object of philosophical attention. He also believes that man is free in his creative activities and the essence of the world. Herbart emphasizes man’s will rather than man’s knowing, saying that man’s worth does not lie in his knowing, but in his willing. Krause regards man as the supreme unification of reason and nature, and believes that the main goal of man is the imitation of the divine life both in his inner life and his social life.

Besides these philosophers described in the second chapter, there are, according to Liebschner, some more educators who influenced Froebel in the formation of his philosophy of education, for example, Comenius, Rousseau, and Arndt. Comenius (1592-1670) believed that man was by nature lacking in goodness but capable of improvement and, like any bishop of the Christian church, he was convinced of the final victory of goodness in man. Rousseau (1712-1778) asserts that children were born good and only contact with man spoilt them. Arndt (1769-1860) described his contemporary man like a shell without a core and criticized the emphasis on ‘all talk and no action’ prevailing in his time. He advised man to return to the source of his existence: nature.

How does Froebel explain the origin, structure, and nature of man, then? How does he see man and child? What is his view on human development? How different is his view of man from the Christian view of man? These are the topics to be discussed. Froebel firmly declares that man is created in the image of God by God. (Gen.1:26-27) He regards man as the being created for freedom in the image of God. In a sense, he goes too far beyond the teaching of the Scripture about man. He says:
Froebel and Christianity

With reference to his eternal immortal soul, every human being should be viewed and treated as a manifestation of the Divine Spirit in the human form, as a pledge of the love, the nearness, the grace of God, as a gift of God. Indeed, the early Christians viewed their children in this light, as shown by the names they gave them.88)

In calling the human race 'God’s children', Froebel describes man as the beloved of God.89)

One of Froebel’s fundamental views of man is that a child should not be treated as only receptive but, also, and more particularly, as a creative, productive being. He puts it in this way:

God created man in His image; therefore, man should create and bring forth like God. ... This is the high meaning, the deep significance, the great purpose of work and industry, of productive and creative activity. We become truly godlike in diligence and industry, in working and doing.90)

His belief that man is created in God’s image is one of the very crucial foundations to such elements of his educational theory as the importance of creative activity, children’s play, the goal of man, and the purpose of his education. Concerning the structure of man, he says:

Man, as an earthly phenomenon, is destined to have body and soul developed consciously and rationally, with a certain degree of symmetry and harmony.91)

He continues to say that as spiritual and material beings, we are to become thinking, conscious, intelligent(self-consciously feeling and perceiving), efficient human beings.92) He also sees man as a being of change and development.93) Consequently the child for him is a growing organism. The organism develops by creative activity.94) He elsewhere says that the whole future activity of man has its germs in the child.95) In other words, he sees child as a bud on the great tree of life. The child, for him, is a wonderful creature.96) Thus his view of man is characterized by his belief that God created man in His image.
Another characteristic of his view of man is to try to explain man in terms of relationship. He states:

For man, as such, gifted with divine, earthly, and human attributes, should be viewed and treated as related to God, to nature, and to humanity; as comprehending within himself unity (God), diversity (nature), and individuality (humanity), as well as also the present, past, and future.97

He, therefore, sees every human being as a member of humanity and as a child of God. Based on these human relationships with God, man, and nature, he has developed his educational theory. For instance, the responsibilities of a dependent parent, the destiny of man, and the worth of baby are all founded on these relationships. What is the responsibility of the parents? Froebel emphasises the very important point in Christian education of parental duty:

Even as a child, every human being should be viewed and treated as a necessary essential member of humanity; and therefore, parents are responsible to God, to the child, and to humanity.98

According to the group to which man belongs, a different task is imposed upon man. He puts it like this:

The destiny of man as a child of God and of nature is to represent in harmony and unison the spirit of God and of nature, the natural and the divine, the terrestrial and the celestial, the finite and the infinite. Again, the destiny of the child as a member of the family is to unfold and represent the nature of the family, its spiritual tendencies and forces, in their harmony, all-sidedness, and purity; and, similarly, it is the destiny and mission of man as a member of humanity to unfold and represent the nature, tendencies, and forces of humanity as a whole.99

I think that we need this principle of life to prevent society from becoming segmented. He suggested this to keep the balance between the collective life and the individual life as Goethe discussed it in his great works.

Froebel once mentioned, in a letter, a reason to welcome the new-born baby.
He writes:

As a member of nature and natural life, as a member of humanity and human life, and as a member of that collective mental and spiritual life which springs from God, and rests also in Him, the new born-babe thus receives the consecration of his existence. The love, faith, and hope which welcomed him into existence, welcome him also to the holy and manifold entwining of his life with the source and wellspring of all life, with God.100)

It is quite difficult to grasp Froebel’s educational philosophy without understanding human relationships with God, man, and nature. These relationships are the fundamental ground for a Christian education, too. In this context, he expresses the goal of man. Man has to try to accomplish unity and keep harmony within himself, with nature and people around him, and with God. According to Froebel, he has to reveal unity, individuality, and diversity through his life and outward reactions.

How does he speak of the nature of man? He believes that the nature of man is in itself good, and there are in man qualities and tendencies in themselves good.101) On what ground does he assert it? He adds:

Since God wished to reveal himself in the finite, this could be done only with finite and transitory material. Whoever, then, considers that which is finite, material, physical, as in itself bad, thereby expressed contempt for creation, nature, as such, nay, he actually blasphemes God.102)

He warns us not to consider ourselves in our essence as neither good nor bad or evil. In this he surely denies the neutral state about the nature of man. How does he justify shortcomings in the life of children? He suggests two reasons: in the first place, the complete neglect of the development of certain sides of full human life; secondly, the early faulty tendency - the early faulty and unnatural steps of development and distortion of the originally good human powers and tendencies by arbitrary and wilful interference with the original orderly and logical course of human development.103) What is his solution of all wrong-doing committed by man? He says:
If man could only reach a clear and distinct knowledge of his nature... he would immediately throw off all shortcomings, even the manifestation of all evil that is in him and done by him - that clings to him, as it were, and hides him like a disguise.  

Is this idea of the nature of man given by Froebel, in accordance with the teaching of Christianity? Chalke comments that Froebel refused to accept the doctrine of total depravity of the child. Bruce, in dealing with children's discipline, makes mention of it. She writes:

At the centre of Froebel's approach to discipline is his belief that the child's intrinsic motivation should not be damaged. This is encouraged by his belief that humans are basically good. He rejected the notion of original sin.

Though Liebschner admits that Froebel's concept of the nature of man was essentially a Christian one, he gives us a very clear illustration on this matter. He says:

Froebel does not make any reference to the cross nor the resurrection. Christ may be an example to follow but he was neither an example of power nor of domination. But then this power was not needed in Froebel's philosophy, for man was essentially good not crippled by original sin as in certain manifestation of the Christian religion.

Calvin insists that the knowledge of God and that of our self are connected. He puts twofold knowledge of God in this way:

First, as much as in the fashioning of the universe as in the general teaching of Scripture the Lord shows Himself to be simply the Creator. Then in the face of Christ (IICor.4:6) He shows Himself the Redeemer.

We ought to have the twofold knowledge of the nature of man in the light of the twofold knowledge of God. It means that we must know both the state of man when he was created and that of man after the Fall.

I think that Froebel only focused on the state of the first man and ignored that
of man since the Fall. In this context, as far as Froebel’s view of the nature of man, he seems to have failed to see what the Bible says about the nature of man. We must notice that this is one of the vital deficient points for Christian education in Froebel’s theory. In order to make this weak point of Froebel’s view of man complete, it is necessary to add the Christian viewpoint of man here.

What then, does Scripture teach about man’s plight? Taylor describes it as follows. Man, who, like the rest of God’s creation, was originally good, by his disobedience to God’s word he involved not only himself, but his offspring and the whole created order in a kind of cosmic disharmony. This is how Paul expressed it in Romans 5:12-21:

Sin came into the world through one man and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all men sinned...many died through one man’s trespass... One man’s trespass led to condemnation for all men... By one man’s disobedience many were made sinners.

Both Old and New Testaments insist that there is universality about sins, and that the tendency to sin is within man by virtue of his humanity. This is so called original sin or total depravity.

A phrase for original sin means inborn sinfulness. It refers not to man’s original state, but to the evil infection that has spread through the whole human race by reason of its historic connection with its source. The reformers insisted that Adam’s nature was corrupted as a result of the Fall so that human nature was thenceforth changed and all man were infected with the tendency to sin. To express this they used the word depravity. The addition of the adjective total was not intended to convey the degree of man’s depravity, but the extent of it.109

In short, man is morally perverse and spiritually blind. Every man, therefore, needs the saving grace of Christ to restore the right relationship with God. God completed this redemptive process for man through His Son, Jesus Christ, by His
incarnation, death on the cross, and resurrection. Even though Froebel does not make any reference to the cross and the resurrection, I do not think that it means that he denied the salvation of man through Christ as the Saviour. There is no evidence to show the fact that he denied the need of man's salvation through the death of Christ. Rather he mentions about the salvation and the kingdom of God. But I think that this would be a deficiency of Froebel's theory in Christian Education, even if it does not clearly appear the reason why he did not mention it in his writings. If the Christian educators are aware of this defect of Froebel's view of man and hold the teaching of the Bible about man, I think that they would be able to get some insight through his educational practice as well as theory based on his idea of man.

How is Froebel's understanding of the nature of children and his view on children and the kingdom of God? Froebel is dealing with the children and the kingdom of heaven in his book *The Education of Man*. He says:

> Of children, too, is the kingdom of heaven; for, unchecked by the presumption and conceit of adults, they yield themselves in childlike trust and cheerfulness to their formative and creative instinct.

Explaining again Matthew 19:14, he writes, apparently believing that the kingdom of God belongs to children:

> Jesus says, 'Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God.' Is not the meaning of this: Forbid them not, for the life given them by their heavenly Father still lives in them in its original wholeness-its free unfolding is still possible with them.

These two statements raise a vital question about the position of children in the sight of God. As it depends on the understanding of Jesus' statement in Mark 10:13-16 (Cf. Mt.18:1-5, 19:13-15, Lk.18:15-17), the original sin, the covenant theology, infant baptism and the character of God, it is true that there must be controversy involved. Instead of discussing them, I would just like to present them and categorize Froebel's position among them.
Prince and Buckland handle this matter in depth, for Prince's three groups are included in Buckland's seven groups. There are seven general categories about the position of the child in relation to God which it would be useful to summarize here:

i) All children are outside God's kingdom until they opt in. It means that children of all ages are in exactly the same position before God as adults: responsible, accountable, and capable of repentance and faith. This view stems from the doctrine of original sin;

ii) The presence of a Christian parent establishes right standing before God. This view is based on the covenant theology. (Gen.17:, Deut.29:, 1Pet.2:9-10);

iii) The presence of a Christian parent creates privilege, not right standing. This view tells us that the child is privileged because with at least one Christian parent it is more likely that he will be nurtured towards faith;

iv) The experience of baptism establishes right standing before God. This view holds the fact that if a child is baptised, he has acceptance with God;

v) The experience of baptism enhances privileges. This view is based on the fact that baptism achieves nothing in itself but it enhances the possibility of future discipleship, because it arises out of a Christian environment;

vi) All children are in God's kingdom until they opt out. This view is supported by Pridmore and Inchley. It rests on three different positions. Firstly, Pridmore argues that the expression of Luke 18:16, "Let the children come to me and do not hinder them; for to such belong the kingdom of God." and that of Luke 6:20, "theirs is the kingdom" are equivalent. Prince comments that the Greek of Luke 18:16 can be so interpreted, but the great majority of commentators disagree with Pridmore.

Secondly, Inchley confessed that his belief in the universal spiritual security of children was confirmed by George Goodman and Griffith Thomas. What did they say? Goodman stated categorically, in his booklet entitled "The Heathen, their Present State and Future Destiny" that all irresponsible persons (infants and others) will have no charge against them and can therefore be the
Surely the truth is that all children are included in the great atoning sacrifice, and belong to Jesus Christ until they deliberately refuse him. \(^{118}\)

Finally, many evangelicals, both as parents and as children’s workers, believe that it accords with what they know of the character of God. How could the God of the Bible, truly, just, gracious, loving and merciful as he is, send a newborn infant, incapable of expressing right or wrong, to hell? This is their argument to assert this view.

vii) All children begin with God, but will drift from that position unless an effective nurturing or evangelistic influence operates in their lives. This is Buckland’s view. He says that it is a belongingness that may become rebellion. \(^{119}\) Comparing Mark 10:13-16 to Matthew 18:1-5, 19:13-15 and Luke 18:15-17, he concludes like this:

It is clear that Jesus used children as visual aids to challenge adults about the kingdom of God. But he also made an important statement about children themselves. He said the kingdom of God belongs to them.

I think that Froebel appears to belong to either group vi) or group vii) as far as his view of children in relation with God is concerned. He seems to have a very optimistic view of the nature of children and their relationship with God.

How does Froebel think about human development? Bowen says that, according to Froebel, true freedom, depends on perfect development; and development is only another name for progress according to law. \(^{120}\) Froebel believes that God has laid the eternal laws in earth and nature and the development of nature and man takes place in accordance with the same laws only at different stages. \(^{121}\) For Froebel, human development cannot be understood and explained without this law. He gives some warning against his ideas. He states:
Unfortunately, our conceit induces us to lose sight of this natural and divine starting-point of all human development. Having denied God and nature, we seek counsel from human knowledge and wit.\textsuperscript{122}

The goal of human development is linked with self-activity by Froebel like this:

The highest goal of human development demands the highest degree of self-consciousness. This self-consciousness implies self-knowledge as a condition, and self-knowledge is only attainable through self-activity. In the products of his activity man recognizes himself and his power, just as God, the Creator, manifests himself in the works of creation.\textsuperscript{123}

He pursues the harmonious development of every side of human nature. He insists that we should be able to build up a life which would be everywhere in touch with God, with physical nature, with humanity at large.\textsuperscript{124} The subjects he wants to teach children depend on this idea. He is concerned about the development of senses, body, will (mental activity) and spiritual growth. He possesses a specific view on human development:

Man should be looked upon not as perfectly developed, not as fixed and stationary, but as steadily and progressively growing, in a state of ever-living development, ever ascending from one stage of culture towards its aim which partakes of the infinite and eternal.\textsuperscript{125}

Concerning the stages of human development, he divides them into six stages; infant, child, boy or girl, youth or maid, man or woman, old male or matron. He claims that the child, the boy, the man should know no other endeavour but to be at every stage of development wholly what this stage calls for and only the adequate development of man at each preceding stage can effect and bring about adequate development at each succeeding later stage.\textsuperscript{126} What are the main purposes of the early three stages in his developmental theory? The period of infancy demands chiefly fostering care. While the period of childhood is predominantly that of life for the sake merely of living, for making the internal external, the period of boyhood is predominantly the period for learning, for making the external internal. He has made
Froebel’s view of man has been discussed in the perspective of Christian education. It contains not only the strong but also weak points for the grounds of Christian education. His human development theory and some aspects of the view of man are, of course, influenced by others. As indicated in the previous section, I would like to stress our special attention to Froebel’s view of man, when we intend to apply his theory into Christian education, for he did not discuss about man’s desperate spiritual state and the need of God’s saving grace which are fundamental truths for Christian education.

(3) NATURE

Much of Froebel’s work concerns the beauty and wonder of the world and the importance of nature in the life of children and man. Subsequently there have been many efforts to interpret his meaning of nature. These two facts seem to tell us that his experience and understanding of nature have partly contributed to both the theory and practice of his education. The meaning of nature in his education is so pivotal that we cannot avoid treating it as one of key issues in understanding him and his education more fully.

For this reason, I would like to handle the following questions in this section:
What sorts of views on nature did exist at that time? For Froebel, what is his relationship with nature and how does he see the world around him? How relevant is Froebel’s view on nature to Christian education?

How did Froebel’s contemporary philosophers think of nature? There were a number of conceptions of nature at Froebel’s time. Rousseau regarded nature as intrinsically good and as the guide to all educational development. But his conception of nature implies more than one meaning. According to Bantock, it has three different meanings. He says:
Rousseau seems to use it in at least three different ways in Emile: as that which is the opposite to nurture or the training given by other men, as that which is accord with the behaviour of primitive, precivilised, and therefore, uncorrupted man, and thirdly as the phenomenal world apart from man, in particular the world of plants and animals.  

Goethe believed that the universe consists of an infinite number of unique beings each alive and harmonious with all others and everything in nature is in some sense animate. Fichte had the conception of the world as the construction of the self. Novalis saw nature as a cipher and said, "We shall understand the world when we understand ourselves." Thus he closely linked ourselves to nature. Schelling says, "The system of nature is at the same time the system of our spirit. Nature is visible spirit; spirit is invisible nature." Schelling maintains that nature is inseparable from God, but distinguishable from him. Cole explains the difference between the view on nature of Fichte and that of Schelling in this way. He writes:

To Schelling, nature was more than the self-set limit of Fichte, more than subjective, and more than moral...The world had for Schelling an aesthetic unity.

What, then, is Krause’s view of the nature? As already has been mentioned in Chapter II, for Krause nature is a divine work of art, at the same time it is itself the artist, fashioning itself. Krause did not see nature as a blind, mechanical system without consciousness. He developed his view on the relationship between God and nature. According to MacVannel, he sought to improve upon pantheism through his doctrine of panentheism - a philosophy founded on the notion that all things are in God. Liebschner puts the influence of Krause on Froebel like this:

We have to remember that the one philosopher whom Froebel knew personally and who influenced Froebel probably more than any other, was Krause. Krause was a disciple of Schelling, but also admired Fichte. His contribution to philosophy lay in the attempt to bridge the differing views of Schelling and Fichte.

Within this climate of thought on nature and the world, how does Froebel
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develop his intimate relationship with nature and experience it through his life? What is his view on nature? Before examining it, I think that the first question should be answered by presenting some anecdotes in his life. Froebel, right from his childhood, had a deep relationship with nature. His awakening and intimacy with nature was formed in his boyhood. He confessed that the development and formation of his character was exercised by the position of his parents' house which was closely surrounded by other buildings, walls, hedges and fences and was further enclosed by an outer courtyard, a paddock, and a kitchen garden. During his early days, two experiences were to stay in his memory: looking at the sky from a cramped space and helping his father for gardening. He recollected them in this way:

For a long time I remained thus deprived of any distant view: but above me I saw the sky, clear and bright as we so often find it in the hill country; and around me I felt the pure fresh breeze stirring. The impression which that clear sky and that pure air then made on me has remained ever since present to my mind... Nature, with the world of plants and flowers, so far as I was able to see and understand her, early became an object of observation and reflection to me. I soon helped my father in his favourite occupation of gardening, and in this way received many permanent perceptions.130

As already has been indicated in the section of his life and Christianity, it was one of his great apprehensions on the relationship between human being and nature that he realised the existence of similar sex difference in plants when his brother showed him hazel buds. Through this experience, his eyes were opened to the life of nature, and humanity and nature were closely knit together in his mind. The hazel buds with his brother's kind explanation brought him into a new understanding of nature. These are some relevant pictures of his early life.

What he learnt from his first job as a forester's apprentice was a knowledge of plants through the life spent with nature, especially forest-nature. In his life at that time he was obviously fascinated by plants:

My religious life now changed to a religious communion with nature, and in the last half-year I lived entirely amongst and with plants, which drew me towards them with fascination, notwithstanding that as yet I had no sense of
the inner life of the plant. Collecting and drying specimens of plants was a work I prosecuted with the greatest care.\textsuperscript{132)

In Jena, where he took only the lectures that promised to be useful in his career and heard nothing purely theoretical except mathematics, his view of nature, as one whole, became by Batsch's natural system of botany substantially clear, and his love for the observation of nature in detail became more animated. He was obliged to change his employment from place to place after leaving Jena for short periods. He began to study farming with a relative of his father's, near Hildburghausen in 1801. After his father's death (1802), Froebel became an actuary to the forest department of the episcopal state of Bamberg. In 1803, he went to Bamberg to take part in the governmental land-survey. Even though his life in these jobs was very short, it is true that they were all in close contact with nature.

In 1804, he became a secretary and an accountant first to Herr von Woedersdorf, and afterwards to Herr von Dewitz. He remarks on his life in the surroundings of Herr von Dewitz's estate in this way:

Lakes and hills and the fresh foliage of trees abounded, and what nature had perhaps overlooked here and there art had made good. My good fortune has always led me amongst pretty natural scenery. I have ever thankfully enjoyed what nature has spread before my eyes, and she has always been in true motherly unity with me.\textsuperscript{133)

Here is one more his inner expression on nature when he saw a landscape on holiday in 1805:

The more intimately we attach ourselves to nature, the more she glows with beauty and returns us all our affection. This was the first time my mind had ventured to give expression to a sentiment which thrilled my soul. Often in later life has this phrase proved itself a very truth to me.\textsuperscript{134)

According to himself, nature held him so fast that for years he was 'chained uninterruptedly' to her study. Because Froebel's experiences with nature and the formation process of his relationship with nature have been examined so far, I
presume that it is the proper time to see what he thinks nature is. He believes that nature, as well as all existing things, is a manifestation, a revelation, of God. He explicitly defines this view by using other words such as book of creation, God’s work, and God’s handiwork throughout his works. He says:

What religion says and expresses, nature says and expresses. What the contemplation of God teaches, nature confirms... What religion demands, nature fulfils.

He constantly maintains and explains this view in his works and observes and enjoys nature with this religious view of nature. He gives us one illustration which nature shows us. He remarks that the colossal remains of shattered mountains and mountain-chains speak of the greatness of the spirit of God, of the greatness of God. For him, the nature’s law is the revealed will of the Creator. I believe that his attitude and understanding of nature is based on this view. For Froebel, nature apart from God, the Creator, would be drained of meaning. The Baroness Marenholz puts Froebel and his relationship with nature in this way:

In one word, he was a man of truly primitive originality, capable of listening to and understanding the language which the Creator speaks to his creatures by his works, always intent upon interpreting this language to others - this was Froebel.

By insisting that children must first read the book which God himself has given humanity to read in its childhood, Froebel would awaken and strengthen the eyes of children that they may learn to read this book aright. This is the reason why he stresses the importance of nature study especially to Christians.

There is one more point which Froebel has mentioned about lessons from nature. What he has learned through an intimate communion with nature for more than thirty years is this:

Plants, especially trees, are a mirror, or rather a symbol, of human life in its highest spiritual relations; and I think one of the grandest and deepest fore-
feelings that have ever emanated from the human soul, is before us when we read, in the Holy Scriptures, of a tree of knowledge of good and evil. The whole of nature teaches us to distinguish good from evil.\(^{140}\)

Since he believes that nature is the work of the Creator for man, he can express such a statement. I think that his view of nature must be understood under the assumption that nature has a relationship with God. How does he explain nature’s relationship with God? For Froebel, as the work of art is to the artist, so nature is to God. He puts this idea like this:

> As the spirit of the artist is in the work of art, so is the spirit in nature. As the work of art lives and moves in accordance with its spirit and related to its maker, so nature, born from God, lives and moves in accordance with its spirit as a work of God, living in and through God, and breathing the spirit of God, related to God, its Maker and in inner spiritual relation to man.\(^{141}\)

To avoid any misunderstanding of him, he tries to speak of it resolutely in this way:

> As nature is not the body of God, so, too, God Himself does not dwell in nature as in a house; but the spirit of God dwells in nature, sustaining, preserving, fostering, and developing nature.\(^{142}\)

According to Charles Hodge, this kind of illustration is of necessity very inadequate.\(^{143}\) In terms of Christian doctrine, he is talking about the providence of the material universe. In order to help to understand Froebel’s statement quoted above, Christian’s belief on this matter ought to be explained here. God is entirely external to His work. He, however, fills heaven and earth. He is immanent in the world; intimately and always present with every particle of matter. And this presence is not of being only, but also of knowledge and power.\(^{144}\)

I think that some explanation of God’s providence of the world is needed here in the perspective of Christianity. God governs the material, as well as the moral world by His rules which are called ‘laws of nature’. In what relation does God stand to these laws? Hodge replies that God is their author but He is independent of them
and never does disregard them except for the accomplishment of some high purpose.\textsuperscript{145} As far as my knowledge goes, Froebel's basic and main idea on nature is expressed throughout his works in the light of this Christian doctrine. But I do not mean that his ideas of nature are totally based on the teaching of the Bible. It is true that some of his ideas of nature are influenced by his contemporary philosophers. It is, however, a quite strange thing to realise that his most striking and distinct view on nature has not been clearly introduced and explained by the scholars. Rather, they have tried to interpret it in their own way instead of stating Froebel's view on nature. In a sense, their interpretations of Froebel's view on nature might be helpful to guide us to understanding it in an analytical way.

Let me offer three examples which seem to be very good summaries. Firstly, MacVannel explains four ways of suggestive interpretations of Froebel's nature with his own opinion that no wholly consistent interpretation will be discovered in scattered materials throughout his works.

i) In a certain place an interpretation is given reminding one of the Wordsworthian;

ii) But... Froebel was not a poet so much as a religious mystic, and frequently, perhaps most frequently, we find in his works the Romantic impulse uppermost, - to revel in a content of consciousness by such as Froebel and Scheleiermacher won through religious rather than aesthetic institutions and symbols;

iii) Sometimes he essays a mathematical construction of nature...;

iv) Again, he believed that he found the morphological element in crystallization.\textsuperscript{146}

He means that Froebel's nature has four aspects - that is, romanticism, idealism, mathematical construction and a morphological element.

Secondly, six positions of the attitude of Froebel toward nature are given by Cole. He accounts for them as follows: Nature is:

i) spirit visible;
ii) objective;

iii) a unity, such that every part is utterly in harmony with every part;

iv) one with the mind of man, in the sense of involving a necessary correspondence with his spirit, based upon a common foundation in the absolute spirit, or in God;

v) an harmonious system developing according to its own inner laws, and as it were an organic whole; and finally;

vi) a type and symbol of the life of humanity.147)

Of course, this illustration could be a means to grasp the various meanings of Froebel’s nature. But Cole’s other attempt shows that they are not enough to describe Froebel’s view of nature.

Thirdly, Cole’s synthetical statement is given to complement his first attempt listed above. He adds, in the last part of his book, it like this: What is nature?

To the scientist, nature is an externality to be accurately described.

To the poet, nature is a background to human emotion.

To the idealists, nature is the expression of spirit or reason.

To the Rousseauists, nature is primitivism or origin.

And to the moralists, nature is that which ought to be.

To Froebel nature tends to mean a sort of combination of all of these.148)

I, however, would argue that there is one missing fact which is vital among these examples to present the meaning of Froebel’s nature. I maintain that they have made such a mistake to miss or despise what Froebel himself regards as the most important and basic thing. Although they had spoken of it, they have changed or weakened its original meaning. I think that what Froebel sees in nature as God’s handiwork, and the revelation of God must be put over all other things and the interpretation of his view on nature should be followed and based on this. The scholars missed the wood for the trees.
Now, it is the time to consider the last question in this section. How relevant is Froebel’s view on nature to Christian education for young children? A Christian believes that God is the Creator, Designer, and Preserver of all things. In Him the entire universe, macrocosm and microcosm, has its origin, its energy and control, and its final destiny. This revelation between God and the world, organic and inorganic, is expressed in such statements of Scripture as Colossians 1:16,17 and Romans 11:36.¹⁴⁹)

What Froebel constantly believes about the relationship between God and nature is apparently written in Romans 1:20:

For since the creation of the world, His invisible attributes, His eternal power and divine nature, has been clearly seen, being understood through what has been made.

Froebel’s view of nature as a manifestation of God Himself is clearly rooted in this Biblical teaching. What does this verse mean? Hendrikson expounds on it in this way:

The reference is rather to the works of creation: the works of God which for a very long time, in fact ever since the creation of the universe, have been visible to men and have made their indelible impression upon their mind... The term ‘his divine nature’ indicates the sum of all God’s glorious attributes, in the present connection especially those attributes which make and leave an impression on everyman’s mind: the exhibition of God’s power, wisdom and goodness in the created universe... But how is it possible to see the unseeable? Is it not true that physical eyes are unable to see God's invisible qualities? True; yet, while these eyes are observing the glories of the universe which God created, the soul, with its invisible eye, is being deeply impressed. It clearly sees God’s power displayed in ‘the things that were made,’ that is, in God’s works.¹⁵⁰

When we look into Froebel’s writings on nature from a Christian standpoint, many parts which have been regarded as mystic or symbolic can be understood. I think that even though not all his statements on nature are in accordance with that of Christianity, his main and basic idea of nature is sound and strong enough to be a ground for Christian education for young children. As will be seen in the next
chapter, it is a significant contribution by Froebel that science education for children has been carried out based on this belief.

As Froebel indicates, it is not wise to separate Froebel's educational work from his religion, because one's religious education totally depends on one's life and ideas in relation to one's religion. That is why we have examined Froebel's life and ideas in connection with Christianity in this chapter before seeing his theory and practice of his religious education.

Froebel received the constant and consistent Christian education from his father and his uncle who were all Protestant ministers at his home and his uncle's home, churches and schools until his confirmation. His faith grew through his religious experiences such as daily family service, Sunday worship, school religious instruction, and hearing his father's teachings and conversations. So he held his conviction of salvation and felt the deep religious feelings and joy in his mind.

I think that we can just assume his Christian faith through the various evidences in his educational works. In the Lutheran Church confirmation is a rite rather than a sacrament and the recipient offers it as a confirmation in his heart of those baptismal vows which his parents assumed on his behalf. Because there are no evidences about his sudden change of religious life and his expulsion from his church after his confirmation, we may think that he might have kept his baptismal vows throughout his lifetime.

He also attended church services and made his confession several times. He identifies himself a Christian by using a phrase like "we, as Christians" and believes in the guidance and providence of God. Froebel who believed the Bible to be the Holy and Sacred Writing and book of God left his own Bible whose leaves were worn quite thin by constant use and whose margins were written over with remarks. I think that we are able to infer Froebel's Christian identity from his contemporaries' witnesses with these proofs.
Christianity has always embraced a wide range of interpretations of the central truths that are seen as the revelation upon which the religion is founded. In order to understand an individual writing from within this world-view it is necessary to assess his perspective on Christian teaching. However, it is remarkably difficult to precisely isolate the Christian identity of an individual writer if he is not directly addressing the various foci of Christian thought. Thus, in order to identify a standard or norm by which to compare Froebel's writings, we will choose the classic Confessions of the Christian Faith that have been generally accepted by the Church throughout the world as defining the heart of Christian doctrine.

In analysing the thought of Rousseau, Karl Barth said "it is not for us either to confirm or deny that his was the true Christianity". This is how we must analyze Froebel. We must judge him according to the general definitions of central Christian faith, and yet do so against the background of specifically 19th century German thought about these doctrines.

He has more than a passing commitment to God as Trinitarian. A standard criticism of him is that he is pantheistic, or merely theistic in a general sense. However, this seems to miss his profound understanding of the trinitarian structure of the being of God. Froebel is fascinated by the problem of unity in diversity throughout the universe, and it is his trinitarian commitment that enables him to grasp this apparent paradox as an expression of the very nature of God. He repeatedly confesses his belief in God as Father, Son and Spirit, not merely some philosophical idea of Absolute Being, or Ultimate Reality.

Froebel's view of Jesus Christ is more difficult to express in a precise, coherent, final way. In many ways he is a product of general nineteenth century German philosophical-theological speculation and moralism. Generally, he portrays Jesus as a perfect model of human behaviour and life before God. Jesus is the perfect revelation of the nature of humanity. Jesus displayed the Fatherhood of God towards all humanity. He came to believe that "it is not impossible for man to live the life of
Jesus in its purity, and show it forth to the world, if he will only take the right way towards it". However, Froebel sometimes shows a deeper, more ontologically superior perception of the person and work of Jesus Christ e.g. "The Christian religion, the religion of Jesus, satisfies to perfect completeness the mutual relations of God and man; and indeed creates them". Elsewhere Froebel is able to speak of Jesus as the Mediator between God and humanity, and even as the Saviour. Thus, Froebel is not contented with the merely Divine Teacher and Example theology that was so popular in so much 19th century religion: he knew that if he was to take his trinitarian thought seriously he could not neglect or underplay the uniqueness of Christ as the very foundation of Divine-human encounter.

It is slightly ambiguous as to how important the Holy Spirit is in Froebel’s thought. If his talk of the Divine Spirit is specifically about the Holy Spirit, then his theology is immensely Holy Spirit orientated. Holy Spirit would then be the Person of the Divine Being most committed to relationship with humanity, whereas in classical Christian thought it is the Son who is the ground and priest of all divine-human relations. However, if Divine Spirit simply refers to God in a general sense, then Froebel does not appear to have anything substantial to say about the Holy Spirit at all.

Froebel believed that the Bible is God’s Holy and Sacred writing. It was not just a collection of historical documents of equal status with any other historical documents. In Germany during his lifetime the Bible had been treated as an account of human thought about God e.g. the Tübingen school led by F.C. Baur used the New Testament as a presentation of the clash between the Jewish followers of Christ and the Gentile followers of Christ, and explained the development of the Church from this human perspective. Froebel seems to have maintained a view of the Bible most common among the Pietists in Germany at that time, even though Froebel was very influenced by the critical rationalism of people like Hegel.

Traditionally the centre point of Christian thought is the Cross and
Resurrection of Jesus Christ. This has been understood to refer to the way in which human disobedience is atoned for, and new, God-approved life is given to alienated humanity. However, Froebel, like so many 19th century thinkers, did not concentrate upon this sin-orientated understanding of Christ. Froebel does not seem to have anything to say about the meaning of the Cross, nor about the necessity for atonement. This might be because such subjects did not really fall within his area of concern, or it might mean that his thought was more philosophically based than Biblically based. It is difficult to draw definite conclusions about this matter with the evidence available.

Froebel’s description of humanity is in some ways his controlling idea for education. He denies that there is such a thing as original sin i.e. the belief that humanity, because of Adam’s first sin, has become corrupt at heart, even from the moment of birth. Froebel believes that humans are good from birth and that they are in good standing with God right from the beginning. He says that we are born children of God, and our very existence is carried out within, through and for God. This does not mean that we are all incapable of wrong action or wrong thinking, because we are moral agents, with the capacity for self-determination. We are free to live out of harmony with God’s moral and spiritual laws, but by doing this we will be unable to understand the world around us, given that nature itself is in complete harmony with the will and mind of the Divine Spirit.

It is Froebel’s understanding of nature that is most distinctive, and yet is so profoundly Christian. Nature is an inter-related unity, governed by the Laws of the Divine Spirit, and thus revelatory of the Divine Spirit. Christian theology in the 16th century especially had focused on nature as being revelatory of God. The great Reformers like Luther and Calvin taught that humanity unavoidably knows God, because of the creation that surrounds us at every moment in everything that we do. Froebel re-emphasises and deepens that aspect of Christian theology, at a time when so much of popular Christian thought was trying to see the universe as a closed, mechanistic, non-personal arena for life. Froebel asserted the intensely personalistic
environment of God's creation, given that it all speaks of Him, and is governed by Him. Physical laws are in accordance with the Divine mind, and govern all the purely physical phenomena that are presented to the human mind. But, there are also moral and spiritual laws which God has established to govern human behaviour too. Moral, physical and spiritual laws are all manifestations of God's Law, His Mind and Character. To the extent that a human conforms his life and thought to these moral and spiritual laws, he will understand the physical world correctly, and live in harmony with it. In this way Froebel has used Kant's basic dualism between the physical realm of Buber's I-It relations and the noumenal realm of I-Thou relations, and yet Froebel has breathed into these categories a fundamentally Reformational view of nature and God. He is not content to see the realm of nature as basically amoral and areligious, confining all religious content to the noumenal. No, Froebel floods the law-governed realm of nature with the personal categories usually reserved for noumenal description. Our relationship to the creation cannot be divorced from our personal relations to one another and our spiritual relationship to God Himself. The three relationships of God, humanity and nature become so profoundly interrelated in Froebel's thought, that one cannot grasp just one aspect of his thought and successfully understand it without grasping the whole. In this way Froebel anticipated much Christian thinking of the 20th century in taking the reality of God's revelation in nature so seriously.

In conclusion, Froebel's thought is not merely theistic and it cannot in any way be described as pantheistic. His commitment to Christian concepts and controlling beliefs is not at the periphery of his thought, but occupies a central position. Although on some details of Christian doctrine he is obscure or silent, this cannot be taken to mean that he was not authentically Christian: after all, Froebel was not trying to write a systematic theology. Froebel's thought is deeply Christian in most ways even if in certain areas he fails to articulate Christian belief with classically orthodox terminology and clarity.
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CHAPTER IV

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION FOR YOUNG CHILDREN IN FROEBEL’S EDUCATIONAL THEORY

Having discussed Froebel’s life and ideas in connection with both his contemporaries and his religion in the two previous chapters, I would like to examine Froebel’s Christian education for young children in his educational theory as well as in his educational practice in the following two chapters. In this chapter, his educational aims, the subjects he taught and his methods will be considered in order to find out how Froebel tried to teach children in the light of Christian education in his life.

1. THE AIMS OF EDUCATION

Under this title the following things will be considered: (1) some educational aims in the history of education; (2) the meaning of the aim of education; (3) four approaches to Christian education, and (4) the aims of Froebel’s education both for general and for Christian education.

(1) SOME EDUCATIONAL AIMS

Plato (427-347 B.C.) thought that the aim of education was to make a man the ideal perfection of citizenship and to teach how to rule rightly and obey fairly. Education for Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) was an achievement of happiness and virtue. His happiness is not comfort and freedom from care but rather the original meaning of good spirit and form of activity.
Quintilian (A.D. 35-95) said that it was the perfect orator that we were training and he could not exist unless he was a good man. Erasmus (1466?-1536) put four aims of education in this way:

The first and principal function is that the tender spirit may drink in the seeds of piety, the next that he may love and learn thoroughly the liberal studies, the third is that he may be informed concerning the duties of life, the fourth is that from earliest childhood he may be habituated in courteous manners.

There are three central educational themes in Luther (1483-1546): the importance of education, the responsibility of parents for the education of their children, and the responsibility of government to educate children. Concerning Lutheran education, Jahsmann puts it:

Though Lutheran education is also interested in the development of man for a useful and good life on earth, it approaches this concern through the primary goal of eternal life with God.

Peter DeJong describes Calvin’s (1509-1564) educational aim thus:

The teaching of children is to be instruction in the life which is according to Godliness. They must learn what it means to be Christian, not simply by giving the right answers with mind and in words, but so appropriating God’s message of redemption of Christ Jesus that all life comes to be lived by them in obedience to the Scriptures.

Comenius (1592-1670), the author of the Great Didactic, hopes that the entire youth of both sexes shall quickly, pleasantly, and thoroughly become learned in the sciences, pure in morals, trained to piety for the present and for the future life. Milton (1608-1674) says:

The end of learning then is to repair the ruins of our first parents by regaining to know God aright, and out of that knowledge to love him, to imitate him, to be like him, as we may the nearest by possessing our souls of true virtue, which being united to the heavenly grace of faith makes up the highest perfection.
As to the central aim of education, Locke (1632-1704) says:

The great business of learning and accomplishment is virtue and wisdom. Teach him to get a mastery over his inclinations, and submit his appetite to reason.\(^9\)

In Brief and Simple Treaties on Christian Education, Francke (1663-1727) indicates that the aim of education is to honour God.\(^{10}\)

Pestalozzi's educational aims from the various points of view are well summarized by Walch. She puts one of them in this way:

Pestalozzi (1746-1827) wrote that the aim of education must be and cannot be anything other than vigorously training children to be God-fearing, pious, intelligent, willing, efficient, and fitted for the entire sphere of their duties to God, to their neighbour and themselves.\(^{11}\)

Herbart (1776-1841), as mentioned in the chapter II, considers the aim of education as sound moral development. He asserts that morality is universally acknowledged as the highest aim of humanity, and consequently of education.\(^{12}\)

Horace Bushnell (1802-1876), the author of *Christian Nurture*, presents his idea in this way:

What is the true idea of Christian education?... That the child is to grow up a Christian, and never know himself as being otherwise. In other words, the aim, effort, and expectation should be, not, as is commonly assumed, that the child is to grow up in sin, to be converted after he comes to a mature age; but that he is to open on the world as one that is spiritually renewed, not remembering the time when he went through a technical experience, but seeming rather to have loved what is good from his earliest years.\(^{13}\)

Dewey (1859-1952) says:

There is nothing peculiar about educational aims. They are just like aims in any directed occupation. The educator, like the farmer, has certain things to
According to Whitehead (1861-1947) culture means activity of thought and receptiveness to beauty and feeling:

"What we should aim at producing is men who possess both culture and expert knowledge in some direction." 

Montessori (1870-1952) stressed that education is for life itself. She writes that the education of our day is rich in methods, aims, and social ends, but one must still say that it takes no account of life itself. She adds that the education of even a very small child does not aim at preparing him for school but for life. So it is said that the aim of the Montessori method is to help children realize their full potential.

The Plowden Report shows us some aims of primary education such as whole personality, happy atmosphere, full and satisfying life, full development of powers, satisfaction of curiosity, confidence, perseverance, and alertness.

(2) THE MEANING OF THE AIM OF EDUCATION

These mentioned above are statements of educational aims. Why have the educational aims appeared in various forms and different aspects? According to Byrne, there are four sources of the aims of education: survival values, an historical analysis of social institution, a scientific analysis of current life, and the psychological study of the original nature of man.

What is, then, the aim of education? The meaning of it can be seen in one of the comments made by Peters. He states:

Most disputes about the aims of education are disputes about principles of procedure rather than about ‘aims’ in the sense of objectives to be arrived at by taking appropriate means. The so-called ‘aims’ are ways of referring to
the different valuations which are built into the different procedures like training, conditioning, the use of authority, teaching by example and rational explanation, all of which fall under the general concept of 'education'.

The word 'aim' means to point so as to hit something, to direct one's effort, intent or purpose.

What is the distinction between the aim, the purpose and the objective of education? There are two opposite opinions on this matter. Wringe explains that aims are not ideals, nor objectives, they are of an open-ended, on-going kind. He insists that an educational aim must be capable of being achieved in an educational context by recognizably educational means. He says that objectives usually refer to specific pieces of learning which we intend to see achieved at the end of a piece of classroom activity, a particular lesson or number of lessons, or even at the end of a longer unit of work. He clearly distinguishes between aims and objectives of education. Byrne, using the term 'aim' and 'purpose' indiscriminately, draws a distinction between aim and objective like this:

An aim may be thought of as that with which the educator starts and the objective is the goal, the place of arrival, the ultimate resting place.

Langford thinks that purpose differs from aims, not only in not embodying any sort of analogy, but in implying a broader perspective. He emphasizes it in this way:

It is important to be clear about those aims which are internal to education, i.e. to be clear about what those engaged in education are trying to achieve. It is perhaps more appropriate to speak of their purpose than aims; 'purposes' are internal to actions, and place the action in a broad perspective.

According to Moore, an aim is a logical prerequisite of a practical theory. His distinction between aims and purposes is summed up by saying that whereas to talk of purposes is always to refer to some external end to which the activity is directed, to talk of aims is not to refer to external ends but to the activity itself, to its internal end. Wringe and Byrne, as already has been mentioned, tried to distinguish
between aims and objectives. Langford and Moore attempted to make a distinction between aims and purposes.

However, Grimmitt has a very different view from those of the four men mentioned above. He puts it in this way:

When we talk about 'aims' in education we are really talking about intentions and purposes. There is no difference between saying, "The aim of education is..." and "The intention or purpose of education is ..." ... Educational aims, therefore, are really designed to help us to answer the question, "Why?" - "Why am I teaching this subject, this fact, this concept, the skill and so on?" They also help us with the question, "How?" - "How shall I teach this subject, fact, concept, skill and so on?" because how we teach something, our "approach", is governed by what we hope to achieve.

In relation to these two different opinions, there is one question to answer in dealing with Froebel’s educational aims: should we regard the terms such as aims, purposes, and objectives of education which Froebel used in his writings as synonymous or not? This is the first point to make clear before clarifying his aims of education. Froebel makes no mention of this matter. As these terms are synonymous in everyday speech, it seems to me that he did not distinguish them in his writings. I think that he employed the words such as object, objective, aim, goal and purpose as synonymous. As far as the writings of Froebel are concerned, there is no different meaning between these words.

(3) FOUR APPROACHES TO THE AIMS OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

We have to bear in mind that Froebel’s educational views are not separate from his religious views. His purposes of education are, as will be demonstrated, woven into his Christian religion. Therefore, I would like to present here the four typical approaches to the aims of religious education and their examples discussed by Grimmitt quoting from Schools Council Working Paper. Those are "The Confessional or Dogmatic approach", "The Neo-Confessional or Neo-Dogmatic approach", "The Personal Quest approach" and "The Phenomenological or
Undogmatic approach

1) The Confessional or Dogmatic approach

This approach reflects an assumption that religious teaching should be Christian, should lead children towards a Christian commitment and that the Bible is the text book "par excellence" for achieving these ends. It is religious teaching which is narrowly Bible-based or Bible-centred. The following are some examples of this approach.

i) "The aim is not simply to present the Bible as a record of historical events but to bring children into an encounter with Jesus Christ..." (North Western C.S.E. Board R.K. syllabus)

ii) "The theme is Christian discipleship...Which may be defined as a way of life based upon faith in Jesus Christ whom God sent to be our Deliverer and through whom man can enter into a special relationship with God." (East Midlands C.S.E. Board R.K. syllabus)

iii) "This syllabus aims at presenting to young people the challenge of the personality of Christ..." (West Yorks and Lindsey C.S.E. R.K. syllabus)

2) The Neo-Confessional or Neo-Dogmatic approach

The Schools Council Working Paper refers to "The across-subject approach" to religious teaching as "The Neo-Confessional or Neo-Dogmatic approach". The central objection to the Child-centred and development approach to religious education is that they are still confessional in both outlook and approach. The across-subject approach arose from this objection. This approach emphasizes the child's own experiences, and tends to disguise its concern to inculcate a Christian view of man and the world. Here are some examples:

i) "I would lead children to integrate all they are learning and doing in all
subjects within a world view of God as creator and as the person who cares about his people..." (R.J.Goldman, Readiness for Religion, 1965, p. 197); ii) "Christianity should be taught because it answers the deepest needs of human nature, and without a knowledge of the love of God and a relationship with him men and women will live impoverished lives..." (R.J.Goldman, Readiness for Religion, 1965, p. 59); iii) "It is the prime object of religious education to awaken children to the spiritual dimension, to show that religion belongs to life, to show that the life Jesus lived, His death and resurrection, and the stories which He told are of present importance because they are eternal;...to open a path to a freely chosen community to the way of life that millions have trod through so many centuries; to make the Bible live again as the word of God to His world." (Kent Council of R.E., A Handbook of Thematic material, 1968), and iv) "Children should be taught to know and love God and to practise in the school community the virtues appropriate to their age and environment." (Plowden Report, Children and Their Primary School, 1967)

3) The Personal Quest approach

There is a group which insists that the state school, unlike the Church, does not have the right to teach children the Christian faith with the intention of moving them towards a religious commitment, but it has the responsibility of educating children in religion and in religious understanding. They try to provide children with the religious interpretation of life and abandon the confessional standpoint. This is called "The Personal Quest approach". Some examples are set below.

i) "The aim of religious education in a county school is to enable a boy or girl to have a proper understanding of what is meant by a religious approach to life...It is not the purpose of religious education in the county school to bring about a commitment to the Christian faith..."(Social Morality Council, Moral and Religious Education in County School, 1970, p. 13)
ii) "The aim of religious education should be to explore the place and significance of religion in human life and so to make a distinctive contribution to each pupil's search for faith by which to live." (Church of England commission on R.E. in Schools- The Durham Commission-The Fourth R, 1970)

iii) "There is a growing feeling that R.E. ought to be, in the jargon today, 'open-ended'. This means it should have as its aim the giving to children of a religious view of life and then allowing them freely to make up their minds how that view shall express itself in belief and practice." (Edwin Cox, Changing Aims in Religious Education, 1966)

iv) "Religious education, in brief, is about the life our children learn about, the depth of the life they learn about on the surface, the whole of the life they learn about in fragments. At root religious education is a conversation between older and younger on the simple question, what is life like?" (Harold Loukes, New Ground in Christian Education, 1965)

4) The Phenomenological or undogmatic approach

According to Grimmitt, this approach takes religion as its field of study and seeks to show what is distinctive and unique about religion as a (unique) "mode of thought and awareness". Two examples are given here.

i) "The aim of R.E. is to promote understanding of the nature of religion itself as a distinctive way of interpreting experience."

ii) "The aim of R.E. is that of creating in pupils 'certain capacities to understand and think about religion'." (N. Smart, Secular Education and Logic of Religion, 1968)

These four approaches to the aims of religious education help us to understand the fundamental basis and the sorts of religious educational aims, and their differences. I believe that they can also give us some insight into Froebel's aims of religious education.
(4) THE AIMS OF FROEBEL'S EDUCATION

What are, then, the aims of education in the educational theory of Froebel? I would like to elucidate them by putting his own statements and others on objectives to be arrived at by education as a whole, by means of instruction and training. We had better look at his aims of education in five sections.

1) With reference to the law of unity

Generally speaking, his aim of education is to teach man to understand the law of unity and to help him to live in accordance with it. The term 'unity' may be understood in two different ways: i) the state of being united or unification ii) harmony, or agreement. I think that the latter is more appropriate to express Froebel's intention. If the former is taken to apply to his aims of education, it could distort his intention to educate children. He did not lead children to lose individual personal identity in any Buddhist-type absorption into the infinite reality or universal consciousness at all. In this context, I do not think that his law of unity is mystical or unreal.

How, then, could we justify his law of unity? Living in accordance with the law of unit means living with himself and humankind, with nature, with God harmoniously. 'Union with Christ' and 'the idea of unity' are essential Christian teachings. As Jesus is one with his Father (Jn.17:21), the church is to be one with her Lord (Jn.17:11). There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus (Gal 3:28). How do Christians exercise and realize them? Baker explains:

The Christian's knowledge, experience and enjoyment of God are through Christ, his baptism is into Christ, his standing and every blessing are in Christ, and his destiny is with Christ.39

Even though the ultimate Christian goal is complete union with God,
Christians do not have necessarily ‘ecstatic’ content in the pagan sense or occult sense at all. But Christians should make every effort to keep this unity by deepening our knowledge of the Lord and submitting our whole life to him in trust and obedience. I think that Froebel’s principal aim of education known as the law of unity should be understood in this way. The seven examples concerning the law of unity as Froebel’s principal aim of education are set below. Three of them are directly connected with schools.

i) "Education should lead and guide man to clearness concerning himself and in himself, to peace with nature, and to unity with God; hence, it should lift him to a knowledge of himself, and of mankind, to a knowledge of God, and of nature, and to the pure and holy life to which such knowledge leads." ([The Education of Man], p. 5)

ii) "He sought to rear the boy to unity with himself, with God, with nature, and with mankind, and the way led to trust in God through religion, trust in himself by developing the strength of mind and body, and confidence in mankind - that is, in others, by active relations with life and a loving interest in the past and present destinies of our fellow-men" ([The statement given by Georg Ebers, one of Froebel’s pupils in Keilhau, Sketches of Froebel’s Life and Times], p. 52)

iii) "I desire to educate men whose feet shall stand on God’s earth, rooted fast in nature, while their head towers up to heaven, and reads its secrets with steady gaze, whose heart shall embrace both earth and heaven, shall enjoy the life of earth and nature with all its wealth of forms, and at the same time shall recognise the purity and peace of heaven, that unites in its love God’s earth with God’s heaven." ([Autobiography], p. 63)

iv) "The aim of instruction is to bring the scholar to insight into the unity of all things, into the fact that all things have their being and life in God, so that in due time he may be able to act and live in accordance with this insight. Instruction itself
v) "Never forget that the essential business of the school is not so much to teach and to communicate a variety and multiplicity of things as it is to give prominence to the ever-living unity that is in all things." (The Education of Man, p. 135)

vi) "One of the purposes of the college indeed, is to open the inner eye for outer and inner truths." (The Education of Man, p. 202)

vii) "At Keilhau he is to be perfected, converted into a fashioned production without a flaw. If the institute has fulfilled its duty to the individual, he will be:

* To his native land, a brave son in the hour of peril, in the spirit of self-sacrifice and sturdy strength;
* To the family, a faithful child and a father who will secure prosperity;
* To the state, an upright, honest, industrious citizen;
* To the army, a clear-sighted, strong, healthy, brave soldier and leader;
* To the trades, arts, and sciences, a skilled helper, an active promoter, a worker accustomed to thorough investigation, who has grown to maturity in close intercourse with nature;
* To Jesus Christ, a faithful disciple and brother; a loving, obedient child of God;
* To mankind, a human being according to the image of God, not according to that of a fashion journal." (Sketches of Froebel's Life and Times, p. 53)

In the light of the law of unity, Froebel's aims of education are i) leading man to clearness about himself, to peace with nature, and to God ii) teaching him to unity with himself, with mankind, with nature and with God iii) giving him the insight
concerning unity. As the law of unity is composed of the individual, humanity, nature and God, I would like to put some examples concerning each of them.

2) With reference to the individual

   i) "The aim is to develop the whole man, whose inner being rests between the poles of true enlightenment and genuine religion." (Froebel and Education by Self-activity, p. 30)

   ii) "Froebel's garden is a place in which the children are surrounded by such conditions as allow them freedom of growth for body, mind and spirit and in which their powers develop in harmony and beauty." (The Kindergarten System, p. 187)

   iii) "Jesus himself, therefore, in his life and in his teachings constantly opposed the imitation of external perfection... The highest and most perfect life which we, as Christian, behold in Jesus - the highest known to mankind - is a life which found the primordial and ultimate reason of its existence clearly and distinctly in its own being." (The Education of Man, p. 12)

   iv) "We should first seek to cultivate our powers, our spirit, as received from God; to represent the divine in our lives... We are to grow in wisdom and understanding with God and men, in human and divine things. We should know that we are and ought to be and to live in that which is our Father's... We should know that we are to be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect; and in accordance with this knowledge we should act and live. To this knowledge the school is to lead us; for this the school and instruction are needed; in accordance with this aim they should be constituted." (The Education of Man, pp. 136-137)

   v) "The aim and object of the parental care of the child,... is to awaken and develop, to quicken all the powers and natural gifts of the child, to enable all the members and organs of man to fulfil the requirements of the child's powers and
vi) "Education consists in leading man,... growing into self-consciousness, to a pure and unsullied, conscious and free representation of the inner law of divine unity, and in teaching him ways and means thereto." *(The Education of Man, p. 2)*

What are these six examples saying about the aims of education with reference to the individual? The purposes of education for the individual are i) developing our powers, natural gifts and spirit in harmony and beauty to be the whole man ii) growing in wisdom and understanding with God and man iii) living perfectly as our Father in heaven.

3) **With reference to humanity**

i) "The first object of education is to teach to love, to break up the egoism of the individual, and to lead him from the first stage of communion in the family through all the following stages of social life to the love of humanity or to the highest self-conquest through which man rises to divine unity. This is the same thing that Christianity designates as the "Following of Christ" and expresses in the words, "Love one another."; "He who loves not his brother whom he has seen, how can he love God whom he has not seen? etc.." *(Reminiscences of Friedrich Froebel, p. 104)*

ii) "Man must ever aim at learning God's method of development of culture, of education, as applied to humanity; and especially at striving to set them forth as applied to his own individual education, and the education of his family and his nation." *(Froebel's Letters on The Kindergarten, p. 87)*

iii) "The object of education is the realization of a perfect humanity. Purity and simplicity of heart are as important for educators as knowledge and culture." *(The Kindergarten System, p. 34)*
For Froebel, the objects of education with reference to mankind are teaching man how to break up his egoism and how to love his family, his nation and humanity in order to realize perfect humanity.

4) With reference to nature

i) "To reach the unconscious harmony of nature with consciousness in the human sphere, is the goal which God has set for man." *(Reminiscences of Friedrich Froebel, p. 45)*

ii) "To Froebel... the complete harmony between the developed human faculties and external nature was the great purpose of human existence." *(A Short Sketch of the Life of Friedrich Froebel, p. 12)*

According to Hailmann, the unity of life with reference to nature means a thoughtful subordination to her laws of development. Therefore, the educational aims for this are i) helping children to see the nature as the handiwork of God and her beauty and harmony ii) teaching them to find out the laws of the nature iii) guiding them to live in it harmoniously.

5) With reference to God

i) "The object of education is the realization of a faithful, pure, inviolate, and hence holy life... To be wise is the highest aim of man." *(The Education of Man, p. 4)*

ii) "God-likeness is and ought to be man's highest aim in thought and deed, especially when he stands in the fatherly relation to his children, as God does to man." *(The Education of Man, p. 328)*

iii) " The Christian religion entirely completes the mutual relation between
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God and man. All education which is not founded on the Christian religion is one-sided, defective, and fruitless." (Reminiscences of Friedrich Froebel, p. 160)

iv) "Jesus commanded his disciples: "Go ye into the world and teach all nations."; Purify and lead them to the knowledge of God the Father, of Jesus, the Son of God, and of the Holy Spirit of God, to a life in accordance with this knowledge and insight, and to all insight necessarily proceeding from this." (The Education of Man, p. 151)

v) "Religion is the endeavour to raise into clear knowledge the feeling that originally the spiritual self of man is one with God, to realize that the unity with God, which is founded on this clear knowledge and to continue to live in this unity with God, serene and strong, in every condition and relation of life." (The Education of Man, p. 140)

vi) "But teaching and insight alone do not reach it; it must be enacted as Jesus enacted it. We must educate the children to doing and acting if they are to become in truth Christians." (Reminiscences of Friedrich Froebel, p. 46)

Froebel's objects of education in relation to God are i) arousing the religious sense and knowledge of himself and of the Father, the Son and of the Holy Spirit ii) keeping a holy life and a God-likeness life iii) maintaining and developing mutual relationship between man and God iv) educating children to become Christians by doing and acting like Jesus.

Having tried to present Froebel's educational aims under five headings as they were in his several books, I think that it is worth examining his way of presenting them and looking at them according to Moore's three criteria. First of all, I have to indicate one deficiency in his way of presentation of his ultimate educational aim rather than its content, because most of the criticism of his educational aims are a result of this failure. In my view Froebel seemed to have failed to make his readers
realise his principal aim, 'the law of unity', clearly. He should have explained it in one place of his one major book more intensively and explicitly. I do not mean that he did not present it in his several works as much as he needed to do so. I think that he mentioned it often enough throughout his works to easily recognize his main aim of education.

Normally one would grasp the main idea of a writer from an examination of his major book. Because of this, if Froebel had carefully, clearly, concisely explained his definite idea of unity in his book *The Education of Man* (which has been regarded as his main work) then, I think that there may have been significant differences in the general understanding of his educational aim. I would argue that *The Education of Man*, which was written in 1826, does not include his whole and complete ideas, because, as will be seen in Chapter V, he continued to make efforts to develop his educational ideas both in theory and in practice after this book. In this point several detailed examples of his aims in this study, which are quoted from various works of Froebel, including *The Education of Man*, according to the law of unity, the individual, humanity, nature, and God, may help us to see his aims of education more clearly and systematically than ever before.

Secondly, let us turn to the contents of his aims of education by taking Moore's three criteria: i) Are they realistic? ii) Is it possible to show whether or not they have ever been realised? iii) Are they morally acceptable? For Froebel the declared aim was to teach man to understand the law of unity and to help him to live in accordance with it. I think that this is his ultimate aim of education. This idea is motivated by a profound grasp of the Creator-creature and Father-son relationship in Christian teaching. His belief that the main aim of education is to pursue unity by unifying modes of learning is realistic. For Froebel early education was a matter of 'making the inner outer' - training, sharpening the senses and abilities so that children would express themselves and interact with the world about them. And also instruction - 'making the outer inner'- introducing the child to knowledge man has developed about the world. He insisted that life, action and knowledge should go hand
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in hand.

He also emphasized that children should learn by doing. Froebel, like Pestalozzi, disliked meaningless words in the field of education. How can we imagine the fact that the educator with such belief and conviction set unrealistic aims of education? I think that his descriptive, practical and detailed aims tell us that they are intended to be realistic. For Christians, living the truth is much better than merely knowing it. (Jas. 1:22, Mt. 7:21-27) Froebel’s educational aims are not unrealistic.

Concerning Moore’s second question: have they ever been realised? I think that it is not particularly difficult to answer this, because we can easily point out the fact that there are numerous people such as St. Paul, Martin Luther King, who lived in accordance with the teaching of unity with God, himself, others and nature in the history of Christianity. The fact that Froebel’s aims are rooted in Christianity can show us whether his aims have ever been realized. With the same reason we can respond to Aspin’s criticism of Froebel’s axiology. He claims that Froebel fails to provide us with an answer to questions regarding the source of moral institutions and an absolutely impartial criterion that will give us the means to adjudicate between rival institutions, competing claims or contradictory accounts of what is good so that both Froebel’s normative ethical system and his meta-ethics, he says, are hopelessly controversial yet undefended. 32) If a person believes that God is the Source of all and the giver of the Bible as the norm of belief and life, for him God is the source of moral institutions and his commands are moral judgement criteria. If Froebel did not hold this sort of view, I would agree with Aspin’s severe criticism on Froebel’s axiology. But Froebel believes that Nature is good, and that the God that unites and reconciles all things to Himself is the source of all that is right in the world and that there are objectively existing moral laws at work in the universe. In my view Aspin’s dispute is not with Froebel but with Christianity itself. Although I know that there are very sharp disputes on this issue between Christianity and rationalism, I would like to avoid dealing with them in this study. I, therefore, think that the educational aims of Froebel are in no way morally objectionable, in terms of Christian teaching. More
than that: they are desirable, though I doubt that I can convince an atheist of the fact.

Let us turn our attention to how Froebel’s educational aims have been understood and presented by the modern educational philosophers. Priestman (1952) wrote that Froebel gave as his aim that he wanted to ‘train up free thinking independent men’. For him, man only achieves full stature when, as a child of God, he can live harmoniously in relation to the spiritual and the natural world. Lilley (1967) who understood that man’s purpose presented by Froebel is to know himself, put the aim of Froebel’s education as the development of self-consciousness, citing Froebel’s statement, ‘Let my aim be to give man himself.’ Selleck (1968) says that Froebel’s aim was ‘to secure in the young human being all-sided development and unfolding of his nature’. He explains that Froebel joined Pestalozzi to stress the need for the harmonious development of the powers of the child, for the cultivation of all his faculties. When Dearden (1968) discussed aims of education, he observed that ‘growth’ can be found in Froebel’s Education of Man (1826), as also in Rousseau’s Emile (1762), in Holmes’ What Is and What Might Be (1911) and in Dewey’s Democracy and Education (1916).

According to Monroe (1970) it was the purpose of education to expand the life of the individual and comprehend the existence of self-conscious spirit which gives the unity which furnishes the explanation of the manifoldness of nature and of life through participation in this all-pervading spirit. Monroe further mentions that this inner-connectedness furnished the explanation of all reality; the realization of it in the life of the individual constitutes the aim of Froebel’s education.

Power (1970) who believes that unity is Froebel’s dominant principle, that the whole purpose of Froebel’s education is to enable men to fulfil themselves, to complete themselves, to attain unity with God, states:

Froebel envisaged a twofold aim for education. One part of the general aim was to produce in the individual a firm, pure, and strong will. The other part, which is somewhat difficult to interpret, is to lead and guide a man
[through education] to clearness concerning himself and in himself, to peace with nature, and unity with God.' In brief, Froebel was saying that education's chief purposes should be moral and, in a broad sense, social.

Binder(1970) puts Froebel's educational aim as the realization of a faithful, pure, inviolate, and therefore holy, life. He further explains that for Froebel education must develop the divine spirit in man and make him conscious of it so that his life may become a free expression of that spirit. In other words, education should lead man to a clear knowledge of himself, to peace with nature, to unity with God. 

Having looked at some statements of Froebel's educational aims in the history of education, I think that they can be categorized into two: secular and religious. We can examine the adequacy of these as interpretations of Froebel's vision. In my view, examples of the first are: the development of self-consciousness(Lilley); all-sided development and unfolding of the child's nature(Selleck), and growth and development(Dearden). Although the contents and expressions of Froebel's educational aims are comprehensive and various, as was shown earlier, whichever aim may be taken, one has to bear in mind that it would have to be extracted from his theistic metaphysic, as I have demonstrated in earlier chapters.

My contention is that Froebel's educational aims are so intimately tied up with his basic Christian beliefs that it is misleading to detach them from their Christian framework. These 'secularized' aims are a travesty of Froebel's purposes. Let us take 'growth' as an example of them. The claim is that Froebel believed there were laws of development and that children should be allowed to grow and develop free from adult moulding and shaping. They should be allowed freedom because the laws of development would ensure they grew and developed properly. Hence, Froebel was a founder of child-centred educational philosophy because he believed that children should and would grow and develop properly without adult interference and constraint. Their natural curiosity, instincts and motivations would sustain their growth.
Now, if this were true: if, that is to say, Froebel did believe that, then the consequences would be (i) that children would all grow up the same (because the laws of development were the same for all); (ii) that knowledge would be subjective - that it would not matter what children learned because they would naturally learn what they needed and that would be right for them; and (iii) that because each child developed his own understanding his knowledge would be different from the 'knowledge' possessed by others. Froebel's child-centred philosophy was, in short, deterministic, subjective and relativistic. This conclusion is shared by the secular interpreters of Froebel but they differ in their assessment of its merits. For writers such as Lilley and Holmes Froebel's educational philosophy is to be applauded and followed while for Dearden, Darling and others it is deeply flawed and is to be mistrusted.

My contention is however that both their assessments are valueless because the assumptions they share are incorrect. (i) First, Froebel's view of the laws of the development did not lead him to believe that humans developed or were compelled to develop in the same way. The concept of law bears at least two meanings: scientific and legal. The former is descriptive and the latter is prescriptive. Froebel did of course use the term in its descriptive, scientific sense. For Froebel unity was a plurality. This paradoxical-sounding phrase signified for Froebel that although there was an ultimate harmony, all living things which comprised it were significantly different and individual. Thus their paths of development would differ, although the life-force or energies which activated and sustained them was similar. But because such forces were blind, guidance was needed by teachers and other adults in order to save children from harm and lead them in the direction of the good. While Froebel counselled that teachers should do this with a light rather than a heavy hand - allowing greater freedom to children than was thought usual at the time - this in no way amounted to a deterministic account of a pre-programmed child and a laissez-faire teacher. What the modern interpreters omit is that all takes place within divine creation in which all is in a state of becoming. All things continually change and this do so in accordance with divine purpose. It is man's efforts to understand this divine
purpose and the ways by which it is achieved that we call science.

(ii) The second assumption is that knowledge in Froebel’s philosophy is subjective because it relates to each individual child who is on his own path of development, hence that there is no curriculum as such. Again this is a false assumption obtained by ripping out propositions from their Christian metaphysical framework. Froebel it was self-evidently true that we were born into a divinely created and sustained universe; moreover we were ourselves part of that universe. Our understanding had therefore an object - one object. We each had the task of understanding ourselves and the universe and our place in that universe. To do this we had to make use of the ways humans had developed to pursue their enquiries: science, religion, history, philosophy, etc.. For Froebel there was simply no room for doubt that there were epistemological objectives and that these were the same for all. God created everything and our task was to understand this creation.

(iii) The third assumption is linked to the other two. As the arguments against them have been considered, damage has also been done to this one, namely, that knowledge is relative to each individual; that what is true for one person may not be true for other. This assumption can be easily disposed of. If knowledge is objective - if, that is to say, the object of understanding is the universe, the being who created and sustains it, and the ways by which He did it - then knowledge itself is not relativistic. It is not a case of ‘true for me but not true for you’. There is a confusion between knowledge and understanding here. Of course one person’s way of learning and the state of his understanding at any one time are different from another person’s. That is not to say however that what the understanding aims at is relative. The world is the world. Deep and difficult to understand. Of course we make mistakes in our individual efforts to comprehend, but we should not infer from this that it is the world itself which is to be doubted rather than our individual, necessarily limited, and partial understanding.

I would conclude therefore that the attempts to extract secularized aims from
the Froebelian philosophy and make pronouncements on its merits or shortcomings are mistaken, flawed and lead to unsafe conclusions (whether favourable or unfavourable).

I now turn to the modern interpretations of 'religious' aims. Examples of those are: realization of self-conscious spirit in the life of the individual (Monroe), moral and social development within a firm religious structure (Power), realization of holy life (Binder). As far as I understand Froebel's educational aims as a whole, he based them on God-centred knowledge and life. I think that this approach is very crucial in Christian teaching. Groom claims:

Christian faith as a lived reality has three essential and constitutive dimensions: it is i) a belief conviction, ii) a trusting relationship, and iii) a lived life of agape. Given that we are speaking here especially of Christian faith, and of this faith as lived, these three dimensions find expression in three activities: i) faith as believing, ii) faith as trusting, and iii) faith as doing. I argue further that when we propose Christian faith as the purpose of religious education, then three dimensions and activities must be promoted.40

Froebel insists that we ought to lead them to the knowledge of God the Father, of Jesus, the Son of God, and of the Holy Spirit of God, to a life in accordance with this knowledge and insight, and to all insight necessarily proceeding from this." (The Education of Man, p.151) As Grimmitt indicates, when we talk about "aims" in education we are really talking about intentions and purposes, and we can clearly see Froebel's intentions and purposes for teaching children in his educational aims. Holding his intentions and purposes in order to realize Christianity through education, I would like to examine how adequate those presentations of Froebel's educational aims are as interpretations of Froebel's vision.

First, realization of self-conscious spirit (Monroe) is likely to be abstract and obscure. He explains that Froebel's purpose of education to expand the life of the individual and comprehend the existence of self-conscious spirit. In Froebel's descriptions of educational aims there are a number of repeated words which contain
his well-balanced intentions for education: knowing and doing, understanding and living, knowledge and life, thought and deed. Because for the Christian, religion is life itself as Groom points out, it is very necessary to describe the aims of Christian education in a practical way. If Monroe had chosen some of the practical terms which Froebel used for his own presentation of his educational aims, it would have enabled a more successful interpretation of Froebel's educational vision in the light of Christianity. Froebel did not allow a separation between knowing and doing, understanding and living, knowledge and life, thought and deed. So it seems to me that the religious educational aims of Froebel are well-balanced and integrated. Monroe has failed to show us this point.

Second, what of the view that Froebel was a Christian educator in the sense that he merely wanted children to love God and grow up to behave decently or even piously? Power's interpretation of Froebel as a religious moralist was that education's chief purposes should be moral and, in a broad sense, social. I think that Power's interpretation can be discussed in the perspective of both moral education and Christianity. According to Moran, Durkheim in *Moral Education* and Piaget in *Moral Judgement of the Child*, both believed that Christianity is a great obstacle to moral education. Moran says:

Their search was for a moral stability and moral progress unencumbered by dogmatism and intolerance. Christianity was thought to be at best a pedestrian sort of morality based on fear or at worst an immoral burden on human shoulders. Therefore, from twentieth century beginning moral education/moral development has excluded religion on principle.\(^\text{62}\)

If there is such tendency in moral education, Power's interpretation would not be acceptable to a moral educator because of Froebel's Christian religious framework. For Christianity also, Power's interpretation is unsound. If we consider The Ten commandments (Exd. 20:17) and The Greatest commandment given by Jesus (Mt.22:36-40), Christianity is more than morality. Christian teaching, of course, has something of ultimate value to offer to morality. Froebel dealt with all-sided relationships not just man to man, but man to God, man to man, man to nature in his educational aims.
He did not exclude God's heaven, either. He writes:

I desire to educate men whose feet shall stand on God's earth, rooted fast in nature, while their head towers up to heaven, and reads its secrets with steady gaze, whose heart shall embrace both earth and heaven, shall enjoy the life of earth and nature with all its wealth of forms, and at the same time shall recognise the purity and peace of heaven, that unites in its love God's earth with God's heaven. " (Autobiography, p.63)

With these perspectives Power's interpretation of Froebel's educational vision is quite reductive and minimal. Power's view may lead us not to see the importance of his world view in Froebel's educational system which is far more open, generous, wide, and expansive than his contemporary Christian thought. I think that it may become Froebel's greatest gift to educational aims.

Last, I think that Binder comprehensively presents Froebel's educational aim in the religious perspective. Holy life is the final destination of education. In order to reach it something more is needed to be done. I think that in Binder's presentation we can find these processes which Froebel set in his educational aims. We can end this section by describing Froebel's education in this way: Learning (knowledge of God, man, and nature) by doing (experience, play, self-activity, observation etc.) for living harmoniously with God, man, and nature. He states:

The aim of instruction is to bring the scholar to insight into unity of all things, into the fact that all things have their being and life in God, so that in due time, he may be able to act and live in accordance with this insight.49

In the light of this discussion how can we restate Froebel's vision? I think that it is possible to put his educational vision in this way: Education aims to bring children into the understanding that the whole of reality, (God, fellow humanity and the physical world in all its manifold aspect), is a single, integrated unity, and that authentic human life must be lived in harmony with God, humanity and Nature.
Christian education for young children in Korea has confronted various difficulties from parents’ high expectations and the mood of society. There are some parents who expect their children to learn much more and quicker for their ages even in the kindergarten. In a sense, we can say that there are some excessive phenomena in the circle of pre-school education, because many educational institutions are teaching young children under the name of early education, specific education for brilliant children and education for special skills development. The main concern of some parents is not their harmonious development but their well-preparation for being good at their studies at the elementary school. It is not easy for the Christian educational institutes to escape from these expectations.

The central focus of true, perfect religion, according to both the Old Testament (Isa. 1:17) and New Testament (Jas. 1:27, 3:13) is selfless love and care for our fellow human, out of a profound loving relationship with the Triune Creator God. This is why Christian belief cannot be real and genuine and living if it does not issue in a self-giving, holy lifestyle. Korean believers are beginning to realise that one cannot create a dichotomy between one’s intellect and one’s life: human beings have been created body and spirit. In this context, I think that Froebel’s educational aims are extremely important for the Christian education of young children. Froebel provides a basic vision and system of thought that grasps the Christian teaching of humanity and our relation to the universe, as not simply that of brute factuality but of interpersonal encounter, both with creatures and the Creator.

Finally, I would like to discuss if Froebel’s aims of education are sound and felicitous enough to be those of Christian education for young children. There are four points involved in discussing on this matter.

i) The content of his aims of education are quite comprehensive. They include a number of aims described in the first part of this section: preparation for citizenship (Plato, Erasmus), sound moral development (Herbart, Locke), God-fearing life (Calvin, Commenius, Pestalozzi), good life on earth and eternal life with God
ii) He tried to set his aims of education on the basis of the teaching of the Bible, even if his ideas are not entirely in accordance with the teaching of the Bible. But, in my view, this attempt can be regarded as a very encouraging fact in the history of Christian education. As already has been mentioned in Chapter III, his ideas on God, man, and nature are developed on the basis of the Bible. What is his attitude about this? He says, "All my efforts in the cause of education are in harmony with these words of Jesus."[44] But I do not think that his approach to the aim of Christian education is "the Confessional or Dogmatic approach".

iii) In my view, his approach to the aim of Christian education is "the across-subject approach" that is, "the Neo-Confessional or the Neo-Dogmatic approach" including the child-centred and development approach. As will be demonstrated in the next section, his Christian views of God, man, and the world can be found among the subjects.

iv) In spite of having the above points, there is one missing crucial thing. As Byrne insists,[45] the true aim of education for the Christian must be redemptive. As the cross of Jesus Christ is the centre of the message which Paul preached (ICor.2:2, Gal.6:14), so the aims of Christian education must have a redemptive element in them as a essential one. I think that Froebel's aims of education should include it.

2. THE SUBJECTS OF EDUCATION

Having discussed the aims of Froebel's education in the former section, the subjects Froebel taught children will be considered on the ground that he dealt with them in *The Education of Man* and the subjects are always a very important matter in...
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education. Some approaches to early childhood programmes will be briefly presented in the first part of this section and Froebel’s subjects for children will be discussed later.

Before considering the subjects in Froebel’s educational theory I would like to deal with the epistemology of Froebel’s educational position. Educational theory is nothing less than a theory of knowledge for conveying knowledge. As with all theories it is built upon assumptions, presuppositions, observations and aims. The validity of these basic building blocks must be constantly and thoroughly examined. However, not only the results of a theory but the assumptions must be open to thorough examination. For example, I may have a theory that when I cannot see something it disappears, because it relies on someone seeing it for it to exist: my results will be perfect, but my assumptions are highly questionable. So, the lack of bad results does not necessarily mean that the theory is correct.

Educational theories often include a very complex nest of aims, assumptions, presuppositions and objectives. Judging the validity of these can be very difficult e.g. one must test whether an aim is realisable, not whether it has in fact been realised. Thus, we must test an educational theory with a range of questions: how can we test its results? is it morally objectionable? are its aims unrealistic? are its assumptions reasonable? how well does it describe reality?

At the most fundamental level we must examine what epistemological basis the theory is operating from. Educational theory is dealing with the raw material of knowledge, so it must be clear what knowledge is, what kinds of knowledge are to be addressed, what is the structure for understanding knowledge etc.. For Froebel knowledge is a system of truth that encompasses everything: it is a unity of truth grounded in the Divine Spirit that underlies the whole universe. Aspin aptly says that for Froebel there is some sort of cosmic unity in all creatures and between all phenomena and this unity underlies all events in the world.46) In fact, for Froebel knowledge is not simply about objective facts to be gathered. No! knowledge is far
more subject-involving, self-involving. This is not to say truth is relative. No! Truth is Absolute, but it cannot be apprehended without the full engagement of the subject of the knowing, even at the deepest religious level. The principle that is the key to all knowledge is the Divine Spirit. Thus, unless one is properly related to the Divine Being one is not properly equipped to grasp and understand (even acquire) true knowledge.

Given that Froebel bases his epistemology on the unity of knowledge in the Divine Spirit, his thought develops along significant lines as Aspin rightly sums up:

The whole range of objects in the world of knowledge are in some way related to each other and to all; it is as though one were to start from investigating one object of knowledge and then go on being led from one to another.47

Thus we are brought to the very heart of Froebel's epistemology. If all of reality constitutes a single, unified system of knowledge, how is it possible to know any part without knowing the whole? This is the classic problem of epistemology. Some might argue that we do not need to know all to know a part, but this line of reasoning cannot be logically maintained. Let us say I want to know about an oak leaf. I must know what a tree is. I must know where the tree grows, how it grows, how it gets its energy. I must know what the sun is. To do this I must be able to give an account of the cosmos. Thus, all truth is interconnected and unavoidably so. Knowledge of a leaf depends upon a knowledge of the whole universe, and knowledge of the whole universe depends upon a knowledge of all its individual parts. How can I even know what are appropriate questions to put to my experience unless I possess a grasp of the unity of truth?

So, Froebel's answer to this classically insoluble problem of epistemology is that the human mind is made in the image of the Divine Spirit. As the human mind conforms itself to this Divine image, it may make true statements about creation, given that the creation bears the same rational basis as its creator. This means that
I can make true statements about the universe, but I cannot make exhaustive statements about individual things, because I am merely finite in capacity. Because I think like the creator, I am able to truly analyze my experience, but I cannot exhaustively know anything, because to do so would mean that I had to know everything exhaustively. I may predicate on the basis that the Divine Spirit has enabled me to know because the Divine Spirit is the final source of all knowledge and interpretation. I cannot creatively interpret my experience. I am able only to reinterpret my experience in the light of the Divine Spirit's definitive interpretation.

Thus, although Froebel might be attacked for his epistemology of unified knowledge in the Divine Spirit, it seems as if his answer to the problem of knowledge is far from unreasonable, and offers a very formidable solution to the classic issue. However, a far more serious criticism of Froebel may be made in connection with the process of learning this knowledge.

How can a human actually apprehend the truth? Froebel claims that humanity has been created with a mind in the image of the Divine Spirit. Equipped with this again as a manifestation and representation of the mind of God a man can go out and directly apprehend (Anschauung) the underlying relatedness of things in all their multifariousness, and moreover, apprehend them as exhibiting and conforming to a unity in a way that is also itself a kind of unitary, holistic appreciation.

This kind of thought enabled Froebel to make educational principles for teaching. He believed that a child would gain knowledge and understanding simply by being exposed to raw experience. He was able to make such a claim because he believed that the natural law of the cosmos operated also within the child allowing experience to be brought into the overarching unity of truth in the Divine Spirit.

There seems to be a genuine difficulty here. Froebel's belief in the unity of truth in the Divine Spirit cannot be easily dismissed using logic, given that his presuppositions and conditioning beliefs make it a consistent, reasonable conclusion.
Most criticism of this aspect of Froebel's thought seems to come out of a basically naturalistic, rationalistic set of presuppositions and conditioning beliefs. So, Froebel's basic epistemological assertion is quite strong, but what he does with it is more problematical. The following questions are difficult to answer from within his theory of knowledge: If there are objective, absolute natural laws and because of the Divine Creator Spirit the human mind is able to think in harmony with and discover and understand these Laws, then why is everybody's knowledge not entirely in agreement? If a person's knowledge and experience directly relate to objective truth according to natural laws, can anybody be wrong? Yes, but only in so far as they operate inconsistently with the natural laws and the Divine Spirit. But, is it possible to be inconsistent with natural laws? The content of these natural laws is far from agreed on and what Froebel understood by the natural laws would be very different from what is generally understood by basic natural principles today.

For Froebel the most valuable knowledge is knowledge of the law of unity and harmony. Education is aiming at the individual living harmoniously with the physical universe, fellow humanity and God Himself. It appears that Froebel's epistemology and educational aims are so intimately tied up with his basic Christian beliefs that it is difficult to make his principles apply in a non-Christian framework of belief. If a person presupposes that there is no God and that, therefore, God is not the fundamental unity behind all thought and experience, then Froebel's thought will appear incoherent and "silly". Of course, to Froebel any non-theistic interpretation of the universe would appear incoherent and 'silly'. Modern philosophy's focus on the fundamental importance of controlling beliefs which are not argued to, but argued from, is a great help in making a fair assessment of Froebel.

Froebel does not attempt to justify many of his presuppositions and assumptions. He accepts them as essential aspects of Christian dogma. Thus, the real question must be placed over the fundamental assertions of Christian dogma concerning a Triune Being who has made a universe and humanity in basic conformity to His own mind. Froebel is far from alone in choosing this as his starting
point. The twentieth century has been full of similar thinkers: Karl Barth (1886-1968), Herman Dooyeweerd (1894-1977), Cornelius Van Til (1895-1987) - all these men have impacted religious philosophy most profoundly with their insistence on taking the starting point of Christian thought as a given revelation to be built on, rather than a logical conclusion to be built up to.

If Froebel is taking the existence of the Creator Trinity as the source of all truth and meaning as the basic content of the Christian revelation, then to attempt to justify these ideas using logic is to deny them as revealed. This is not to say such ideas are immune from criticism, but that the criticism must be directed at the source of those beliefs, Christianity, rather than at the beliefs themselves in and of themselves. If there has been no revelation or if that revelation is not what Christianity claims that it is, then Froebel’s system of thought falls.

Having seen Froebel’s explicit epistemology, we should ask some questions concerning the relation between Froebel’s view of knowledge and the curriculum. Does Froebel’s world-view present him with any difficulties over the teaching of science, mathematics, art, language? I do not believe so, because we can see that Froebel managed his school smoothly without any difficulties related to the curriculum. As will be demonstrated in the following section, instead of despising each subject he insists on the necessity of these subjects as the chief groups of instruction and further presents the importance of each subject. For instance, he sees science as enormously important in connection with Christian cosmology. He called mathematics the science of learning and thinks that it is the expression of life. We cannot see any differences between Froebel’s type of curriculum and others’. If there is one, it is the different attitude of teachers in Froebel’s education who ought to deal with each subject integratively not separately. It means that the teacher should keep the line of ‘the life of unity’ in dealing with each subject. In this sense, Froebel is a very modern and contemporary educator.

Curtis makes her comments on Froebel’s influence on the education for the
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pre-school child in this way:

Although his pedagogy has long been considered sterile there is no doubt that Froebel pioneered a new approach to our understanding of children’s activities and ways of learning, demonstrating that children need a vast number of experiences before they can arrive at an awareness of themselves and the world.⁴⁸

This is just one of the many evaluations of Froebel’s approach to early childhood programme which we frequently come across in the books concerning the early childhood education.

There are some different kinds of approaches to early childhood programmes such as the developmental approach, the constructivist view, and the child-centred approach, which should be considered separately.

In the developmental education for the early years, the curriculum is based on the assumption that children do indeed pass through stages of development—that growth is an orderly, predictable, sequential process and that a good teacher or parent can help children grow to their full potential by recognizing these stages and by offering suitable experiences that nurture and challenge them they develop.⁴⁹ It is well-known that the developmentally appropriate programme is widely carried out in the early childhood education in America. The curriculum of the developmental education for the early years is composed of fostering physical well-being, nourishing and maintaining emotional health, fostering social development, enhancing creativity, and developing language skills and mental ability.

The constructivist view is understood to include those who are trying to put Piaget’s theory into educational practices by demonstrating the relationship between psychological theories of mental development and educational practices. In other words, it is a cognitive developmental approach based on the theory of Piaget.

DeVries and Kohlberg(1987) suggested three types of translation of Piaget’s
theory into educational practice: Global, Literal, and Free translation\textsuperscript{50)} Global translation is a simplification into vague generalities - certain very general aspects of the theory are loosely matched with certain educational objectives or practices. Literal translation is a direct transfer or application of part of Piaget's research and theory to teaching. Free translation is a process of elaborating practices that preserve the spirit of the theory's constructivism.

'We teach children, not subjects.' is one of the child-centred education slogans. Entwistle puts the meaning of the slogan like this:

What is really being claimed is something like this, 'We teach children, not subjects', but human knowledge organized in ways more easily apprehended by the immature or more in accordance with the way in which they use knowledge in their everyday lives. What we want to avoid is knowledge in watertight compartment.\textsuperscript{50)}

Kelly summarizes three main points which are claimed in this approach: i) Our main concern should be the needs of the child; ii) the contents of the curriculum should be decided by reference to his interests; iii) we should attempt to give a coherent account of the nature of growth.\textsuperscript{52)}

In order to see whether Froebel's subjects for children have any significance to Christian education, I think that the grounds for his curriculum, the contents of his curriculum, and his attitudes towards the curriculum should be examined.

His chief groups of subjects of instruction were religion and religious instruction, natural science and mathematics, language and art. Why did Froebel regard these subjects as the main subjects for children? According to him, it has been related to two reasons: human necessity and the different ways in which we live.

Firstly, he explained the necessities of these subjects for children in this way. He believed that religion, nature, and language constitute an integral unity. Froebel sometimes put mathematics in the category of nature study, because he believed that
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mathematics represents the tendency, laws, and causes of nature in man and without mathematics man can obtain no knowledge of nature.\(^{33}\):

Since man is destined to know and to see clearly, human education requires the knowledge and appreciation of religion, nature(mathematics), and language in their intimate living reciprocity and mutual causality. Without the knowledge and appreciation of the intimate unity of the three, the school and we ourselves are lost in the fallacies of bottomless, self-producing diversity.\(^{50}\)

Secondly, he thinks that there are three ways in which we conduct ourselves.

There is either a tendency to inward repose and life, or a tendency to the study and comprehension of the external, or a tendency to direct representation of the internal. The first is the prevailing tendency of religion; the second, the contemplation of nature; the third, self-development and self-contemplation.\(^{59}\)

He also presents a principle to bring new subjects to the pupil. He says:

No new subject of instruction should be brought to the pupil unless he at least feels vaguely that it is based on previous work, how it is applied in this, and it satisfies a mental need.\(^{50}\)

This warning is one of the considerations for the readiness of the learner which teachers always ought to take into account.

Which subjects did Froebel teach children throughout his life? They were Christian education, natural science, mathematics, language and art which will be dealt with in the following section.

(1) CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

The definition of Christian religion ought to be presented before mentioning the Christian instruction. Froebel says that Christian religion is the eternal conviction of the truth of the teachings of Jesus, and a firm, persistent conduct in obedience to this
Christian Education in Froebel’s Educational Theory

conviction... For Froebel, religion mostly designates Christian religion in his works.

Because the content and direction of religious instruction depend on the definition of religion, I think that it is necessary to put Froebel’s definition of religion. He says:

Religion is the endeavour to raise into clear knowledge the feeling that originally the spiritual self of man is one with God, to realize the unity with God which is founded on this clear knowledge, and to continue to live in this unity with God, serene and strong, in every condition and relation of life. Religion is not something fixed, but an ever-progressing and, for this very reason ever-present tendency.

He had tried to explain who can be called a Christian. He remarked:

If man consciously and clearly recognizes that his spiritual self proceeds from God, that is originally one with God, and that consequently he is in a state of continuous dependence on God, as well as in a state of continuous and uninterrupted community with God; if he finds his salvation, his peace, his joy, his destiny, his life, and the source of his being in this eternally necessary dependence of his self on God, in the clearness of this knowledge in all he does, in a life, indeed, fully unified with this knowledge and conviction - he truly, and in the full sense of the words, recognizes in God his Father. If he acknowledges himself to be a child of God, and lives in accordance with this, he has the Christian religion, the religion of Jesus.

He claimed that the truth of this conviction is the sole foundation of all insight and knowledge and that it is the foundation of all religious instruction. With this confidence he strongly proposed that school should give children Christian instruction. He said:

Every human being, as proceeding from God, existing through God and living in God, should raise himself to the Christian religion - the religion of Jesus. Therefore, the school should first of all, and above all, give instruction in the Christian religion; everywhere, and in all zones, the school should instruct for and in this religion.

He once pointed out the reason why man fails to know God and Jesus. He puts
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It like this:

We are ignorant of our own nature and of the nature of humanity, and yet would know God and Jesus. We imagine that we already know our own nature and the nature of humanity, and, therefore, fail to know God and Jesus.63

He seemed to believe that this vital failure could be overcome through religious education.

What did Froebel tell us of the role of religious education then? He sets it out clearly in his book The Education of Man.

Religious instruction quickens, confirms, explains the feeling that man’s own spiritual self, his soul, his mind and spirit, have their being and origin in God and proceed from God; it shows that the qualities and the nature of the soul, of the mind and spirit, have their being in and through God; it gives an insight into the being and working of God; it gives an insight into the relation of God to man, as it is clearly manifested in the mind and life of every one, in life as such, and particularly in the life and development of mankind, as they are preserved and revealed in the sacred books; it applies this knowledge to life as such, and particularly to and in the life of each one, and to the progressive development of mankind, so that the divine may be represented in the human, and that man may know and do his duty; it presents and points out the ways and means by which the desire to live in true unity with God may be gratified, and by which this unity, if impaired, may be restored.63

As already has been demonstrated in the former section, all Froebel’s educational aims are related to the aims of religious education.

In dealing with the curriculum with regard to childhood education, Froebel indicated two main failures in it. He writes:

We do not give early boyhood enough credit for religious power as well as for mental power generally. For this reason, in later boyhood, life and soul are so empty, so wholly without experience, and therefore, so callous and dull with reference to spiritual, ethical, and religious notions. They are early introduced to outer life, and estranged from inner life; for this reason the latter is so hollow and dull.63
Thus he stressed the point that religious education should be carried out for every child in the early stages with the appropriate methods. As will be seen in the next section, he also suggests many good methods for it in the home as well as at school and church.

Froebel’s nephew, Karl Froebel, tells us about the religious education which Froebel carried out for children in his school in this way:

Religious instruction belongs to instruction in poetry, that is to the sublime poetry which is contained in the Psalms, and throughout the whole Bible. Religion is the philosophy of the heart; philosophy is the religion of the head - the knowledge and the enjoyment of the Divine truth. The heart can only be satisfied by the love or fear of a personal God, to whom we can pray and speak. In this way children must be taught Divine truth, and in this way Froebel taught it. Religious education is more than religious instruction; it cannot succeed without the church and the family. The boarding school of my uncle was a religious Christian family in a wide sense.65)

Of what did Froebel’s religious education consist? He illustrated some of his ideas like this:66)

The life of a family and a boy will necessarily be:

i) a prayer of Jesus expressed in conduct and in deeds, a living prayer of Jesus;

ii) a rich and efficient Christian life;

iii) trusting in God;

iv) loving God, and man;

v) spontaneously active in childlike obedience to God;

vi) the teachings of Jesus will be interpreted in their own life;

vii) and the application of these teachings in life will become possible.

viii) the way of arousing, strengthening, and cultivating a religious sense;

ix) the importance of a mother’s prayer; and

x) how to help children to get the knowledge of God, man and nature.
In Froebel’s teaching about Christian education, religious sense is a vital concept especially Christian education for children, because he believes that it is like a germ for their later religious life. His main concern for the Christian education of children is to explain how to arouse and cultivate it. According to him, it can arouse and strengthen the religious sense of children through having spiritual union between parent and child and then it helps them to have a relationship with God. He explains its importance in this way:

This feeling of community, first uniting the child with mother, father, and brothers, sisters... is the very first germ, the very first beginning of all true religious spirit, of all genuine yearning for unhindered unification with the Eternal, with God.  

In addition to this, there are a number of his illustrations concerning the religious sense of children, I would like to put one of them here. He says:

Therefore pure human, parental, and filial relations are the key, the first condition, of that heavenly, divine, fatherly, and filial relation and life, of a genuine Christian life in thought and action.

The mother’s prayer as one of Froebel’s methods for Christian education will be presented in next section. As will be seen in the following section, Froebel designed the other subjects to help children to get the knowledge of God, man, and nature.

I think that it would be better to look at Froebel’s two guidelines of religious education before moving on to see the other subjects. Firstly, he insists that religious instruction should throw light upon experiences resting on one’s inner freedom, serenity, and contentment, should bring them into clear consciousness, should harmonize and unite them, should deduce from them the self-evident and axiomatic truths, show their application in all conditions of life in which force, life, and spirit are active, should exhibit their agreement with the truths recognized and uttered by the God-inspired men. Secondly, he asserts that unless man ascends from the
knowledge of the Fatherhood of God in his own life to a knowledge of his Fatherhood in the life of mankind, future religious instruction will be empty and barren in the same inverse.\(^7\)0\)

He also tried to explain other subjects on the basis of his principles described below.\(^7\)1\)

i) Every form of education which is intended to be really fruitful, must be based upon religion,…

ii) The Christian religion, the religion of Jesus, satisfies to perfect completeness the mutual relations of God and man; and indeed creates them. …

iii) Every form of education which is not based upon the Christian religion, the religion of Jesus, is deficient and limited.

iv) Through Jesus came to us that deepest of all truths, and that profoundest of all experiences - God is our Father.

In dealing with other subjects of Froebel for children in the following section, the content will be limited to the things which may be related to Christian education, for it is in accordance with the purpose of this study.

(2) NATURAL SCIENCE

Froebel's view of nature is so striking in his ideas that we cannot think of his education, especially natural science apart from it. As already has been mentioned in chapter III, he believes that nature is the work, a revelation of God and the law of nature is the will of God. This is the reason why Froebel claims that children should learn natural science. As was indicated earlier, he considers nature as the book which God has given humanity to read in its childhood.

According to him, the more children get to the knowledge of nature, the more they can get to the knowledge of themselves and God. He describes it like this:
How much more, then should we endeavour to know nature, the work of God, to acquaint ourselves with the objects of nature in their life, their significance, in their relation to the spirit of God.72

For a Christian, as Froebel maintains, the study of nature is not just optional, but compulsory. There is much evidence in the Psalms as well as in the history of Christianity that believers joyfully praised God as the result of the study of nature.

Concerning this kind of experience Davies expresses it in this way. He remarks:

Scientific experience may mean a vivid sense of entering into God’s mind and co-operating, in awe and wonder, with His purposes for the world; to see and meditate in colour and shape a moment, or an arrangement, of perfect beauty in nature may give an intense consciousness of sharing in the divine work of creation; to hear certain sounds, to see certain sights, to appreciate certain patterns and meanings, in nature or in art, may give a certainty of at least momentary at-oneness with the Creator of the universe.73

Davies continues to say that science can give us awe, wonder, and gratitude in the presence of a God supremely wise and skilful, and intellectual fellowship with Him.74 Davies assures that science education could be taught on the basis of Christian belief.

With reference to this subject, I think that it is necessary to show Froebel’s basic outlook on the study of nature. He maintains that a Christian perspective is the only true way to view nature. He writes:

This truth is the foundation of all contemplation, knowledge, and comprehension of nature. Without it there can be no true, genuine, productive investigation and knowledge of nature. Without it there can be no true contemplation of nature, leading to insight into the essential being of nature.75

As Mason says, science and religion cannot, to the believer in God, by any possibility, be antagonistic,76 Froebel earlier confirmed this crucial fact as the
ground for the study of science. His strong conviction of this can be noted in the following statement. In my view, it is actually what the Christian teacher should have and apply in teaching children science. He states:

Only the Christian, only the human being with Christian spirit, life, and aspiration, can possibly attain a true understanding and a living knowledge of nature; only such a one can be a genuine naturalist.77

What is the content of natural science for Froebel? For him, the study of natural science means individualities in nature, in themselves and their relations to one another and to the whole including energy, the cause of its action and this action itself. Among them, physics and chemistry are considered important subjects as the bases for other sciences. He says:

The physical and chemical sides of nature-study, so important for man, will strike their roots the deeper in the pupil’s interest the more this in this instruction has been exhaustive of essentials.78

The observation of nature and our surroundings has been emphasized as the best way of science learning. He says:

The observation of surroundings has already shown clearly the budding-points for the development of physics and chemistry as future distinct subjects of instruction.79

Thinking of Froebel’s examples of science education, I think that it is worth noting Lopez’s suggestion for science education. She suggests:

Children will learn to use and understand the scientific method which will involve the use of reading and math skills - developing a scientific vocabulary, noticing likeness and differences, classifying, sequencing, drawing conclusions, making generalizations making inferences, noting cause and effect, measuring, and making graphs, charts, and diagrams. In addition, hypothesizing will be introduced.80
(3) MATHEMATICS

Arithmetic was one of Froebel's favourite subjects and he also received private tuition in this subject. His progress was so rapid that he came to equal his teacher at the school at Stadt-Ilm both in theory and practice. During working as a forester's apprentice, he devoted himself to the study of mathematics and language. As has been shown in chapter II, he also took lectures on applied mathematics, algebra, geometry with other subjects at University of Jena.

But when he felt that he could not solve the questions being set to Pestalozzi's students at Yverdon, he decided to begin arithmetic from the very beginning over again according to his system. Froebel not only studied mathematics with keen interest and enthusiasm but also taught it to children with confidence and using his own methods.

Why, then, did Froebel think that children need to learn mathematics as a chief subject? It was because he believed that mathematics has a function as a mediator between man and nature, between the inner and the outer world, between thought and perception. This, his explanation about mathematics, mostly depends on his philosophy to pursue the unity of life. It seems to me that there are some symbolic and mystical aspects in his explanation of mathematics which are related to Christianity.

According to him, number is the expression of diversity, and form and magnitude find their explanation only in diversity. So a knowledge of number is the foundation of a knowledge of form and magnitude - of a general knowledge of space. He employed many different ways to develop children's concept of number and to teach them how to count, such as the drawing of object, language exercise, using gifts and play activities.

He tried to explain the relationship between mathematics and human life in this
way:

Mathematics is, then, neither foreign to actual life nor something deduced from life; it is the expression of life as such: therefore its nature may be studied in life, and life may be studied with its help.

Froebel who called mathematics the science of learning stressed its importance in education like this. He stated:

Education without mathematics (at least without a thorough knowledge of numbers, supplemented by occasional instruction in form and magnitude) is, therefore, weak, imperfect patchwork; it interposes insuperable limits to the normal culture and development of man.

What is the place of mathematics in a Christian education? Bielby developed his ideas to answer this question by examining the functions of mathematics with Christian belief. I think that putting Bielby's ideas here may help us to understand what Froebel tried to say and not to be misled into the symbolic and mystical aspects of his mathematics education for children.

The following five points are given by Bielby:

i) It obviously should have an important place in any education, both as a necessary aid to science and technology and as an expression of the human spirit.

ii) Mathematics is also an art. It is its aesthetic appeal which has led many students to the study of mathematics. The mathematician, like an artist, is concerned with form, order, and pattern; and his pattern must be beautiful.

iii) As Christian beliefs in God, one of which is that God is the source of all truth, a Christian education will, then, be one in which there are no limitations to free inquiry, one which will range over the whole of human knowledge in its pursuit of the truth. Mathematics contributes to this pursuit of the truth.
iv) Mathematics has a function to reason from a hypothesis and to test its truth.

v) The truths of mathematics are universal in their application, and know no barriers. The results of it are also permanent. In this respect the study of mathematics seems to point to the changelessness of God 'with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning'(Jas.1:17).

(4) LANGUAGE

As English is one of the core subjects in the national curriculum of England and Wales, so is language education in Froebel's education. As far as his studies were concerned, language studies were an important one to him. He learnt Latin both at the school of Stadt-Ilm and in the prison at Jena. As can be seen in Chapter II, he studied linguistic and several languages (Hebrew, Arabic, Sanskrit, Persian, Hindustantee, and Greek) at the University of Gottingen. When he saw the language lesson at the school of Pestalozzi, he thought that it was an arbitrary and non-productive style. At Berlin University, he studied language especially the vowels a, o, e, ae, au, ei, for language appears to him to underlie the universal laws of expression. How does Froebel define language itself? The five following statements show his definition of language:85)

i) Language represents the unity of all diversity, the inner living connection of all things;

ii) language is the self-active outward expression of the inner;

iii) the attributes and phenomena of life must be revealed in human speech;

iv) it is the expression of the human mind, as nature is the expression of the divine mind;

v) language is concerned more with the outward representation of inner perception, has reference more to reason.

In other words, he sees language as a means to represent the inner perception,
human mind and the inner. But he once said that in instruction language comes in as an auxiliary in order to furnish tests of the extent and accuracy of the pupil’s observation. According to him, as God, desiring to reveal Himself unequivocally in the fullness and integrity of His being, uses religion, nature and language for this end, man equally needs the knowledge and appreciation of these three. As indicated above, for Froebel, it is not permissible to think of them separately in their serviceability and their relations with man. He says:

> A complete knowledge and firm confidence in the one necessarily implies complete knowledge and firm confidence in the other; a true study of the one necessarily implies also the true study of the other.\(^{87}\)

I think that language in Froebel’s curriculum thus has a prominent meaning for Christian education, however there may be many others to consider from other viewpoints.

(5) ART

Art means music as representation by tones particularly song, and drawing being made up of painting as representation by colour, and modeling as representation by plastic material in Froebel’s curriculum. Froebel found that children have a desire to express their ideas and what they see around themselves by one of the arts even at an early stage of childhood.\(^{88}\)

He believes that music instruction helps children’s development of ear and voice simultaneously and children to express their feelings in word and sound. In
addition to this, he also emphasizes the importance of the memorizing of religious maxims for the purposes of song and in song. Many examples justifying teaching children songs and singing them to praise God are shown in his educational activities.

Concerning the value of drawing, Froebel says:

The drawing properly stands between the word and the thing, shares certain qualities with each of them, and is, therefore, so valuable in the development of the child. The true drawing has this in common with the thing, that it seeks to represent it in form and outline; like the word, however, it never is the thing itself, but only an image of the thing.

Even though Froebel claims that art and appreciation of art should be cared for early, at latest in childhood, he does not imply that children are to devote themselves chiefly to art and are to be become artists; but that they should be enabled to understand and appreciate works of art.

He explicitly expresses his main purpose of art education. He puts it in this way:

Its intention will not be to make each pupil an artist in someone or all of the art, but to secure to each human being full and all-sided development, to enable him to see man in the universality and all-sided energy of his nature, and particularly, to enable him to understand and appreciate the product of true art.

Like other subjects, Froebel manifests the relation of art to other fields of the life of man. I think that with this respect, the place of his art education in relation to Christian education can be shown. He states:

There is an art, too, a side where it touches mathematics, the understanding; another where it touches the world of language, reason; a third where - although itself clearly a representation of the inner - it coincides with the representation of nature; and a fourth where it coincides with religion.

He, therefore, comes to the conclusion that Christian art is the highest, for its
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aims to represent in everything, particularly in and through man, the eternally permanent, the divine and that man is the highest object of human art. As Davies states art also can give us intellectual-emotional harmony with the source of beauty and creativity, we will be able to have fellowship with God - an ‘I and thou’ relationship through art with the belief in the saving work of Christ.

In conclusion, I would like to characterize Froebel’s main principles of curriculum for children as follows:

i) He tried to explain and develop every single chief subject on the basis of his own understanding of Christianity and belief. I think that such an attitude and attempt can be a good example for Christian teachers and parents. But we have to note that our understanding of Christianity and belief should be firmly rooted in the teaching of the Bible;

ii) he did not see all subjects separately. As already has been shown, he rather explained the nature, aim and importance of each subject in the light of its relationship with the other subjects. I think that this attitude of dealing with all subjects as integrated is more important in childhood education than others.

Here is a warning given by Moberly which seems to be on the same line as Froebel in dealing with the curriculum for Christian education. He says:

All things must speak of God, refer to God, or they are atheistic. History, without God, is a chaos without design or aim or end. ... Physics, without God, would be but a dull enquiry into certain meaningless phenomena; Ethics, without God, would be a varying rule without principle, or substance, or centre, or ruling hand; ... All sciences... will tend to exclude the thought of God if they are not cultivated with reference to Him.

With Moberly, I think that all subjects in Christian education must be Bible-centred and God-centred. It seems to me that Froebel was one of those who tried to carry out education in this way.
3. THE METHODS OF EDUCATION

Whilst the curriculum which has been discussed in the previous section is concerned with what we should teach children, the methods of education are concerned with how to teach children effectively what the teacher intends. In other words, the methods of Christian education for children mean the ways of teaching to put a child in touch with God, the human race, and the universe on the basis of the philosophy of Christian education.

Before considering Froebel's methods of general education and Christian education for young children, it is necessary to deal with his pedagogical principles, because the methods of education are entirely depend on pedagogy. How did Froebel conceive of education itself? As a matter of fact, he set out his own thinking of education in the first part of his main book *The Education of Man*. He defined the science of education, the theory of education and the practice of education in connection with the knowledge of the eternal law. For him education consists of training and instruction: bodily training, language training, use of senses, and religious training, play, instruction in words and in examples, and true discipline. We can make his explanation of them according to children's age as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Children’s main task</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Role of adult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infancy</td>
<td>Making the internal external</td>
<td>Fostering period</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyhood</td>
<td>Making the external internal</td>
<td>Learning period</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As one can see, he used the terms ‘training’ and ‘instruction’ in a non-modern fashion; nevertheless his view clearly emphasized the dynamic role of the teacher. There is no hint of laissez-faire freedom here.

In Froebel's pedagogy, education is based on consideration of the innermost.
So the main point of education is how to connect the inner and the outer. Froebel maintains that subjects should have connection with real life. Hailmann indicates that Froebel designates the law of the connection of contrasts variously as the law of development and as the law of unification. Froebel puts:

Every thing and every being comes to be known only as it is connected with the opposite of its kind, and its unity, its agreement with this opposite, its equation with reference to this is discovered; and the completeness of this knowledge depends upon the completeness of this connection with the respective opposite, and upon the complete discovery of the connecting thought or link. ⁹⁹

I think that the role of the teacher and the methods are characterized by this. Of the role of the teacher he says:

The educator, the teacher, should make the individual and particular general, the general particular and individual, and elucidate both in life; he should make the external internal, and the internal external, and indicate the necessary unity of both; he should consider the finite in the light of the infinite, and the infinite in the light of the finite, and harmonize both in life; he should see and perceive the divine essence in whatever is human, trace the nature of man to God, and seek to exhibit both within one another in life. ⁹⁹

He also insists that education in instruction and training, originally and in its first principles, should necessarily be sensitive and helpful, not prescriptive, categorical, interfering. ¹⁰⁰ But he explained the process of education as double-sided - giving and taking, uniting and dividing, prescribing and following, active and passive, positive yet giving scope, firm and yielding.

Because he believed that the purpose of teaching and instruction is to bring ever more out of man rather than to put more and more into children, he stressed the importance of voluntary and free activity, experience rather than instruction, action rather than books, explanation by and through concrete things. What are the main principles of Froebel’s idea of teaching? Bowen states:

The main principles, it will be remembered, whose applications form
Froebel’s system, are: self-activity, to produce development; all-side connectedness and unbroken continuity, to help the right acquisition of knowledge; creativeness, or expressive activity, to produce assimilation of knowledge, growth of power, and acquisition of skill; well-ordered physical activity, to develop the physical body and its power; and happy and harmonious surroundings to foster and help all these.101)

With Froebel’s ideas of teaching and learning he developed his own methods for children’s education. For example, because of his belief that education should be largely sense-perceptual, he invented certain devices called ‘gifts’ and ‘occupations’ for guiding and development of the perceptions of young children.102)

As the result of the development of child psychology and technology, there are abundant methods ranging from the Socratic method known as the dialectic to the audio-visual aids around us. Grimmitt recommends educational drama, music and art, and films, tapes and communication media as the methods whose potentialities would appear to have been least explored by many teachers within the context of religious education.103) Educational drama includes movement, improvisation, play-acting, role-play, sociodrama, mime, dance drama, stylized drama and even story-telling. Byrne makes mention of it in this way:

Much of the inspiration for and guidance in the use of methods in Christian education was given by Jesus Christ. He used the objective method, the analytical-synthetic method, the inductive-deductive method, the method of suggestion, the Socratic method, and discipline. Other methods used today in Christian schools include memory, recitation, discussion, lecture, project, drama, and story-telling. This by no means exhausts the list. Audio-visual aids illustrate this.104)

In a sense, it is a blessing both for teachers and for children that there is an abundance of different methods of education around them. These blessings resulted from the combined efforts of those who have been involved in education. Froebel was undoubtedly one of these.

In treating the methods of Froebel’s Christian education for children, I think that there are three points to be tackled: 1) the importance of the method in the
teaching-learning process, 2) the characteristics of children's faith development, 3) and Froebel's methods of Christian education for children.

(1) THE IMPORTANCE OF THE METHODS OF EDUCATION

After setting up the curriculum of Christian education, the next problem is transferring it to the pupil through the teaching activities. Lebar puts it like this:

How can we help pupils to get through the written Word to the Living Word? How can we help them translate Scripture into life? How can we help them take the next step toward maturity in Christ?... Our problem is to bring them to Christ, help them grow in Christ, and send them out for Christ.... Unless we discover how people learn, we won't be able to teach as we ought.105

So he continues to define effective learning as an inner, active, continuous, disciplined process in order to unfold the importance of the methods of education.106

What is the importance of the method of education? First of all, although pupils are always learning something, often what they learn is not what the teacher intended to teach, particularly if the appropriate method is not used. The method of education is an important means of achieving the aim of education.

Secondly, unless something has first happened in the inner life of children, teachers cannot expect their desired changes to be influential after the lesson is finished. Considering their physical, emotional, psychological and spiritual needs, the teacher ought to reach their inner life through the right method of education.

Thirdly, the method of education has a role to elevate the effectiveness of the lesson in the teaching and learning process. Edman says:

Teaching by the printed or spoken word is made really effective when
indoctrination becomes inspiration, when precept becomes practice, when illustration becomes experience. We learn best by doing the right things, and we can only hope that information and exhortation will suffice to keep our boys and girls from the wrong kind of experience.¹⁰⁷

Through employing the right approaches in the lesson, the pupils will be able to understand what is taught more effectively.

As the term ‘method’ itself means a way of doing things, the method of education involves the use of educative procedures in attaining educational goals. Consequently, as was indicated above, the method of education has its own importance in the educational process. In other words, the method of education is the means by which children learn.

Apart from the importance of the method of education, I think that there is one thing that we have to bear in mind in connection with the method of education. It is the fact that the success of education does not totally depend on the methods. Allison puts it in this way:

Success depends not upon the method, but upon the teacher. ...It must be an intensely personal approach capable of meeting the needs of particular children in a particular setting. Furthermore, the teacher must feel comfortable with it.¹⁰⁸

The ability of the teacher using a method of education should be taken into account in the teaching and learning process.

(2) THE CHILDREN AND THEIR FAITH DEVELOPMENT

As the method of education depends to some extent on the age of the learner as well as on the subject, I think that it is necessary to look into some theories of the faith development stage in children. It is not a reasonable thing for the teacher to take some methods without first understanding the children’s development and the nature of the subject to teach.
It is a well-known fact that there are theories of developmental stages according to various perspectives. Freud held five psychosexual development stages of man: Oral (birth to 18 months) - Anal (18 months to 3 years) - Phallic (3 to 6 years) - Latency (6 years to puberty) - Genital stage (puberty through adulthood). Even though Freud's theory has dubious scientific value, it explains how and why individuals are different.  

Erikson maintained eight psychosocial development stages of man: Basic trust v. mistrust (birth to 18 months) - Autonomy v. shame (18 months to 3 years) - Initiative v. guilt (3 to 6 years) - Industry v. inferiority (6 years to puberty) - Identity v. identity confusion (puberty to young adulthood) - Intimacy v. isolation (young adulthood) - Generativity v. stagnation (middle adulthood) - Integrity v. despair (old age) stage. Erikson's theory covering the entire life span focused upon social and cultural influences on the development.

Piaget had four cognitive development stages: Sensori-motor (birth to 2 years) - pre-operational (2 to 7 years) - Concrete operations (7 to 12 years) - Formal operations (12 years to adulthood) period. Piaget explained many aspects of children's thought and behaviour at each stage. He has had great influence in education as well as other fields such as linguistics, anthropology and medicine. Especially his study stimulates others to research cognitive development in childhood. Liebschner claims that Froebel discerned the developmental stage of child like Piaget. Liebschner says:

Though Froebel did not name each stage, the order of them together with their characteristics are the same as those given by Piaget.

What do these theories and I Corinthians 13:11 reveal about children and their way of thinking? Ronald Goldman claims, "Children cannot think in an abstract way about religious concepts before the mental age of thirteen." Five translations of what Apostle Paul writes in I Corinthians are as follows:

"When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child." (AV)
"When I was a child, I spoke like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child." (RSV)

"When I was a child, I used to speak as a child, think as a child, reason as a child." (NASB)

"When I was a child, I talked like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child." (NIV)

"When I was a child, my speech, my outlook and my thoughts were all childish." (NEB)

I think that the Faith Development Working Party's (FDWP) comment on this verse could be an answer for the above question. They say:

The quotation implies that children think differently from adults. This does not just mean that they think about different things or have different ideas - that the content of their thinking is different. It also means that the way they think is often different from the way an adult thinks.\textsuperscript{113}

Another attempt has been carried out in relation to this verse by the FDWP. They maintain:

Faith is not something we have, but something we do. We might even call it ‘faithing’. St. Paul's text may then be rewritten: 'When I was a child, I faithed as a child.' Or, to put it in James Fowler's own words: One who becomes Christian in childhood may indeed remain Christian all of his or her life. But one's way of being Christian will need to deepen, expand, and be reconstituted several times in the pilgrimage of faith.\textsuperscript{114}

Such statement could be supported by many relevant verses in the Bible. God commends the believers to grow up and become mature, attaining to the whole measure of the fullness of Christ through verses such as "But grow in the grace and the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." (2Pet.3:18, cf.1Cor.14:20, Eph.4:13,15) There are a lot of references about spiritual maturity (1Cor. 13:11, Col.1:10, Heb.6:1) and immaturity (1Cor. 3:1,2, Gal.4:1-3, Eph.4:14, Heb.5:12) and examples of the spiritual growth (1Sam.2:26, Lk.1:80, Act9:22).
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Just as Piaget held stages in the way of our thinking, and Kolberg kept stages of moral judgement, so James Fowler claims to have discovered six stages of faith. Westerhoff postulates four styles of faith. Moran suggests three stages of religious education development. Keen claims to discern five stages or dimensions of life.¹¹⁵) Lebar recognizes the existence of the stages of spiritual development and defends its validity based on God's attribution. He says:

Spiritual growth resembles physical growth in that it is usually steady, ongoing, continuous.... He doesn't skip any of the major stages, but takes one after another in a distinct pattern of growth. "First the blade, the ear, after that the full corn in the ear"(Mk.4:28). Never the ripe fruit before the earlier stages, nor the ear before the blade. These stages of development are part of the orderliness of God's universe that He has ordained in infinite wisdom.¹¹⁶)

In order to see the nature of a child's faith development before looking at Froebel's methods for Christian education, I would like to present four theories of faith development. As already has been mentioned, they are those of James Fowler, John Westerhoff, Gabriel Moran, and Sam Keen.

1) Fowler's stages of faith

How does Fowler define Christian faith and what are his stages of faith? According to Fowler, Christian faith means that conversion and formation of human faith in and through relationship to God which is mediated through Jesus, the Scriptures and teachings of the Church and the Holy Spirit.¹¹⁷)

As Fowler adds Robert Kagan's titles to his faith stages in his more recent writing like Faith Development and Pastoral Care, I will put them before a slash(/) and add the terms retitled Fowler's titles by FDWP after the slash, in the same square, for the sake of clarity. The work of Robert is the area of the evolution of the self. Fowler set up his theory after his research based on structured, semiclinical interviews of from one to three hours each with over 500 individuals.¹¹⁸)
Pre Stage 0: Primal Faith (Age: 0-4 approximately)
[The Incorporative Self/Nursed Faith or Foundation Faith]

For the child in his mother’s arm, parents are so important because they form and constitute the infant’s world including religious faith. According to Erikson, this stage is vital to form the character of children and the basis of their future religious faith. Fowler insists that it (the nursing, mothering care of the young child) gives us our first pre-images of God mediated through recognizing eyes and confirming smiles. This is the stage of ‘undifferentiated’.

Stage 1: Intuitive-Projective Faith (Age: 3/4-7/8 approximately)
[The Impulsive Self/Chaotic Faith or Unordered Faith or Impressionistic Faith]

This stage is characterized by the way of knowing and forming their faith. Their trust is established intuitively and by imitation. Knowing is primarily by intuition, and faith is formed by imitation of moods, example, and actions of the visible human faith of significant others, primarily parents. The children at this stage regard themselves under the authority of their parents and significant adults. Fact and fantasy are not yet differentiated to them so that they tend to take symbols literally and think of God in anthropomorphic, magic terms.

Stage 2: Mythic-Literal Faith (Age: 6/7-11/12 approximately)
[The Imperial Self/Ordering Faith]

Children at this stage come more consciously to join and belong to their immediate group, or faith community and then come, with some enthusiasm, to learn the lore, the language and legend of the particular community and to appropriate them as their own. This is because at this stage they can feel the differentiation between themselves and the collective of immediate others. The way of making meaning is now more linear and narrative rather than episodic as in stage one. Reasoning and thought beyond intuition are now possible and children are beginning to distinguish the natural from the supernatural. This stage is called an ‘affiliative’ or a ‘joining faith’ stage.
Stage 3: Synthetic-Conventional Faith (Age: 11/12-17/18 approximately, and many adults)

[The Interpersonal Self/Confirming Faith]

The person with a Stage Three faith cannot make autonomous judgement with his own ability, but he just follows the directions and criteria of popular convention in his religious life. So this stage is called a conventional or conformist stage. At this stage, faith is still not self-chosen but continues to be conventional. There is a synthesis, but it is not a personal autonomous synthesis.

Stage 4: Individuative-Reflective Faith (Age: From approximately 17/18 onwards, or from the 30s or 40s onwards)

[The Institutional Self/Choosing Faith or Either/Or Faith]

The person at this stage has the experience to shift from relying on conventional authorities to taking personal responsibility for commitments, lifestyle, beliefs, and attitudes. Fowler lists some of the polar tensions as "individual v. community; particular v. universal; relative v. absolute; self-fulfillment v. service to others; autonomy v. heteronomy; feeling v. thinking; subjectivity v. objectivity." The person at this stage is likely to take an "either/or" approach to such questions and paradoxes.

Stage 5: Conjunctive Faith (Age: Rare before 30)

[The Inter-Individual Self/Balanced Faith or Inclusive Faith or Both/And Faith]

This faith is characterized by showing real empathy with others and a true openness to others with very different views and traditions. Of this stage, FDWP put in this way:

This faith stance is one that is hard to describe, but its consequences are easy to discern and well-captured in the metaphor of 'balance'. Someone who is at Stage 5 lives with, internalizes, includes and keeps in balance multiple perspectives on reality.

Stage 6: Universalizing Faith (Age: Usually only in later life; a very rare stage)
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[The God-Grounded Self/Selfless Faith]

Fowler’s language becomes somewhat poetic to express this stage. He also gives us some examples of this stage such as Mother Teresa of Calcutta, Dag Hammarskjold, and Martin Luther King. The people at this stage engage in spending and being spent in order to transform present reality in the direction of a transcendent actuality.\(^{122}\) Groome explains this stage like this:

For people at stage six the human community is universal in inclusiveness. In theological terms the Kingdom of God is an experienced reality. In spiritual terms stage six is the most complete state of union with God that is possible this side of eternity.\(^{123}\)

2) Westerhoff’s four styles of faith

Besides Fowler’s stages, as was indicated above, three other theories are introduced to compare with Fowler’s by the FDWP. Westerhoff recommends the socialization/enculteration approach to religious education. He is claiming liberation theology as his theological base.\(^{124}\) The four styles of faith that Westerhoff held are as follows.

i) Experienced Faith:(Pre-school years and early childhood)

This faith is the active and responding faith, which is experienced in the child’s relationship to others. (The FDWP think that presumably this would be equivalent to Fowler’s stage 0 and 1.)

ii) Affiliative Faith:(Late childhood/early adolescence)

Affiliative faith is the ‘belonging faith’ dominated by the religious affection, significant others and their stories, and the authority of a community. (The FDWP think that this may cover Fowler’s stage 2 and 3.)

iii) Searching Faith:(Late adolescence/early adulthood)

Searching faith is composed of doubt and/or critical judgement, experimentation with alternative understandings and ways, and the need for
commitment to persons and causes. (The FDWP has attempted to describe this as transition between Fowler's stage 3 and 4.)

iv) Owned Faith:

The last one is Owned faith which integrates the previous stage into a witnessing faith stance, a new personal faith-identity that is expressed in both word and deed. (The FDWP say that this is equivalent to Fowler's stage 4.)

3) Moran's three stages

According to Groom, Moran's approach to religious education is an experiential one. Groom says:

When Moran argues that the starting point of revelation is the personal, relational, social, and practical experience of people today, then an experiential approach to religious education would seem inevitable.\(^{125}\)

What are his three stage of religious education development?

i) Simply religious: He says that at this time, all education is religious education.\(^ {126}\) Young children may simply be religious and religious education at this stage has more to do with providing warmth, stability and aesthetic form than offering instruction in belief.

ii) Christian (or Jewish or Muslim): As an intermediary stage, children get the solid substance of a particular religious tradition, and contents and practices of its belief and systematic knowledge of its theology.

iii) Religiously Christian (Jewish, Muslim): As an adult stage, the childhood religious position is placed in a new, globally-ecumenical, richer context of understanding; when the religious element of early childhood re-emerges in adulthood... now itself qualified and specified by Christian, Jewish, or Muslim elements.\(^ {127}\)
4) Keen's Five stages

Sam Keen, who is a theologian and was the co-author with Fowler of Life Maps, claims to see five stages or dimensions of life. It seems to me that each stage is characterized by a different response and attitude toward culture or authority.

i) The Child: This is a period of dependence and affiliation, of accepting the given culture. The FDWP think that it is equivalent to Fowler's stage 1.

ii) The Rebel: The rebel is counterdependent, defining themselves against parents and culture.

iii) The Adult: People at this stage have established their character, built up a character armour and affirm the values of the culture.

iv) The Outlaw: As this dangerous stage, people destroy the old authorities to seek autonomy, questioning the old values - for love is prior to the law.

v) The Lover or the Fool: Keen writes:

> The clue to the personality of the lover is that vulnerability and compassion have replaced defensiveness and paranoia. The lover has come back to the basic trust of the child. S/he is primarily with.128

As the FDWP regards this stage as equivalent to Fowler's stage 6, it is an incommunicable stage of enlightenment: the world has ceased to be a problem to be solved and has become a mystery to be enjoyed.129

(3) FROEBEL'S METHODS OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION FOR YOUNG CHILDREN

There have been many references concerning the methods of Froebel. Hanschmann introduces them in this way:

> All his teaching should be based on the self-activity of the children; they should learn by living and know by doing; Their observation, perceptions, and conclusions should be their own. Everything should start in action, movement, manipulation, and production. Life, action, and knowledge should go in hand.130
Cole summed up Froebel’s methods of education and a principle of his methodology like this:

As a principle of methodology, Froebel preferred education through concrete activities to education through abstract ideas. This principle involves,

*firstly*, the preparation for thoughts by activities; and again the application of thought in activities.

Secondly, it involves a concrete treatment of song and story, which are such as the child may make, as it were, into vehicles of his own feeling. Therefore they involve, in addition to self-expression, social appreciation. Stories, where possible, are to have an outlet in action; and are to preserve the pleasurable realism of infant drama.

Thirdly, Froebel would emphasize the constructive arts, less with Rousseau from industrial motives, than because he perceived in the creativities something divine, as God himself is primarily creator. In order to understand 'Creator', man must be in a position to create after him, man must himself be relatively a creator.

Fourthly, education by doing implies at least a respect for what may be called the natural methodology of the child. 'Watch, only watch, the child himself will teach you'....

Fifthly, it accords with the method of activity, that a teacher need not answer every question as it arises, if he but put the child in the way to answer it for himself.131)

Even though these explanations of Froebel’s methods of education are enough as far as general education is concerned, I think that it is necessary to add some more explanations about the methods of Froebel’s Christian education for children. They are mother’s prayer, observation, play(self-activity), and symbolism.

1) **Mother’s prayer for and with child**

O God! I am indeed a blessed wife;
With heavenly joy Thou hast adorned my earthly life,
And chosen me to highest human dignity;
For I have borne an angel-child through Thee.

................................................
God and Father, Life’s eternal well-spring!
Let Thy streams flow to him, strong, pure and free.
We are all Thy children, Thine own offspring:
So let one Love unite us all in Thee!

This is the first and the fourth verse of the first song in Mother’s Songs. Its title is *A Mother’s Feelings on seeing her First-born Child*. This may be one of the mother’s prayers for herself and her child, and with the child. Thus Froebel presents the example of a mother’s prayer in his song for mothers.

Why did Froebel stress the importance of mothers’ prayers and encourage them to be used in Christian education? First of all, he believes the mother’s prayer for fatherly protection and loving care would be productive of eternal blessings for the child. He puts it in this way:

> It is, therefore, not only a touching sight for the quiet and unseen observer, but productive of eternal blessings for the child, when mother lays the sleeping infant upon his couch with an intensely loving, soulful look to their heavenly Father, praying to him for fatherly protection and loving care.132)

Secondly, he believes that the mother’s prayer would be the blessings for the whole life of the child. He writes:

> It is not only touching and greatly pleasing, but highly important and full of blessings for the whole present and later life of the child, when the mother, with a look full of joy and gratitude toward the heavenly Father, and thanking him for rest and new vigour, lifts from his couch the awakened child, radiant with joyous smiles; nay, for the whole time of the related life between child and mother exerts the happiest influence.133)

Thirdly, he believes that prayer gives peace; through God man rests in God, the beginning and end of all created things.134)

Fourthly, he believes that there is intimate unity between parent and child. He
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says:

If father and mother would give to their children, as the choicest portion for
life, this never-failing hold, this ever-steady point of support, parent and
child must ever be in intimate inner and outer unity, when in prayer - in the
silent chamber or in open nature - they feel and acknowledge themselves to
be in union with their God and father. 135

How did he explain children’s understanding of prayer? He insists strongly
that children understand prayer. He asserts:

Let no one say, ‘The children will not understand it.’ for thereby he deprives
them of their greatest good. If only they are not already degenerate, if only
they are not already too much estranged themselves, and their parents, they
understand it not through and in thought, but through and in the heart.136

Thus Froebel, like Pestalozzi, not only encouraged mothers to use prayer for
their children as one of vital methods for Christian education, but also he practised
it.137 It is needless to emphasize the importance of prayer in Christian life. All
parents as well as all those who are involved in Christian education should pray
fervently for their spiritual growth and God’s protection for children regardless of
their ages as Froebel encouraged and used them.

2) Observation

Observation by which Froebel learned how children act and think, became his main
method of education both for teachers and children. According to Hanschmann,
Pestalozzi declared his principle that observation is the beginning, and understanding
the end of education and Froebel adapted it.138 But Marenholz-Bülow further
explained it in this way:

Instead of the principle of observation on which Pestalozzi rests, Froebel
combines doing and observing. Then he lets children represent their
observation objectively and certainly, not only by imitation but freely by
remembrance, which thereby prepares for inventive activity.139
Because observation is concrete and self-activity, as already has been mentioned in Chapter III and in the previous section of this chapter, it is applicable to every subject. How has 'observation' been used for Christian education by Froebel? Froebel says:

We must open the eyes of our children that they may learn to know the Creator through His creation. Only then, when they have found God the Creator through the help of visible things, or seen Him foreshadowed in them, will they be able to apprehend the meaning of the term God in spirit and in truth, and learn to be Christians. First comes the visible world, and then the invisible truth, the idea. These opposites, visible and invisible, must for the young child be united by concrete images, not by words, which at most give him only a vague impression. My 'Mother's Songs' show how this work may be begun.\(^{140}\)

Walking with children, pointing to something strange, asking them about what they are looking at, and showing something to them are all good ways to use observation. Object lessons are introduced to the teachers for young children.

Bruinsama, like Froebel, indicates the usefulness of object lesson for young children's spiritual growth. She writes:

Using objects to hold children's attention is an effective way to teach children spiritual truths. Like the biblical parables, using familiar objects and drawing spiritual parallels makes it easier for children to understand abstract concepts.\(^{143}\)

3) **Play**

As many studies on Froebel's play have already been carried out, I think that it is meaningful to examine grounds and examples of play as being one of the main methods used by Froebel in Christian education for children.

Firstly, what is Froebel's basic idea of play? Froebel thinks that play is the highest phase of child development and the purest, most spiritual activity of man; for it is self-activity representing the inner - representation of the inner from inner
necessity and impulse. He, therefore, believes that it can give us joy, freedom, contentment, inner and outer rest, and peace with the world. 142) This idea is closely related to his purpose of teaching. He says:

For the purpose of teaching and instruction is to bring ever more out of man rather than to put more and more into him,... and still, human nature, like the spirit of God, is ever unfolding its inner essence. 143)

For Froebel, play is one of his main educational methods through which man can express himself and reveal his inner self. That is the reason why he used to call it the self-activity and spiritual activity of man. It seems to me that the nature of play given by Froebel is intimately woven into Christian education.

Secondly, Froebel puts the relationship between play activity and Christian education by illustrating two ways to stimulate the religious sense in the child. He explains:

Do you know how you can awaken the divine spark in your child? Let him behold the beautiful in form, and colour, in tone and gesture, whenever the spiritual element in him threatens to sink away in the satisfaction of bodily wants, or desires threaten to draw him into the animal sphere. Then awaken in him the impulse of activity, and exercise it to a degree of effort which will steel the will, even in the nursling, while he is playing with his limbs, exercising his lisping organs of speech, and while his ear is taking the cradle-song into his soul. 144)

Thus he emphasizes that children should have the chance to exercise all their organs from the early stage for their spiritual development.

Thirdly, according to Froebel, play as a voluntary activity can make the will of the child strong and cultivate his mind in the right way. As the will and mind of man are important to Christian nurture, play could be an important method for it. Froebel asserts:

The will is strengthened only by voluntary activity. By striving to create and
produce the beautiful and good, the feelings are developed, and by all lawful, thoughtful, free activity the mind is cultivated.\(^{145}\)

Fourthly, many practical examples of play used for Christian education are found in *Mother's Songs, Games, and Stories*. Actually, this book consists of 7 mother’s songs and 50 games and songs with the physical exercises. These activities contains some for the feet, Nos 1,29; for the fingers, Nos. 9,10,11,17-23; for the hands, Nos. 12-16,24,29-39; for the wrist, No. 3; for the arm, Nos. 3,7,34,40,41,.\(^{146}\)

Some examples are follows: Of Mowing Grass(No.7) Froebel comments like this:

> It will now be easy for you, with the picture at hand and the song to guide you, so to lead your child who wants to know what it is all about, that he may know he has to thank not only Mother, Peter, the cow, Betty, and the baker, for his bread and milk, but above all the Giver and Sustainer of life, the Father of all being...\(^{147}\) (cf. The Flower Basket No.14)

In Beckoning the Pigeons(No.9), Children are learning through their mother’s action and their finger exercise that life in his mother’s arm attracts life outside. Through the Pat-a-Cake(No. 12) song and game, children can learn that everything in their lives has a connection(the baker-the miller-the farmer-corn-field-nature) and that everything works in inner harmony. Froebel says:

> She could not work in this inner harmony if God did not place in her power and material, and if His love did not guide everything to its fulfilment.\(^{148}\)

In The Children on the Tower, Froebel explains the meanings of drawings and finger’s shape. He writes:

> The drawing on the left shows how to hold the fingers when the grandmothers go into church; the drawing on the right shows how they all give praise and thanks; and the praying, folded position of the hands is well known; nevertheless, the drawing in front of us shows it.\(^{149}\)

In The Bridge(No.34), Froebel mentions twofold lessons in it by contrasting earth and heaven, the great happiness in the family and at home and the dwellings of
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Teach your child, then, to recognize in the outside of the gift the inner thing that is given with it; in the house, the peace of home, the thoughtful life of a family; in the giver of the outer thing that can be seen, the Giver of the unseen thing that within.\(^{159}\)

In the Church Door and Window (No. 48), Froebel clearly indicated what the church is like and what people are doing there and what they can learn for their life. This is supposed to teach the future church life of children. It reads:\(^ {151}\)

"It is through them into Church one goes.
But all who enter, take good care
To be attentive while they 're there;
For all that's stirring in your heart, may Dear,
Is helped in Church by all that you will hear.
And there you'll learn the way you must go
To find out all you most desire to know.
You will learn why flowers bloom and birdies sing,
And why we still remember Christmas Day;

Besides these listed above, it is certain that there are many instances which may draw our attention to Froebel's work.\(^ {152}\) As play has various and wide range activities, it would be a good method even for Christian education. Froebel says:

I am convinced that in this way we may not only arouse and illuminate the ethical feeling of the child, but also strengthen it and elevate it into practical activity; and, finally, that this practical moral activity will recoil with blessed effect upon the nurture and development of religious aspiration.\(^ {159}\)

4) Symbolism

Froebel quite often uses the symbolic to represent something abstract or religious and philosophical and to make people understand it. Liebschner's deep and wide
understanding about Froebel's symbolism are demonstrated in his recent book.\textsuperscript{154} He says:

Froebel continues his explanations by saying that as our mind turns objects into images, so images are turned into symbols, and it is the symbolic which allows us to grasp the essence of matter as part of a spiritual whole. Froebel's explanations relating to comparison between the dovecote and the child's spirit and his home provides an illuminating example of the use of symbolism as a teaching aid.... God, the Creator, The Almighty, the Spirit can only be comprehended in terms of his creation(nature) and in terms of man's own actions and experiences.\textsuperscript{155}

Liebschner regards The Charcoalburner's Hut(No.32) as a symbol of the importance of the seemingly insignificant. As far as symbolism is concerned, Froebel points:

Man's hand is a sign of God's fatherly reconciliation, love, and kindness to man; ...Does it not show him to be like his Creator, who is always making so much from what lies nearest and smallest?... You, mother, ought to rouse in your child in this way of looking at his hand... so that he may not hurt either himself or it by misusing it, but may try to become by his actions more like his Creator, father, God. And, mother, make him also respect and honour nor only a man who by his hand gives us some bread..., but a man who is active by the work of his hands in any business, however lowly.\textsuperscript{156}

Symbolism is not Froebel's own method, though he frequently used it, for God used it many times for his people. Some of those are the ark of covenant, twelve stones at Gilgal, and the Lord's Supper. God commanded Moses to make the ark of covenant (Exd.25:11, Heb.9:4,5), in which was a golden jar holding the manna(Exd. 16: 32,33) and Aaron's rod which budded(Num.17:10), and the tables of the covenant (Exd.25:16,21), as the symbol of the divine presence guiding his people(Exd.25:22 1Sam.4:4). And each of them has a symbol with a very important lesson to them.

According to God's order, Joshua set up twelve stones at Gilgal which they had taken from the Jordan in order that they can say to their children that they could cross the Jordan by the power of God whenever they ask, 'What are these stones?' (Jos.4:5-7,20-24) When Jesus broke some bread and gave it to His Disciples, He told
them, "This is My body which is given for you; Do this in remembrance of Me." (Lk. 22:19) This The Lord's Supper is a symbol which reminds every believer of His sacrificial death for sinners.

Froebel used symbolism as one of his methods for Christian education as God did. Froebel once said that childhood can only be led through symbols to the understanding of truth and the understanding of itself. It needs symbolic action. Gestures have the greatest significance for childhood.157

5) The others

Apart from these four distinctive methods of Christian education for children, there are other methods used by Froebel. These are as follows:

a) Memorizing of religious sayings

Unless Froebel used the way of learning by heart, he would not mention it in this way:

Take any simple religious maxim intelligible to every boy or child through his own life, let a number of boys memorize it, and it will produce in the life of each an effect peculiar to his individuality.... the words must give expression to what is already in the boy's soul and find meaning in this.158

But he suggested that the learning by heart should be limited to a few texts of Scripture.

b) Attending regular meetings

According to Hanschmann, Froebel and his pupils joined the congregation at Keilhau, and contributed not a little to the religious life of the place. His boys joined the village boys in the preparation for confirmation. They never missed the prayer and
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hymn morning and evening.\textsuperscript{159)

c) Love

Bowen evaluates Froebel’s love like this. He writes:

The chief instrument he would use, especially in earlier life, is love, which conquers self-seeking, - love in action, in the family, in the school, in the community; and from love of his fellows whom he has seen should be developed the love of God, whom he has not seen with his outer eye, but is learning to see with his inner mind and heart.\textsuperscript{160)

Marenholz-Bülow puts love for Christian education in this way:

The awakening of love goes before that of faith; he who does not love cannot believe, for it is love that discovers to us the object or the being worthy of our faith.\textsuperscript{161}

I would like to bring this section to an end by quoting Shirreff. She writes:

Admiration awakened by observation of nature; desire for knowledge first stirring among unknown wonders and mysteries, the sense of dependence, the certainty of love and protection; all these things were ceaseless to minister to the awakening and fostering of the religious feeling in the child.\textsuperscript{162}

All these methods employed by Froebel for Christian education show us how he had striven to develop children’s faith. And he also transmitted them to us for children’s sake and God’s sake. As Byrne says, there is no one best method for Christian education. It is the teacher’s main task that the best method is taken for each lesson.

As Froebel’s theory of Christian education the aims, the subjects and the methods had been discussed in this chapter. The range of his aims of education are quite comprehensive. They include a number of aims described by the great educators: preparation for citizenship (Plato, Erasmus), sound moral development
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(Herbart, Locke), God-fearing life (Calvin, Commenius, Pestalozzi), good life on earth and eternal life with God (Luther, Milton), making children Christians (Bushnell) and education for life (Montessori).

As he said that all his efforts in the cause of education were in harmony with the words of Jesus, we can see that he tried to set his aims of education on the basis of the teaching of the Bible. In my view, this attempt can be regarded as a very encouraging fact in the history of Christian education. As already has been mentioned in Chapter III, his ideas on God, man, and nature are developed on the basis of the Bible. I think that his approach to the aim of Christian education is "the across-subject approach" that is, "the Neo-Confessional or the Neo-Dogmatic approach" including the child-centred and development approach.

His Christian views of God, man, and the world can be found among the subjects. In spite of having the above points, I think that there is one thing to point out. Froebel missed out one crucial thing in his aims of Christian education for young children. As Byrne insists, the true aim of education for the Christian must be redemptive. As the cross of Jesus Christ is the centre of the message which Paul preached (ICor.2:2, Gal.6:14), so the aims of Christian education must have a redemptive element in them. I think that Froebel's aims of education should include it.

Froebel proclaimed that human education requires the knowledge and appreciation of religion, nature, mathematics, and language in their intimate living reciprocity and mutual causality. Christian education, natural science, mathematics, language, and art are his curricula. Froebel also explained the reasons to teach children each subject and its importance in Christian education. For instance, he said that the more children get to the knowledge of nature, the more they can get to the knowledge of themselves and God.

Having seen Froebel's subjects for Christian education, we can notice that he
tried to develop every single subject on the basis of his understanding and belief of Christianity. Furthermore, he tried to teach each subject not separately but interrelated with others. In other words, he dealt with the nature, aim, and importance of each subject in the light of its relationship with the rest of the curriculum. We can, therefore, say that Froebel who dealt with subjects for Christian education in such ways is one of pioneers in the history of Christian education for young children.

In the last part of this chapter, the methods of Froebel's Christian education with four faith developmental theories of Fowler, Westhoff, Moran and Keen was examined. I think that these theories help us to see how Froebel's methods are relevant to a developmentally appropriate programme in Christian education for young children. According to Froebel, the methods of education must be suitable for children's developmental stage. Alongside many well-known methods such as self-activity, learning by living and knowing by doing, his methods for Christian education for young children were presented.

Mother's prayer for and with child, observation, play, symbolism and other activities (memorizing religious sayings, attending regular meetings, and love) were put forward as the methods which Froebel himself took and encouraged others to use. So Froebel can be regarded as the developer of these methods and the man who put them into practice for Christian education for young children.
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CHAPTER V

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION FOR YOUNG CHILDREN IN FROEBEL’S EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE

The formative process of Froebel’s educational ideas, his commitment to education, and the close relationships between him and Pestalozzi and his colleagues have been examined in Chapter II. His life and Christianity, and his Christian ideas of God, man, and nature have been studied in Chapter III. In the previous chapter, three topics in Froebel’s educational theory have been discussed in the perspective of Christian education; the aims, the subjects and the methods of Froebel’s education.

In the study of Froebel’s education, unlike that of Rousseau’s education, one feels that it is a great advantage to be able to see both his theory of education and his practice of it. In the last part of this study, Christian education for young children in Froebel’s education practice will emerge.

Just as Froebel received Christian education from his home, church and school, so he carried out his educational activities in connection with these three institutions where children were living, acting and growing. It is the last task, therefore, to look at what Froebel has done for children in home, church and kindergarten. It also includes considering the following main points under three titles; the roles of parents, teachers, the functions of home, church and kindergarten and the relationships between them in Christian education for young children, as given by Froebel.
1. PARENTS AND HOME EDUCATION

At the conclusion of the conference at Liebenstein which was held for three days in 1851, a year before Froebel’s death, the following resolutions were put and carried:

That Friedrich Froebel’s contribution to pedagogy is one of the utmost importance for the understanding of childhood. His principles are adapted to help mothers and to benefit family life.¹)

If the conference came to this conclusion, we must consider the following; (1) What did Froebel do for parents and home education? (2) How did Froebel teach parents about their role? (3) What instructions concerning the functions of home and the meaning of family life were given by him?

(1) FROEBEL’S CONTRIBUTIONS TO PARENTS AND HOME EDUCATION

1) Froebel enlightened parents on the early Christian education of children in the home.

Froebel stimulated parents to awaken a religious sense in their children from the earliest stage of their life. He claims:

Without religious preparation in childhood, no true religion and no union with God is possible for men. Faith in God is innate in every man, every child; it has only to be awakened in the right way, but it must be awakened, or it remains dead.²)

He also urged parents to start Christian education early in their home:

Religious spirit, a fervid life in God and with God, in all conditions and circumstances of life and of the human mind, will hardly, in later years, rise to full vigorous life, if it has not grown up with man from his infancy. On
the other hand, a religious spirit thus fostered and nursed (from early infancy) will rise supreme in all storms and dangers of life. This is the fruit of earlier and earliest religious example on the part of the parents, even when the child does not seem to notice it or to understand it. Indeed, this is the case with all living parental example.3)

2) Froebel instructed parents in their roles as parents and gave them guidelines for rearing their children.

Froebel also expressed the responsibilities of parents more comprehensively. According to Froebel, parents, as guardians, are responsible to God, to the child, and to humanity, because even as a child, every human being should be viewed and treated as a necessary essential member of humanity.4)

With reference to the duty and the attitudes of parents, Froebel mentions them this way:

Parents should do before and after the annunciation, as follows, readily, clearly, and unmistakably - to be pure and true in word and deed, to be filled and penetrated with the worth and dignity of man, to look on themselves as the keepers and guardians of a gift of God, to inform themselves concerning the mission and destiny of man as well as concerning the ways and means for their own fulfillment.5)

In order to help parents to achieve their duties and roles, which will be described in the subsequent sections, Froebel set them out in his main book, The Education of Man published in 1826. The duty of the parents, the destiny of child, parental and filial relations, and the value of the family are related in it to the roles of parents.

The nature of early childhood, the nature of play, a sketch of the mother's work, the union of family and school, the need of soul-training and the subjects instructions are described in The Education of Man as the guidelines for parents. It is not hard to see this kind of admonition for parents in his other works such as Froebel's Letters on the Kindergarten, Mother's Songs, Games and Stories.
3) **Froebel tried to invent some materials and provide parents and children with them.**

Froebel provided the Gifts, Occupations, the Movement plays and the Mother's Songs for the children and parents and teachers. According to Bowen, Gifts and Occupations took him some fifteen years (1835-50) to think out and invent.\(^6\) Hanschmann accounts for Froebel's motive in inventing them in this way:

> Balls, bricks, paper, songs, games, and simple gymnastics have always occupied little children; but in an unsystematic, casual, and aimless way. Froebel has managed to put these objects and occupations at the service of little children in a way both satisfying to their instinctive longing for expression and to give them the discipline they require at this age.\(^7\)

How did Froebel try to spread and introduce to parents, for their use, these educational materials in the home? *The Sunday Journal* (1837-1840), Froebel's weekly paper, became one of the means of spreading his ideas with regard to gifts and occupations. In 1850, he founded *The Weekly Journal of Education*, where he described the complete system of Gifts and Occupations.

The complete title of *The Mother's Song, Games and Stories* published in 1844 is this: *Come let us live for our children. Mother's songs, as well as songs for Games with body limbs and senses. For the early and uniting care of childhood. A Family Book by Friedrich Froebel.* Liebschner stressed it as a family book like this:

> It is a 'family book' for the purpose of 'the early, continuous and uniting care of childhood'; a family book which might be read and used by mothers or fathers, grandparents or older siblings, all of whom would be united by the common activity and the common goal, the welfare and education of the youngest in the family.\(^8\)

Thus through his writings his invented materials were made known to parents.

Liebschner sums up his other activities for introducing his materials to parents,
families and all those who were interested in childhood education. He writes:

Froebel and Middendorff travel widely, lecturing, persuading, inspiring, and carrying their message through Germany. They also carry the Gifts with them and demonstrate whenever possible.\(^9\)

What are, then, the Gifts, Occupations and the Movement plays provided and used by Froebel?\(^{10}\)

i) 'The Gifts' has six sets of play things. The first Gift was a soft ball on a piece of string. The later edition of the first Gift consists of six soft coloured balls (red, orange, yellow, green, blue, violet). The second Gift consists of a wooden sphere, cube and cylinder. The third Gift is a wooden cube, divided once in each direction to produce eight little cubes. The fourth Gift is a cube divided once in its height and three times horizontally in its thickness, giving eight bricks. The fifth Gift is a cube divided in each dimension, providing twenty-seven smaller cubes. Three of these smaller cubes are divided into halves by one diagonal cut, and three others into quarters by two diagonal cuts, crossing each other, making in all thirty-nine pieces. The sixth Gift is the cube divided into twenty-seven equal oblong parallelopipades, and of these, three are bisected lengthwise and six are bisected breadthwise.

ii) Occupations are children’s activities to build, construct and model, to weave and sew, to cut out and to paste using various materials such as paper and scissors, sticks, threads of wool, clay and wax, peas and shells, sand and stones. But, according to Liebschner, Froebel did not leave details of them except Paper-folding and Stick-laying.\(^{11}\)

iii) A list of Movement plays are as follows: The travelling or Journey plays, Representation plays, The running plays, The pure walking games.\(^{12}\) Liebschner summarizes Movement play like this:

It involves children in walking, running, hopping and jumping, turning on the
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spot, lifting one or both arms, lateral trunk movements, standing and walking on the tip of one’s toes, and so on. Movements are based on how we saw wood, how we swim, how birds fly, tying a wreath, planting seeds, working in the garden, feeding chicken, cat and mouse. 13

4) Froebel devoted his best efforts to the training of women.

Why was Froebel called ‘The Apostle of women’? Because he devoted himself to assert the necessity of women’s involvement in education and to train women. As Froebel himself indicated, there are two objectivies in the training of women. He put it like this:

Women must be trained in this work, and become penetrated with its spirit to make themselves helpful in family educational cares, and in all grades of completeness from the nurse to the teacher. 14

After his return from the educational journey in 1846, Froebel devoted himself chiefly to the education of women. Froebel’s lecture on ‘Active Instincts of the Child’ was given at Keilhau. With the view of a more perfect family life, he proposed that girls should have this training as a preparation for marriage. 15 Froebel demands:

Fit or not fit, she must of necessity be the first educator of the child…. Train the mother, and you train the child. Make the mother conscious of a goal to be reached, and give her the means to reach it, and you set childhood free from all the evils of convention and routine. 16

He strongly maintains that the fate of nations lies far more in the hands of women - of mothers - than in those of rulers, or of the numerous innovators who are scarcely intelligible to themselves. We must train the educators of the human race, for without them the new generations cannot fulfil their mission. 17

With this conviction, he founded some training colleges both for mothers and for students. There are many evidences of appeals to German wives and maidens to participate in educational activities through letters and lectures delivered during his
educational travelling. After his death, this mission was carried out by Middendorff and Marenholz-Bülow.

(2) THE ROLES OF PARENTS

When Paul with Silias and Timothy tried to remind the believers in the Church of the Thessalonians of their ministry, they wrote:

But we were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children....
As ye know how we exhorted and comforted and charged every one of you, as a father doth his children, That ye would walk worthy of God, who hath called you unto his kingdom and glory.(1The.2:7,11,12)

They said that they had loved them like a nursing mother loves and cherishes her own children and had admonished them as does a father. As they had compared themselves not only to a nursing mother but also a father, so Froebel claimed that children need both motherly love and fatherly care. He puts it like this:

Womanly love, as well as manly strength, are necessary for the child's perfect development.18)

Even if he made a lot of statements about the urgent need of women's involvement in education for children, he did not exclude male significance in children's education. In a letter to German women, he writes:

For indeed, without the powerful support of your sex I am as nothing; just as I should be nothing, either, without the support and active maintenance of my own sex.... I am nothing without the support of at least the majority of those of both sex.19)

He held the same attitude in giving instructions to parents for educating children at home. As he made songs for mothers and the mother's cradle song, so he made the father's cradle song. The instruction for father, although relatively very rare, was given by him, too.
For instance, explaining how to use the ball, which is regarded as the first plaything of childhood by Froebel, he described father’s role like this:

Here is the point, as beautiful as it is important, where the life and activity of the father also, at times when his business permits, can exert a fostering and developing influence on the life of the child; and the ball here again appears as a connecting link between child and father, as it was at the earlier period between and child and mother. The child in the father’s company is to grow up, as it were, climb up to him, and by his aid is to steady itself.  

In dealing with the roles of parents given by Froebel, I do not think that it is necessary to make a distinction between the roles of mother and those of father, otherwise Froebel drew a particularly clear line between them. What are Froebel’s instructions for the roles of parents? He sums it up like this:

Real family life, the tender care of childhood, the education of children, are things which of themselves knit closely together the thought and work of parents with those of the practical educationists.

1) Parents as guardians

Froebel, as indicated above, regards parents as guardians and keepers of a gift of God. For him, this duty is not limited only to child, but to humanity and to God. The term "guardian" means someone who has the responsibility of looking after a child. What is the aim of the parental care of children? He answers:

The aim and object of the parental care of the child, in the domestic and family circle, then, is to awaken and develop, to quicken all the powers and natural gifts of the child, to enable all the members and organs of man to fulfil the requirements of the child’s powers and gifts.

Which principle did Froebel present to encourage parents to care for children with such object? He seems to have used the same knowledge as John does in 1John 4:11. It reads: Dear friends, since God so loved us, we also ought to love one another. Compare this to what Froebel presents as his principle of parents’ care for
Let us only faithfully care for our children, and soon will grow up around us a garden of God. Let us only loyally foster the children, and nothing in heaven and earth has such high promise, such abiding blessing; for God loves his creatures, his human beings; he loves his children; and we children, we human beings, should therefore love our children as much!

The value of caring for children, the conviction of its result and the necessity of whole-hearted fostering are all based on God’s love. I think that Goethe’s motto ‘Come let us live for our children’, which Froebel adopted for *Sunday Journal*, implies the significant meaning of this principle. Thinking of Froebel’s saying that the mother’s heart alone is the true source of the welfare of the child, it seems to me that he acknowledged the priority of maternal love for children. He also gave practical guidance such as the child’s food and clothing to parents as guardians. Concerning a child’s health, he puts it like this:

The care for the entire health of the child is the first thing which is imposed on the attention of the mother and of all those who recognizes it as a duty to take part in his education.

Like any other educational matter, for Froebel, these duties of parents as guardians are connected with one of his main educational aims, namely ‘unity’. He expressed it:

As you are a loving mother who feels one with your child as well as with God, the task of your life is before you; and it is to rear your child as one who is, and is to be, a child of God - a child who is one in himself, in living connection with the outside world, with man and nature, but, above of all, in union with God, the Source and father of all things; this is the highest task of your life, and its highest happiness.

Parents as guardians, as Froebel mentioned, should care for their offspring, keeping them from dangers and all kinds of disease. Parents should also provide them with what children need physically, emotionally, and spiritually, because children cannot live through their first years of life without adult care. Moreover, Christian
ought to follow God’s example. As God is our provider (Mat. 5:45, 6:25-34, 7:11), earthly parents are also instructed to provide for their children: "For the children ought not to lay up for the parents, but the parents for the children (2Cor. 12:14)."  

2) Parents as partners

Another role of parents given by Froebel is as the partners of their child. Partner is defined as either of two people sharing an activity or playing together. Parents are those who are always associated in their children’s activity, and the course of their action in the home. Every child, like every person at any stage, absolutely needs someone beside him with whom he shares his time, life and playthings. How frequently and ardently Froebel put emphasis on his belief that parents should be working as the play partner of their children!

Here is his clear conviction on it. He says, "To educate properly one must share the life of one’s pupil." It means that being a good partner of children makes good parents and teachers. As partners, parents have to share what they have and know with their children, in this way, Christians as the stewards have to do their best by sharing their lives with children. In my view, the concept of partnership is well brought out in his advice to parents and school teachers about how to take children to the outdoors. He admonishes:

parents and school teachers should remember this, and the latter should, at least once a week, take a walk with each class - not driving them out like a flock of sheep, nor leading them out like a company of soldiers, but going with them as a father with his sons or brothers, and acquainting them more fully with whatever the season or nature offers them.

3) Parents as mediators or connectors

The concept of the mediator must be one of the central ideas in Christian theology. Froebel believes, as it has been shown in Chapter III, in Jesus Christ as the God-Man revealing God to man, as the Incarnation of God, and as the Saviour. It means that
he sees Christ as the Mediator between man and God. The Bible says, "For there is one God and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus; Who gave himself a a ransom for all, to be testified in due time."(1Tim 2:5,6) This text proves that Christ as the mediator has completed his redemptive work.(cf. Rom.5:8-11, Eph.2:13-18)

However, Froebel's teaching of the parents' role as mediator or connector is not the same as that of Christ. I think that it is surely beyond that of Christ. Apart from Christ's redemptive work, the nature of the mediator can be applied to parents. As the Bible says, "Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one."(Gal.3:20) It means that parents are working as the bridge to connect and link between children and other beings and things. Froebel explains the connective offices in the following way:\textsuperscript{30}

i) Mother stands as a connection link between her child and his Creator, the Original Source of his life - God. The mother also connects her child with the Mediator between humanity and God - Jesus Christ. As already has been mentioned, she can achieve this role through her prayer life, showing her example of religious life and using materials provided by Froebel.

ii) Next she connects the child with her husband, his early father. And then she is the link that joins the child with the family of which he is a member.

iii) Through the family she unites the child to the human race, humanity, and with each individual member of humanity.

iv) Finally, she is the bond of union between the child and nature.

Consequently parents as connectors should be learners. Without a full knowledge of both sides, nobody can fulfil these connective offices. Froebel, therefore, says:

The mother, as a real human Christian mother, must have a clear idea of all these connective offices, as indeed must all the members of the family. She must know and acknowledge all of them.\textsuperscript{31}
4) **Parents as educators**

Froebel thinks that the family is the child’s first school and the mother is an educator. He states that it is women, to whom God and nature have pointed out the first educational office in the family. He also often addressed himself to both teachers and parents at the same time in giving some instruction about childhood education, he chose to do this because he regarded parents as educators. As Froebel mentioned, there are two means of educating: instruction and training. Educating, therefore, refers to the process of parents instructing, training and stimulating their children to develop the moral, spiritual, intellectual, and social spheres of their life.

What did Froebel expect parents as the educators to do in their home? Froebel, as already has been unfolded, manifested the contents, the ways, and the necessity of instruction through his educational activities. I think that it is worth noting some examples, which may be like the tip of the iceberg.

He suggested what mothers can do for their spiritual development and how they can teach children about Jesus with two steps for the Christian education in this way. He says:

The mother teaches the child to pray, and also what are the claims and commands of the Heavenly Father upon the child, and his conscience awakens. Then she directs his attention to the Christ-child, and he learns how to know and to love the virtues of childhood through knowledge of the Divine, ideal child. He is then prepared for the second revelation, God-man, but chiefly by using and cultivating his powers in acting according to commands from God.

I think that Froebel was wise to give parents the contents of instructions with warnings not to spoil their efforts. Here is one of them. He admonished parents not to hurry the process like this:

But this hurrying has had the saddest and most pernicious results in life of in the education of the individual as well as in that of the whole community...
According to Deuteronomy 6:1-9, real-life instruction for children should be
given by the parents. As the Israelites ought to weave child instruction and training
into the fabric of their daily lives, so should parents do the same as educators in
Christian education. Narramore insists that one of the reasons so many children and
young adults from Christian homes find little meaning in their Christian experience
is that their Christian faith was never integrated with daily living. Their parents failed
to experience or failed to convey their joy at God's creating genius shown in nature.
They failed to see and explain their business and family affairs from God's perspective... As a result, their children failed to see that God is deeply interested and
involved in every area of life.35)

Froebel claims that educators should impress upon children the importance of
carrying their religious thinking into doing and acting in their daily life.36) As a
matter fact, he tried to develop his ideas to help the educators to overcome our strong
tendency to segregate the sacred and the secular. For instance, family devotions and
the example of pious conduct in the family life are regarded as very crucial in this
context. He said:

As long as mothers do not know how to administer the priestly office at
home for their children's benefit, so long will their piety suffer. For the
earliest childhood formal worship, even connected with the daily life itself,
the peculiar life of the child, must be occasional, and as the opportunity
occurs, day by day. Family devotions and the example of pious conduct in
the family life are the chief means. This our forefathers understood better
than we do.37)

With regard to the importance of the early moral training of childhood,
Froebel point out:

If we fail to eradicate the evil during childhood we shall never cease to grieve
over it, for it will continue to make itself felt as now, in families, schools,
churches, and the whole public life of the land.38)

Mothers as educators, as Marenholz-Bülow's suggestion, can use Froebel's


Mother’s Songs, Games, and Stories for their educational purpose. Heewart summarized it well in this way:

The mother in his book makes use of all the impressions, influences and agencies with which the child comes in contact; she protects from evil; she stimulates for good; she places the child in direct communication with nature, because herself admire its beauties; she has a right feeling towards her neighbours and to all those on whom she depends.39

The blessings, rights, and duties towards their children, humanity, and God of parenthood are characterized by their roles as the guardian, partner, mediator/connector and educator in the home. In my view, Froebel did his best to arouse consciousness of the parents’ roles and to support their practical activities with a wide range of advice.

(3) THE FAMILY LIFE

Having reviewed Froebel’s contributions to parents and home education in the previous section, I take the opportunity, in the last section, briefly to review his view of family life and the function of family in the last section.

1) The family

Froebel had two striking home life experiences during his childhood. After his mother died at the age of nine months, he was fostered by the servants till he was four years old when his father married again. He was happy with his step-mother until she had a child of her own, but then he was treated with worse than indifference and he was made to feel an utter stranger. In other words, he wanted motherly and fatherly affection.

His stay with his maternal uncle for five years was, as already demonstrated in Chapter III, quite different from his own home life. Froebel, however, spoke of his feelings about his old father like this: "I loved him, and felt how much good
resulted from that love. 40

How did Froebel, with such home life experiences, think of the family? First of all, he considers the family as the community of love. He expressed it in this way:

The first and fundamental appearance of love - of the love of parents and child, the family love - is found now in the family life; indeed, the family is love itself become personal. 41

There are two songs concerning happy family (No.18 Grandmother and Mother Kind and Dear, No.21 The Happy Brothers and Sisters). He also mentioned the family influence on each member. He said:

Father, mother, and child form a triune life-whole - a family. the child creates the family and the family-life by its advent; and, on the other hand, man's continuous presence on earth is indispensably linked with the family. The family and the child reciprocally condition each other; neither exists without the other; they form in themselves an inseparable unit. 42

So his conviction of the importance of family is this. He indicated that only as a member of the family will it be possible for man to become a symmetric, real, whole man; indeed, the family as a whole is a real, whole, human existence, and the family life as a whole is real, complete, human life. 43

Secondly, Froebel thinks that the family should be holy. Froebel claims that every family must again become God-consecrated, must approximate more and more nearly to the Holy Family, if ever the kingdom of heaven, of God and of Jesus is to come upon earth. 44 But I think that we, as Christians, should follow the guideline given by Shaw. He puts it like this:

When the Bible speaks about the family, it does so in the context of the great doctrines of creation, sin, faith, redemption, love and providence. 45

It means that no family's home can be regarded as holy without Christ's redemption.
2) The functions of the family

According to Hanschmann, Froebel believed that a more perfect organization of family life would inaugurate "a glorious revival; a very renewal of life; a spring time of humanity; a new era; a millennium." Froebel said:

The family alone offers a highest expression of human life, the divine in the human. Life is only complete in the family - father, mother, child. Light, love, and life, are a complete cycle. Only in the sacred soil of the family can the seeds of the new life be sown.46)

Three functions of the family for childhood education given by Froebel are as follows:

i) The first social group and school of child: Froebel explains in his book, The Education of Man, that the child learns to live, seek to understand outer and visible things, and to exercise its own creative faculty at home.

ii) The basis and medium of Christian education: Froebel says that the first groundwork of religious life is love - love to God and man - in the bosom of the family.47) As has been mentioned several times, he emphasized that home is a very important place where children's religious sense and feeling can be awakened and strengthened by the love of the members of the family.

iii) The family should link and support the school life: Froebel says:

In the family the child grows up to boyhood and pupilage; therefore, the school must link itself to the family. The union of the school and life, of domestic and scholastic life, is the first and indispensible requisite of a perfect human education of this period.48)

As a matter of fact, he had such an experience as far as his discipline is concerned, because his father's home life was in complete harmony with the discipline of the school.
Nowadays, there is an increasing tendency for parents to transfer their responsibilities which we have seen so far to the church and the schools. Expounding on Ephesians 6:1-4, Lloyd-Jones stressed the duty of parents like this:

First and foremost, the bringing up of children 'in the nurture and admonition of the Lord' is something which is to be done in the home and by the parents. This is the emphasis throughout the Bible. It is not something that is to be handed over to the school, however good the school may be. It is the duty of their parents, their primary and most essential duty.\(^{59}\)

I think that Froebel's efforts and works for parents and home education are in accordance with this teaching.

2. THE CHILD AND THE CHURCH

Although the Bible, as indicated in the previous section, puts primary responsibility for the child's care and education upon the parents, the great task of children's education has also been entrusted to the church as the body of Christ and the family of God.\(^{\text{Mat.28:18-20, 2Cor.13:1-10, Eph.4:11-15, 2Tim.2:1,2}}\)

Christian education should be linked with educational activities carried out by the church. Froebel also acknowledged the importance of the more inward relations between school and home and of both to the church. As König said, Froebel was a religious but a practical man. He says that some of them (Froebel's songs and games) are still alive today in families, creches and kindergartens.\(^{50}\) If this is the case, some questions concerning his education and the church may be raised. I think that this is, therefore, the proper place to look at the relationship between Froebel and the church, his influence on children's education in the church, and the church ministry for young children.
(1) FROEBEL AND THE CHURCH

Froebel belonged to the Reformed Lutheran Church, which was an Evangelical Protestant Church, and did not separate himself from the Protestant Church. He, as a son of a pastor, had been brought up in the Old Lutheran Protestant Church. He attended Sunday service twice, sitting in the choir, and listening to his father’s sermons with great attention. At that time church and school generally stood in strict mutual relationship. The school children had their special places in church; and not only were they obliged to attend church, but each child had to repeat some passages of Scriptures used by the minister in his sermon of the day before to the teacher on every Monday. Froebel’s confirmation was prepared and conducted by his uncle at the age of fifteen. He confessed that it remained as a momentous event in his life. According to Köing, Froebel attended religious services at twenty years old when he became the forest actuary in Markt Baunach, part of a small strict Catholic state.

I believe that the two events in relation to Martin Luther may reveal to some extent Froebel’s Protestant belief and life. Firstly, he had a deep feeling of reverence for Luther, even though he had not held a complete survey of his life and his struggle before the Tercentenary festival of the Reformation. He puts it like this:

I had learnt in some sort to appreciate this fighter for the truth, by having in my last years at school to read aloud the Augsburg confession to the assembled congregation during the afternoon service on certain specified Sundays, according to an old-fashioned Church custom. I was filled with a deep sense of reverence as I climbed “Luther’s path,” thinking at the same time that Luther had left much behind still to be done, to be rooted out, or to be built up.

Secondly, Froebel and his colleagues provided an education for Luther’s descendants as the best memorial of the tercentenary of the Reformation. Having joined a memorial with Langethal for the erection of a statue to Martin Luther, Froebel set forth such a view. In consequence of this, two boys - Georg aged eighteen and Ernst aged thirteen - were placed in his school: they were the descendants of Luther’s brother’s. These two boys were living with their parents in poverty, herding
swine and cattle. Hanschmann says that the elder boy was of a serious and aspiring nature, and became a pastor; the younger a stone-cutter. One of them attended Froebel's Burial Service, crying with a loud and agitated voice into the grave, "I thank thee, too." After Froebel’s death his grave-stone in the shape of the first gift was carved by Ernst.

There are some records which might be regarded as signs of conflict with the church owing to his educational ideas and practice. Liebschner introduced one occasion like this:

The pupil did not return until Sunday morning, just in time for Sunday service in the village church. When Froebel looked around him during the service, he found that many of his pupils were fast asleep. Pretending to be worshipping while in fact sleeping was educationally inadmissible. Yet, when Froebel subsequently encouraged his pupils to sleep it off in the hay-ricks on returning from their Saturday outings, he drew upon himself the displeasure of the parson and some of the villagers.

Froebel’s two other teachings on Christian education may have brought about conflict with the church. The first one was his objection to dogmatic teaching and of the inculcating of precepts in young children. Froebel expresses the reason for that in this way:

Acting and producing, moreover, cannot be taught by words alone; they require practical exercise from the beginning. We wish to create for children a practical school in which they shall learn to act according to a description of pure Christianity, according to the commands of God, before they learn these prescriptions and commands as dogmas.

I think that he objected to teaching dogmas for young children, not because he did not believe the doctrine of the church, but because he had the conviction that religious instruction should be given matching to the age. He once put it like this:

Even the Holy Writ often needs an explanation couched in a childlike form, corresponding to the age, such as is seldom found in our church.
Marenholz-Bülow explains this matter like this:

The capacity for belief, or sense of truth, is killed out in the childish heart when the truth is presented to it only in the form of abstract language, and offered unclothed. More than one aspect of history teaches this, and yet people persist in it and offer religion and philosophy to youth distinctly as doctrine. Froebel, on the contrary, wishes to awaken original conviction and original insight by religious acts and by philosophical knowledge of concrete things, and thereby to prepare for religious doctrine and for philosophical instruction.59)

Bowen also makes a comment on Froebel’s religious teaching in this way:

Froebel does not desire to produce a being learned and fixed in religious dogma, but to realise in the individual God’s idea in humanity. The chief instrument he would use, especially in early life, is love.60

Bowen continues to say that Froebel discards catechisms and dogmatic teaching for the very young; but it must not be supposed therefore that he avoids all allusion to church matters and to what is distinctively Christian. On the contrary, he prepares the child for these just as he aids him in other developments. Pictures of the child Jesus and the story of his early life are constantly brought into prominent notice, especially at Christmas time, and in connection with the Christmas tree and Christmas games.61) Even though Froebel’s rejection of dogmatic and catechetical instruction for young children was ahead of his time, it might be one of the reasons to cause conflict with the church.

The other might be Froebel’s statement on children’s public worship attendance. He admitted the need for public worship, but he claimed that the reform of children’s service would be achieved by corresponding to their ages. Froebel said:

The form of worship used by adults is not suited to childhood; what is called divine service for children in schools is still worse for them in many case.60) ...Outside of family devotion, the time for Divine worship at an appointed hour and in an appointed place, the church, connected with doctrinal and history faith, comes at a riper age, say the tenth year. But even for that age our public worship is not appropriate. We might have a similar
Froebel clearly stated that children should have their worship held both in the school and in the church corresponding their ages. I think that it cannot be denied that this statement may have caused conflict between Froebel and the church.

In fact, Froebel encouraged mothers to teach the child about the church and the family’s going to church in *The Church Door and Window*. (No.48 in *The Mother’s Songs and Games and Stories*) *The Church Door and Window* is made to call children’s attention to the flocking together of men and women to the church for praise and prayer. Froebel comments on this song like this:

> Where a family’s going to church a real inner meaning and relation to its life, there arises a child’s being early charmed by going to church, his occasional genuine joy in the prospect of a visit there.6)

Hanschmann describes Froebel’s relationship to the church at Keilhau in this way:

> Froebel and his pupils at Keilhau joined the congregation and contributed not a little to the religious life of the place. His boys joined the village boys in the preparation for confirmation, and were addressed by the minister with the familiar pronoun ‘du’. They generally walked to Eichfeld to church, but on wet days they attended the little church at Keilhau.6)

Froebel’s letter to Mrs. Lisette Kirchner written in 1851, one year before his death, contains his relation to the church. It reads:

> You, my dear, Lisette, have never left your mother-church, you have remained in it, like myself…. While you were studying with us, you gained the conviction that one could live a truly Christian life, and more particularly a life based upon the Protestant Evangelical doctrines.6)

Having seen Froebel’s relationship to the church throughout his life, I think that it is appropriate to put Poesche’s statement once more as a conclusion although...
it has been already mentioned in Chapter III. Poesche as Froebel’s contemporary said that Froebel did not separate himself from the Protestant Church in which he had been brought up.

(2) FROEBELIANISM AND THE SUNDAY SCHOOL MOVEMENTS

Because Froebel had his ideas on Christian education and practised it, I think that it is meaningful to chase some traces of his influence on church education like the Sunday school in the history of Christian education. Although the Sunday school has more than two hundred years history, the two Sunday school movements in America and in England will be presented.

1) Froebelianism and the American Sunday school movement

Having seen the Raikes Sunday schools in England, Bishop White, the first bishop of Pennsylvania, proposed a plan for organization of Sunday schools after the Raikes pattern in 1788 after his return to Philadelphia. It spread and the American Sunday School Union (ASSU), now American Missionary Fellowship, had been formed in 1824. The union expanded its ministry by the end of 1825 to twenty-two of the twenty-four states. The Sunday school in the United States grew rapidly by 1963 and has continued to grow since then.

In the early days great attention was given to the memorizing of long passages of Scripture and the catechism. For example, one Sunday school teacher reported that as many as 5,000 verses of Scripture were memorized each quarter. Uniform Bible lessons, one for each sabbath of the year, had displaced most of the scriptural memorization and recitation by the 1870s. The Sunday school was a lay movement at its early stage. As far as supervision is concerned, supervision was more of an inspection made of teachers’ personal lives and their effectiveness in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and early in the twentieth century. The inspection was done by laymen and unprepared administrators.
With the growth of the movement that included middle class children, an identification of individual Sunday schools with particular congregations took place. Slowly the clergy realized the potential of the Sunday school as a growth force, and their attitudes began to change.\textsuperscript{70} How rapid was the growth of the kindergarten movement in the United States? According to the statistics of the Bureau of Education in 1873 there were 42 kindergartens; in 1881 there were 273, with 676 teachers and assistants and 14,107 children; in 1885 there were 563 kindergartens with 1,400 teachers and assistants and 29,716 children; 423 institutions being kept by English-Americans, 142 by Germans, and 100 being connected with various public schools.

Hanschmann reported some aspects of the movement and the people who worked for it as follows: Almost every state had its associations and societies for the promotion of Froebel's methods such as the "American Froebel Union" and the Ladies' Associations of Philadelphia, San Francisco, etc. In Chicago, there were two large societies, the "Froebel Association" and the "Free Kindergarten Association," with two Training Colleges. The fourteen kindergartens of the Free Kindergarten Association took children of the poorest classes without fee. The following had rendered extraordinary service to the cause of the kindergarten in America; Henry Barnard, Peabody, Mathilde Krieger and her mother, the Kraus Böltès, husband and wife, of New York and Edward Wiebe.\textsuperscript{71}

Shapiro described how the ideas of Froebel permeated the Sunday school movement in America. He says:

It was not until three decades after the publication of Bushnell's \textit{Christian Nurture} that the ideas of Friedrich Froebel were considered by a growing number of liberal Protestant clergymen. It was, moreover, not Henry Ward Beecher but three lesser known mid-Victorian clergymen - Wilbur Crafts, a Methodist, Richard Herber Newton, an Episcopalian, and Edward Judson, a Baptist - who became after 1870 the spokesmen for Sunday school reform based on Froebelian principles.\textsuperscript{72}

He goes on to say that all three pastors deemphasized the splits in protestantism raised by the rigid denominational evangelicalism and saw the growing
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unity of the branches as the path toward the eventual acceptance of Froebelian Kindergarten as part of the educational apparatus of the church. As the result of the free kindergarten movement, they had first become interested in the Froebelian movement.

There were two different tendencies in religious education throughout most of the nineteen century in America. Memorization, daily prayer and recitation of Scripture, were their means of Christian education among Presbyterians. As Presbyterians were committed to a denominational interpretation of the Bible, the content of all Sunday school lessons was based on the Bible of the officially approved Westminster Shorter Catechism. On the other hand, denominations like the Baptists and Methodists which grew as a result of revivalism, preferred to give children the simple Bible lessons and moral instruction. Elizabeth Harrison, a former Sunday school teacher who had become a Froebelian, put her criticism for the Sunday school like this:

The rapid dressing for church or Sunday school, the hasty learning of the Sunday school lesson, and the too often critical discussion of the sermon in the presence of the child served only to deaden the child's religious feeling.

Harrison concluded that we had relegated too much of a child's religious training to the Sunday school. Sunday schools, when they are good, assist and cooperate with the home, but they can never take the place of home religion. Although Dwight Moody, a revivalist preacher, who had allowed a free kindergarten to operate within his Chicago church, had never adapted the educational ideas of Froebel, the theories of several European educational reformers were investigated as potential sources for the reform of American Sunday school pedagogy by a committee of the American Sunday School Union. According to Rice, Froebel's idea of spontaneity was examined because it was regarded as more devout than that of his master, Pestalozzi. They, therefore, felt that the adoption of the kindergarten methods and principles of the child's growth might be useful in Sunday school.
pedagogy. But it was rejected by the majority of the churchmen. Rice explained the reason for disagreement like this:

They criticized his system in a large sense because it began with nature instead of beginning with God.

I think that Herbert Newton and Sarah Cooper are very important figures in this movement. Newton expressed his conviction in this way:

And thus all branches of Protestantism ought to be able to receive this gospel of God's servant, Friedrich Froebel ... and follow him in the steps of true education toward that new earth into which, as written of old, a little child shall lead them.

Newton also tried to help Cooper when she was on trial because of her adaptation of Froebelianism to her Bible class work. According to Shapiro, Sarah Cooper, a Bible teacher in San Francisco, hoped that the Froebelianism would be the means of promoting evangelical Christian women to update their Sunday school teaching methods, extend Sunday school education to the children of the poor and rich alike, and revise their narrow views of Christianity. She pointed out two aspects of the traditional Sunday school methods and lessons: the lack of stress on the importance of the material, bodily and spiritual development of the child in the evangelical Protestant texts, and the failure in excluding children outside the church. She wrote:

Froebel, the founder of the kindergarten, was one of the most devout men. He insisted that the spiritual and physical development of childhood should not go separately.

What was the Cooper trial and its meaning to this movement? She was charged with teaching "allegorical and mythical interpretations of the Scriptures" and holding "sentimental and humanitarian" views not in accord with the orthodox creed of the Presbyterian church. James B. Robert, an orthodox deacon and elder of the church, began a formal inquiry into Cooper's right to teach in the Presbyterian church in
1881. She was cleared of the charge after Kate Smith, the head of the Silver Street Kindergarten, defended Cooper as a key witness, and she was invited to remain a member of the church. But she voluntarily left the church in 1881 and joined a Congregational church where she continued her kindergarten Bible classes.

I believe that it is worth noting Shapiro’s evaluation of the meaning of the victory of Cooper’s trial. Shapiro puts its significance like this:

Cooper was on trial for her Froebelian ideas, thereby drawing national attention to the Froebelian movement.... In its narrow terms it was a victory for liberal churchman and a defeat for the orthodox church.... Both Froebel’s methods and message had been on trial; and it was Froebel’s pedagogy, not his social ideas, which had been victorious.... The Cooper trial itself helped to stimulate a broader program for reform among Froebelians and Sunday school teacher alike. Many kindergartners, perhaps encouraged by the stand of Cooper, now joined the effort to reform the curriculum of the Sunday school.83

The more Froebelian kindergartners involved in Sunday school works, the more they agreed that they needed more training for the reform of religious education. Wheelock worked both in her kindergarten training school and in the church Sunday school. She claimed:

Sunday school teachers need not borrow the name, nor the table, nor the block of the Froebelian kindergarten but rather its spirit and method of presenting the truth. The Sunday school teachers, like the kindergartner, needs to be trained in Froebel’s methods of interpreting the symbolic language of all outward things.84

A summer retreat for Sunday school teachers from various denominations at Chautauqua was organized by Lewis Miller and John Vincent to meet the growing need of teacher training. It was so successful that it kept going on. In 1875, Matilda Kriege, one of the kindergartners in America as listed earlier, was invited to speak by Vincent, a Methodist minister, at Chautauqua.

Emphasizing the methods rather than the message of Froebel whilst speaking
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to the Sunday school teachers, Kriege called Froebel's gifts and occupations exhaustless resources for the study of Scripture, for the simple kindergarten could be used to explain lessons on the ark, animals, tabernacles, and the Garden of Eden. She also said that kindergarten gifts could be used on Sunday at the church and on weekdays at home which meant that the parent was often able to transfer the Biblical lessons.85)

At last, Kellogg Hall, a memorial building at Chautauqua in New York State became the centre of all kindergarten activities and lectures. According to Shapiro, Froebelian like Kriege, Kraus Bölte and Elizabeth Harrison annually lectured here to an audience including many Sunday school teachers. Outside of Chautauqua, New York over three hundred local Chautauquas eventually offered kindergarten instruction to parents and Sunday school teacher alike.86) Vincent left the story of this movement in his book titled "Chautauqua Movement". One of his statements about the result of this movement is this. He says:

Children at Chautauqua have found a paradise amidst their pleasures, they have learned useful lessons which are sure to help them everywhere else and always. Chautauqua is a veritable kindergarten.87)

Besides this movement, Vincent with Jesse L. Hurlbut organized "The kindergarten of the Church Association" in 1895 with the mandate "to promote the efficiency of the Sunday school through the Froebelian science of teaching."88)

The Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) set its primary objective to inculcate the children of the working poor in the kindergarten habits of temperance before the drinking habit was formed. So the WCTU made a kindergarten department separately in 1882 and listed the three objectives of it as follows: i) to introduce temperance training into the kindergarten ii) to introduce the kindergarten into the public school and iii) to introduce the kindergarten methods into the Sunday school. In other words, they tried to reach the kindergarten children through the kindergarten, the working mother through the public school, and both through the Sunday school.
One member of the WCTU said that in their department they now sow the seed that shall blossom in evangelical work. With these objectives, the WCTU led a national campaign in the mid of 1880s to introduce the Froebelian methods into Sunday school. The result of it was reported like this:

The efforts of the WCTU were probably more successful in introducing Sunday school teachers to kindergarten methods than in achieving their ultimate goal of inculcating habits of temperance among the children of the working class.

The struggles of the pioneers, the rejections and trial case of Froebelianism in the church, and the process of reforming Sunday school education through Chautauqua movement and the national campaign of the WCTU are presented as a fragmentary picture of Froebelianism and the Sunday school movement in America.

In conclusion of this section, I would like to recall what happened in the Sunday school in America during the last part of the nineteenth century as the result of taking up Froebelian methods. While the group songs, games, pictures, and stories of the Froebelian kindergarten were being used in the Sunday school, it seems to me that two responses which are negative and positive, in a broad sense, took place.

I think that the difficulty of choosing the exact method for explaining Scriptural truths, some mistakes of teachers in lessons, the lack of understanding about the central concept of Froebelian play, and the debate upon the place of the gifts and occupations in the Sunday school can be regarded as negative response. But because it is common for some negative responses to happen when new ideas are put into practice, I believe that these phenomena would be constructive in developing the future education in the church. The wise suggestion was given by Beard after her analysis of the problems in the Sunday school. She states:

The shortness of the Sunday school lesson, the lack of trained kindergarten teachers and the intellectual effort required made the use of gifts and occupations out of the question. Differences in time and place necessitate differences in methods. One cannot impart truth in one hour each week, in
the same way that he may in fifteen hours. We do not believe in changing the Sunday school into the everyday kindergarten.\(^9\)

What, then, are the positive responses? I think that three things can be summarized: the birth of the Sunday school kindergarten as the indirect results of the WCTU campaign, the changes of the environment of the Sunday school kindergarten, and the use of the Froebelian method for the preparation of formal instruction in Scripture.

I do not agree with Shapiro who regarded many of these changes as cosmetic. First of all, it is not easy to discover complete changes in any reforming process at the early stage of new system. Secondly, putting the chairs into a circle rather than the old-fashioned rows of seats and painting a bright colour rather than the drab interior of the Sunday school are not minor changes especially for young children, because the surroundings are very important in the education of the young children. Apart from my disagreement with Shapiro mentioned above, I think that his thoughtful comment on Froebelianism and the Sunday school movement should be noted. He claims:

The impact of Froebelianism upon the Sunday school movement was felt largely outside the kindergarten movement. Froebelianism had its most widespread influence on the mainstream of American evangelical Protestantism by softening the methods and reshaping the content of Sunday school pedagogy.\(^9\)

2) **Froebelism and the English Sunday school movement**

As a matter of fact, the English Sunday school has a longer history than the American Sunday school. In seventeenth century Britain, most Christian nurture of children took place in the home and through the extended family of grand parents and god-parents. Attending public worship and the catechisms were important elements in their teaching.
Robert Raikes started a school for poor children in Gloucester during 1780 or 1781. Children gathered in groups, usually in home, for the purpose of religious instruction and sometimes in reading. In 1786, the Sunday School Society was formed for the support and encouragement of Sunday schools in the different counties in England. Although this was not the first attempt, the Sunday school movement began under the influence of Raikes and the church embraced it after thirty-five years went by.94

Since the Sunday School Union came into being in 1803, the churches and the Sunday schools grew quite rapidly. Cliffs regards 1831-1873 as the great period of the Sunday school movement, when membership of the schools rose, in round figures, from just under 500,000 in 1831 to 3,500,000 by 1870. He says:

As a result of this growth, the Sunday school organization was larger than any other body of the period.... This growth was completely due to the activities of gratuitous teachers, working in all parts of the country under the inspiration of the Sunday School Union.95

Overall the total enrollments had gone up from 3,500,000 in 1870 to almost 6,000,000 by 1903. The decline from 1901 to 1939 averaged 0.99% per year per denomination. The Froebelian movement in the Sunday school took place during this period. Cliff describes some characteristics of the Sunday school in England by 1939 like this:

There is Raikes of 1780 and general acceptance of Sunday schools by 1810; the Education act of 1870 and realization by 1910 that the nature of the Bible and the child had come to be seen differently; and Archibald’s inspiration in the early part of the twentieth century, and the acceptance of grading, and new ways of teaching, in 1930s.96

As the result of Marenholz-Bülow’s first missionary tour for Froebel’s system (for six months in 1854-1855), the first Froebelian kindergarten came into being at Hampstead in England. In 1854, the Manchester Kindergarten Association, the first Kindergarten Association in England, was founded. In 1874, the British and
Foreign School Society established a Kindergarten training college at Stockwell, where Heewart who had been trained by Middendorff worked as principal till 1883. In 1879, the Froebel Society of London founded in 1874 established a Kindergarten Training College in Tavistock street. The Croydon Kindergarten company (1880), the Bedford Kindergarten company (1883), the Sutton Kindergarten company (1888) had consecutively been established.

When the International Exhibition concerning the subjects of health and education was held at London in 1884, the Kindergarten system formed one section of a series of conferences on educational subjects for two days. The president was Rev. Alfred Bourne who read Heewart's paper. Alongside these movements, many German Kindergarten works had been translated into English.97)

In 1875 Froebel's educational ideas and his Gifts were adopted by Whitelands College. It is a Church of England training college founded in 1841 under the National Society solely for girls. I think that its trait is revealed in the daily routine and the curriculum of this college in the mid-1850s. The daily life of students from 6 to 9:30 was scheduled like this: morning and evening prayers, Scripture lesson, lessons and recreation, needlework and singing lesson and the ordinary daily routine.98) Which subjects did they learn to become teachers for two years there? They had to learn the church catechism, the history and contents of the prayer book, the Scripture subjects (two books of Old Testament, the whole of the Old Testament in general way, one Gospel, Acts, and two epistles), Penmanship, School management, English, Domestic Economy, Geography, Arithmetic, Drawing, Music, Singing, etc..99)

Although kindergarten theory, as was shown above, reached England in the 1850s, and Her Majesty's Inspector Michell, according to Cole, had spoken out repeatedly on the value of Froebel's apparatus and the validity of its principles, Whitelands Training College and its infant school did not accept it, because it already had a policy about the training of infant teachers.100) But the ideas of Froebel and
his Gifts were introduced to Whitelands College by John Faunthrope who was appointed as the principal. Cole writes:

He saw that the London School Board and Stockwell College were actively involved with this system and that the leading London college for females (Home & Colonial) was also associated with it and he could not allow his students to be denied it! Within a year of his appointment he had reorganised the schools attached to Whitelands and the professional training of his student teachers. ... He soon had the Froebel gifts in the school (if they were not already there) and his teachers had Kindergarten Certificates from the newly established Froebel Society. ... Whitelands was teaching its students the use of the Froebelian Gifts from 1875, and perhaps even earlier, and the two teachers in its kindergarten each had Kindergarten Certificates from the Froebel Society (founded 1874) though two pupil-teachers were also employed.100

I think that this fact that Froebel’s education had been adopted by Whitelands college, a Church of England training college, is a remarkable instance for his influence on church education in the history of Christian education. We can see one more instance of it. It was Westhill Training College that introduced Froebel methods to Sunday school teachers from the beginning of the twentieth century. Cliff says:

West Hill gradually became Westhill, a home for the training of teachers according to the methods of Froebel, whose methods suited the training of church workers also.102

It means that the methods of Froebel were used and popularized among church workers in England by George Hamilton Archibald (1852-1938), because he worked at Westhill which became ‘A Training Institute for Sunday School Workers’. He also gave lectures throughout the country as an Extension Lecturer for the Sunday School Union. In fact, he did not seem to get any formal Froebelian training, but he attended ‘a Summer School Methods’ at Chautauquau in New York organized by Vincent. According to Cliff, Archibald was forever quoting his favorite saying from Froebel, ‘Wouldst thou teach a child? Observe him, he will tell you what to do.’ Some of the Froebelian colleagues working with him were as follows: Ethel Archibald, Eleanor Wallis and Florence Reynolds.103
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Ethel Archibald Johnston, a daughter of George Archibald and the author of her father's biography, was trained as a teacher at the Froebel Educational Institute and worked as a lecturer and the head of Sunday school work. Wallis was a trained kindergartner and became much interested in the way Froebelian ideas could be used for the Sunday school and she expressed her wish to apply them. So she was invited to join by George Archibald when he needed another helper. Johnston told us how Wallis worked like this:

She proved a splendid organizer, and her work always charmed her observers and convinced them of the desirability of the methods.104

Johnston described Reynolds' contribution to the development of Westhill in this way:

Much of the success of the beginning of Westhill was due to the personality and work of Florence Reynolds. Her influence upon the students was of an unusual quality. Her lectures on Froebel the educator were a great joy.... A lover of the out-of-doors, she made nature study one of the most beloved subjects at Westhill. This infection was passed on down to succeeding members of the staff and influenced in considerable measure the curriculum of the Sunday school teaching in general.105

Beyond these activities at Westhill, I think that other colleges which offered kindergarten training course might have played their part to spread Froebel methods to Sunday school teachers. For example, many students with the intention of becoming missionaries overseas took kindergarten training course at St. Mary’s College which was a Church of England college, Lancaster Gate, during the principalship of Helena Powell.106

I think that Cliff’s estimation of Archibald can be seen as part of the results by which Froebelianism influenced Sunday school education in England. He seemed to follow Froebel’s way of studying children and was working with some Froebel-trained teachers. Cliff states:
Archibald shifted the emphasis of the curriculum away from content, to the learner, away from the Bible (as a primary task), to the child. The recognition of the child as a growing, developing person, rather than a miniature adult, demanded a separate and different treatment at each stage of life, and this in turn affected which parts of the Bible were to be used. Thus the teachers then came back to the Bible, to see it and its potential meaning through the eyes of the pupils.\textsuperscript{107}

Unfortunately we cannot see what Froebel did for church education itself, but he maintained what it was meant to be. I think that the Sunday school in America as well as in England has been influenced by Froebelianism. From my point of view, the two instances shown above prove that Froebel's educational ideas have some connection with the Christian education carried out by the church.

\section*{(3) THE CHURCH MINISTRY FOR YOUNG CHILDREN}

Whether or not Froebel had a connection with church education, I believe that the Christian church has her unique role to care and teach young children, because they are also members of the family of God, the body of Christ and the lamb of Christ.

The British Council of Churches acknowledges this responsibility like this:

\begin{quote}
Within the New Testament period, the right of the child to belong to the church was never called in question. The child belongs to his family and if his family belongs to the church, so does he. The child belongs to the church. The church is a necessary agent in his nurture, giving a wider context and greater stimulus than that provided by his family. His upbringing as a Christian is nurture within the family of God, not evangelism of one outside it.\textsuperscript{108}
\end{quote}

\subsection*{1) Leading children's worship according to the level of their development}

As in Froebel's suggestion of age-appropriate children's worship, the church should lead the worship for young children corresponding to their ages without losing the nature of worship. As worship is the human response to God, there are a lot of elements in it. Young children as well as adults can respond to the living God in love
and thanksgiving; in praise and adoration; in search and growing understanding; in
confession and humility; in prayer for others and for self; in commitment and self-
offering.\textsuperscript{109}

I believe that if we carefully take into account some of the ingredients of
worship (language, hymns, music, prayers, Bible readings, using of all senses,
communion, Baptism or dedication) according to their age, the worship can be
meaningful, relevant, inspiring, challenging and exciting even to young children.\textsuperscript{110}

2) Carrying out parents’ education

If we take the roles of parents emphasized by Froebel as have been noted in the
previous section, the church ought to carry out parents’ education as it does the early
childhood education programme. In doing so, I think that there are two dimensions:
the pastoral care and the education dimensions.

Actually new parents should be encouraged and advised by the experienced
couples and the pastors in the church for their new married life, family planning, the
period of pregnancy, and the birth of baby and so on. For example, when a women
is pregnant, her emotions are very complex and she may even seem to grow self-
centred, because many changes happens to her both biologically and psychologically.
So the role of the husband to protect and care for her is a basic expectation from the
wife. The pastoral care for this couple is one of essential duties of the church. The
church should support parents of children at various stage in order to help them to
build their faith.

What is the educational dimension of the parents’ education? I think that its
aims are two-fold. Firstly, it can give parents the opportunity to examine and form
their own faith before taking on responsibilities for their children’s faith. Secondly,
it can provide parents with the chance to think about and look for teachable moments
throughout the life of the new child.\textsuperscript{111} In order to achieve these aims of parental
education, the following contents are suggested by British Council of Churches: the Christian understanding of the Bible, modern Christian thought, psychology of children, and the practice of the Christian faith in the home.\textsuperscript{112}

3) \textit{Providing young children with the various educational and caring opportunities}

Considering the needs of community and the ability of the church, the church should do her best to provide young children with the caring or/and educational system in various forms based on a full-time or part-time programme. By doing so, the child may have every opportunity to form trusting relationships. They may be mother and toddler club, play group, creche, nursery class, kindergarten and Sunday school.

If we think that Froebel put his main purpose of Christian education for young children to awaken the germ of religion through the love of parents or the teachers, the provision by the church is very important for young children in Christian education. Because it is true that in early childhood the love and grace of God can be mainly known through his parents or those adults in whose care he is, this kind of work done by the church is absolutely meaningful in every respect. The more the church can provide them, the more children have the chance to feel and learn the love and grace of God.

3. \textsc{The Teacher and the Kindergarten}

In the previous two sections, Christian education in home and church has been discussed under the title of Christian Education for young children in Froebel's educational practice. For a child, home is the first and most meaningful place from his birth onwards. If his parents are believers, it is certain that the church is, as the case of Froebel, a very important life field of the child, too. As he is growing up, the child's world naturally is widening. The kindergarten can be the next life field for
young children. I believe that education in the home, church and kindergarten should be fully dealt with if one wants to look at the Christian education of young children.

In this context, Christian education in the kindergarten will be examined in this section. I think that it is necessary to divide this section into three subsections as follows: (1) the kindergarten for young children (2) the teacher of the kindergarten (3) Christian education in the kindergarten.

(1) THE KINDERGARTEN FOR YOUNG CHILDREN

There were infants schools established by the ancient civilisations and the Jewish and others in western culture before Froebel called his new movement the kindergarten in 1840. The term "kindergarten" in this section means Froebel's school for young children aged from three to seven and in the other section it means all educational institutions for pre-school children. I would like to present the history of the kindergarten and the nature of it in the following section.

1) The history of the kindergarten

It was Pastor Oberlin who founded the modern infant school at Walbach, Alsace in 1779. The development of infants schools in France and Belgium was influenced by him. Robert Owen (1771-1858), Scots philanthropist, established an infant school at New Lanark, between 1816 and 1824, where young children were encouraged to play, to sing, and to dance. Lord Brougham's infant schools were scattered throughout England and Creches had been established in many places in Germany between 1802 and 1834.

How, then, did the kindergarten come into existence and why did Froebel intend to make a school for young children? It was in the Helba Plan that Froebel included for the first time the idea of a 'Developmental Institute' for pre-school-age
Christian Education in Froebel's Educational Practice

children, aged between three and seven in 1828. The Helba Plan was Froebel's answer to the Duke of Meiningen's request for the setting up of a school in the Manor of Helba. Froebel said, in a letter to Barop in 1829, while the Helba plan still seemed possible:

For a long time the education and management of little children from the third to seventh year of age has occupied my thoughts. Many reasons had made me decide to erect in Helba in connection with the People's Educational Institute, an institute for the care and development of children of both sexes from three to seven years of age.... I do not call this by the name usually given to similar institutions, that is Infant Schools, because it is not to be schooled, but freely developed.  

Froebel, however, had a chance for his idea of early childhood education to come true for the first time, when he was appointed as the director of the orphanage school in Burgdorf in 1835. Froebel's conviction of the need for early childhood education seemed to grow amidst his little orphans. Barop points it out like this:

All school education was yet without a proper initial foundation, and that therefore until the education of the nursery was reformed nothing solid and worthy could be attained. The necessity for training gifted, capable mothers occupied his mind, and the importance of the education of childhood's earliest years became more evident to him than ever before.

This kind experience with very young children in Burgdorf led Froebel to observe the education of young children. He said, "My resolution is quite clear; to devote my life to fostering of the natural desire for activity." This was 1835 when he had been teaching children for nineteen years. Two years later (1837), he invented his first Gift. Liebschner describes his activities and enthusiasm for early childhood education in this way. He writes:

For the next seven years Froebel's thinking is taken up with the importance of play as a means of education. During this period he founded the kindergarten and created the Gifts, the Occupations, the Movement Games and finally probably his most important educational achievement, the Mother Song-Book (1844).
His interest in the life of the baby appeared earlier than this. According to Liebschner, in 1826 he published an article entitled *The Small Child: or the importance of a child's first action*; in 1830 *The Birth of a Baby* and in 1838 *The Life of the Child: the first actions of a child* and also *Comparisons: the seedcorn and the child*. In 1837 Froebel and his wife moved from Keilhau to Blankenburg where they opened the first kindergarten, which he called "a school for the psychological training of little children by means of play and occupations". So Barbara Denny makes *The Playmaster of Blankenburg* (the nickname for Froebel) the title of her book published in 1982.

I think that it is worth quoting some of Froebel's article titled *Education: Concerning the Education of pre-school-age children*, because it shows us clearly the necessity for early childhood education and his understanding of what was an unsuitable education for young children. It reads:

> The longer we consider and examine the present day methods of education, the more clearly we recognise that the children of pre-school-age lack the care and consideration which would be in accord with their present and future needs, a care which considers equally the child's mental and physical positions. We notice that if children of pre-school age not given the care which takes their stage of human development into consideration, they will lack the foundation for the task ahead in school and for their later lives in general.

The name 'Kindergarten' had occurred in Froebel's mind one fine summer day in 1840. Since then the kindergarten became the name to designate the institution for young children. In this sense, he is called the founder of 'the kindergarten'. The first kindergarten was opened at Blankenburg in June 1840, and the second at Rudolstadt in December 1840. The third was opened by his cousin at Gera in 1841 and thirteen more kindergarten were opened up to 1848.

**2) The nature of the kindergarten**

There are many ways that one could unfold the nature of Froebel's kindergarten. I
would like to it by looking at the motivation, the meaning of the name, the characteristic of the child’s work, and Froebel’s statement.

I think that two different motivations provided by König and Ebers for Froebel to establish kindergarten are helpful to see the nature of kindergarten. Firstly, kindergarten is a good place for a child to meet other children and many objects. König says:

He never forgets to stress that the most important companion for a child is another child or group of children. This idea was to be put into practice in the kindergarten.

According to Froebel, when the child comes into the kindergarten, he enters into a manifold new relation of life - relations with a number of companions, with those companions as individual parts of a whole, and with a plurality of objects.

Secondly, the other motive is to provide children with a happy and bright environment. Ebers states:

The idea of kindergarten arose from his own unhappy childhood. He wished to make the first five years of life, which to him had been a chain of sorrows, happy and fruitful to children - especially to those who, like him, were motherless.

Thirdly, the kindergarten is the place where children are growing and developing their abilities freely like plants. Hanschmann puts it like this:

As an explanation of the name Kindergarten the word ‘garden’ has been traced philologically to limit, circle, uniting, boundary. Froebel’s garden is a place in which the children are surrounded by such conditions as allow them freedom of growth for body, mind, and spirit, and in which their powers develop in harmony and beauty. The name ‘garden’ thus indicates the treatment Froebel desires for the children. They are to be like plants under the care of a ‘skillful gardener’.

Apart from Ebers’ claim, as Froebel did, that every kindergarten should have a small
garden to afford an opportunity to watch development of plants, it is quite meaningful to have a garden in the kindergarten.

Fourthly, kindergarten is not the school, as indicated above, but the free republic of childhood. Froebel says:

Little children, especially those under school age, ought not to be 

schooled 

and taught, they need merely to be 

developed. It is the pressing need of our age, and only the idea of a garden can serve to show us symbolically - but accurately also - the proper treatment of children. \(^2\)\(^3\)

Kilpatrick says that Froebel’s conception of an educational program not based on books is most instructive. When Dickens wrote Infant Gardens in 1855, he mentioned the children’s work in the kindergarten. He wrote:

Up to the age of seven there is to be no book work and no ink work; but only at school a free and brisk, but systematic, strengthening of the body, of the senses, of the intellect, and of the affections. \(^2\)\(^4\)

Fifthly, Froebel defines his kindergarten as follows:

Kindergarten are the surest means, the most correct way, the simple method of general elevation and ennobling, clear accomplishment and beautiful representation of genuine family life in all conditions and relations, as the single, true fount of contented individual life, joyful social life, free life, and united life of humanity. \(^2\)\(^5\)

He thus expressed the nature of the kindergarten through which he wished his ambition for young children to come true.

Lastly, as far as Froebel’s kindergarten is concerned, it is for the Christian education of childhood. In addition to the aims of Froebel’s education shown in Chapter IV, I think that his strong insistence supports this nature of the kindergarten. He puts it like this:
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Do not forget, moreover, that kindergarten have only arisen in the Protestant Evangelical Church, and could not have proceeded from any other.\footnote{126}

Luise Froebel also believed so. She said, "Kindergartens are God's cause, therefore they must spread."\footnote{127} If we separate Froebel's kindergarten system and principles from his religion, then many important points of his system may be lost, both in terms of understanding and practice.

I, therefore, conclude that Froebel's kindergarten was thoroughly for young children themselves, based on free play activities. Comparing Froebel's kindergarten to the existing institutions, Liebschner puts its distinctive difference in this way:

> While child-minding institutions simply made sure that children were fed during the day and came to no harm, Froebel considered pre-school education an essential part of the total education process. The kindergarten was 'the mediator between child, family and society'. Froebel, therefore, considered it essential that all children - not only those of the poor - should have the opportunity to attend the kindergarten.\footnote{128}

(2) THE TEACHER OF THE KINDERGARTEN

It is no exaggeration to say that Froebel was a great teacher throughout his life. Since he began teaching children at the age of twenty-five, as already has been mentioned in Chapter II, he tried to study a wide range of subjects to be a good teacher. On the other hand, his great concern for teacher training was part of Froebel's plan for his kindergarten. How Froebel trained the kindergarten teachers and what they were expected to be are main points to discuss in the following section.

1) The training of the kindergarten teachers

Realizing the fact that the kindergarten movement as the new cause of early childhood education could not survive and become more widely extended without the support of parents and teachers, he, with his colleagues, made all his efforts to seek their support for his own work by holding numerous lectures to smaller or larger groups,
and by demonstrating his activity games in child-care and similar institutions and by making personal contacts with influential men and women. This is the initial stage of the teacher training.

It was at Burgdorf in 1833 that he had his first experience in training teachers when the Government in Bern had sent him five young men to be trained. Liebschner reports his continuous training course there like this:

One year later Froebel and Langethal were also providing a course for sixty students intending to be teachers. The success of these courses led to a request by the government to provide in-service training for the practising teachers who were given three months leave every two years (forty course members at a time).\(^{129}\)

Froebel started courses for child leaders in June 1839 in Keilhau and Blankenburg. According to Liebschner, two young teachers were sent by the Jewish community in Frankfurt to get Froebel’s training. Karoline Luise attended the first sessions as an observer and showed her support by sending another young male teacher to be trained whose fee she paid.\(^{130}\)

Froebel wrote out in 1847 his Plan for the training institute for the kindergarten assistants and teachers in order to organize all courses which he held here and there on a more regular basis. The plan includes the aims of the institute, the entry requirements, the duration and daily schedule of the training course, and his special comments on the training course.\(^{131}\) Köing sums up some other courses before putting this plan into practice and his completed plan like this:

In Keilhau and Blankenburg in the winter 1847/48 and in the winter of 1848/49 where there were 40 participants. In 1849 his wish was fulfilled. First of all, in Liebenstein and then from 1850 in the residence at Marienthal near Schweina in the ‘Training Institute for Harmonious living’. Froebel ran the six-month courses he had planned. Participants were given a certificate once they had followed the course.\(^{132}\)

As far as teacher training is concerned, I think that there are two specific
things to mention in relation to Christian education. Firstly, Froebel adds a religious aspect to general entry requirements. He says:

Besides the already named conditions for the choice of this vocation - love for children, capacity and disposition for play and employment with them, purity of character, consequently sense and modesty - a womanly religious feeling of union with God, and a linking and capacity for singing are indispensably requisite.133)

Secondly, the trainee is supposed to participate in prayer meeting and religious instruction. Froebel sets this rule and its importance like this:

They take part in the general morning prayer and also, immediately afterward, in religious instruction in the classes on that subject in the educational institution. They do this in order to obtain firm religious opinions and clear insight into the nature of religion and its development in mankind, especially at the stage of childhood. They should gain such insight for their own benefit as well as for later use with those confide to their fostering care, as religion is the only sure, satisfying, vital foundation of an education rich in results and blessings.134

Froebel thus put stress on religious aspects of the teacher training course. He says:

The training of the kindergarten is alike of the head and heart, and educates at one and the same time towards skilfulness in action and towards rectitude in life.135

2) The kindergarten teacher

A careful study of each individual pupil, a skilful stimulation of one’s self-activity, and sympathy with childhood were Froebel’s expectations of his fellow-workers at Keilhau. What else did Froebel expect the teacher to do and to be? Froebel insists on the teacher’s commitment to God like this:

Whom shall the educator obey, God or man?...He should obey God rather than men, and he should say distinctly that he means to obey God rather than men.136
Needless to say, Christian education cannot succeed without the teacher’s commitment to God.

As school training and home training must go hand in hand, the kindergarten teacher should be the connector between the kindergarten and home. I think that the teacher with such an attitude can be a good connector. Parents can work for the kindergarten as supporters, learners, helpers, teachers, and policy-makers. Froebel believes that a trusting, working relationship between parents and teachers is essential for the successful education of children.

According to Froebel, the work of a teacher must be based upon intelligent knowledge, enabling a naturally child-loving disposition to understand both children and the directions in which they must develop. In order to meet this qualification, he set the proper subjects in his training course. For example, the study of the development of the human being and the child, the ways of dealing with children, the period of making objects for play and practising with them are involved in it.

As he once said, "The best education I can give them is to live with them.", he encouraged the teachers to share the lives of their pupils. He believed that two benefits are gained from this. One is a genuine bond between teachers and children created through working and playing with children. The other is the teacher’s opportunity to learn from children. I believe that this kind of attitude of Froebel and his colleagues enabled Ebers, one of Froebel’s students at Kailhau, to say this:

The relation between us and our teachers was so natural and affectionate that it seemed as if no other was possible.

What are the roles of the kindergarten teachers? Firstly, the teacher is like a gardener. Claxton who wrote the introduction of Sketches of Froebel’s Life and Times described well the role of kindergarten teacher comprehensively. He states:

The teacher is a gardener, watching patiently and intelligently for the budding
points of the soul, the nascent stages of interest, supplying suitable environment - food, light, and air - and protecting the child against those who, in their ignorance and ruthless zeal, dwarf and warp, or unduly stimulate the child by untimely prescription.\textsuperscript{140}

Secondly, the teacher with reference to play is organiser and guider of children’s activity through play. As Cole puts it:

The teacher may help the children to realize their own impulses by inciting or encouraging them to play; or secondly, may encourage those elements in the children’s own plays which are good and useful; or , thirdly, may discourage elements which are injurious or improper.\textsuperscript{141}

Thirdly, the teacher in the kindergarten should be the connector making the external internal and the internal external. The teacher, like mother, stands as a link between children and their Creator, between them and their friends, between them and nature. In Froebel’s education this role is very crucial.

Fourthly, Froebel encouraged teachers to unite their faculties and various experiences in order to attain true comprehension. In doing so, they can be examples, pursuing the life of unity before children. He urged:

We must before all else strive to raise the science of teaching (\textit{paedagogik}) into a united whole.... To win this holy result let us unite heart, head, and hand; soul, mind, and action; feeling, intellect, and will; religion, philosophy, and education; instruction, experience and observation.\textsuperscript{142}

I believe that Froebel set a good example to the kindergarten teacher through his educational activity. In addition to the many points made in previous sections, the qualities and attitudes of the kindergarten teachers mentioned above - the commitment to God, the possession of knowledge about the child and the subjects, the sharing of lives with children, and their role as protector, provider, observer, stimulator and connector - constitute a remarkably clear and effective description of the ideal Christian educator for young children.
(3) CHRISTIAN EDUCATION IN THE KINDERGARTEN

Having already discussed the aims, the curriculum, and the methods of Froebel’s education in previous chapter, I would like to consider four examples of kindergarten life in relation to Christian education for young children. I believe that much insight can be drawn from these concrete examples found in Froebel’s educational practice.

<CASE 1>

All that is told in Genesis of the history of Creation is lived by the child in his kindergarten education. The history of creation told in Genesis is in words that cannot be comprehended by young children. Instead of words he needs his own experience; his garden work teaches him that the growth of plants does not depend upon himself, or depend upon human power, but that an invisible power governs it. He learns to know the peculiarities and names of the animals, to water the ground, to take care of plants, etc., and out of all things rises the thought of a living Father who creates and animates all. This teaches him almost without words to find the Creator. Only a slight suggestion is needed to awaken the heart of the child to love and thanks to the Giver of all good things. We see this daily in our kindergarten.\[143\]

<CASE 2>

A kindergartner told the children that it is the will of God that those who have greater possessions than others shall give those others what they need. A little girl asked her companions if they had apples at breakfast-time, such as her mamma gave to her, and they replied that they had not. When the child was to be taken to the kindergarten the next day, she said to her mother, "Mamma, you must give me a great many apples today for the children in the kindergarten. Auntie says the dear God wishes it because the children have not any apples." The request was granted by the mother, and the child divided the apples among the children in the kindergarten, as if it were a matter of course. There is no difficulty, if it is done in the right way, in producing at this
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early age obedience to the commands of God, such as "Love your neighbour as yourself," and thus leading children to practise religion.144)

<CASE 3>

When Froebel unexpectedly visited one kindergarten early in the morning, a teacher was in the middle of morning prayers with the children. Froebel was moved by the simplicity and sincerity of the occasion and at the conclusion of prayers said, "A mother should and can pray with young children, and you are their mother at the moment. A man, a father, cannot talk to the children like this, cannot pray with the children in such a way."145)

<CASE 4>

There must be no more sitting still for the elder children for a half-hour on end. Spades, rakes, and watering-pots are now brought out for work in the flower-bed, of which each child has one of its own. But the little ones in their turn take seats and begin laying together and interlacing little laths or sticks in symmetrical shape - forms of beauty, forms of knowledge or mathematical figures, forms of practical life, or buildings, tools, and the like, - a sort of drawing with concrete lines. When the working hours are ended, and a song in which all join, sounds through the kindergarten. The little ones with their teachers form a circle and sing, with childish reverence, words expressing gratitude to God and desire to please him and their parents. The kindergarten always opens and closes in this way. They hurry off to join the mothers or sisters or nurses who have come to fetch them, eager to tell of all the pleasures and work of the morning, and to carry on by themselves at home the arts they have been learning.146)

In Case 1, we can see how Froebel taught young children in the kindergarten about the Creator and creatures not by words but by their own experiences. It was also suggested that a thousand opportunities for children to pay attention to God's
works can be made during the rambling by pointing out the scenes of nature.

I think that Case 2 is a good example to show how a child applied religious teaching in her life setting and the possibility of leading children in the kindergarten to practise Christianity. In Case 3, the teacher’s prayer with children in the kindergarten and Froebel’s understanding and encouragement of it can be seen. The religious sense of children may be awakened through this image of the teacher like mother. The picture in Case 4 is the last scene of the daily kindergarten life. I think that it is a beautiful picture to express their thanks to God and their desire to please him at the time of closing their busy life in the kindergarten.

In my view, these four cases prove that the kindergarten established by Froebel was for young children and carried out Christian education for young children by the trained teachers according to Froebel’s educational theory and experiences. I think that Froebel never lost his balance in putting his Christian education into practice by emphasizing inward relations between school and home and of both to the church. For home education, he gave parents instructions about their role, the family life and the ways of using play things including his Gifts, Occupations, and Mother’s Songs, Games and Stories. Using the principles for church education given by Froebel, his followers in America and in England tried to with considerable success develop and apply it to the Sunday school education. Thus Christian education for young children in Froebel’s educational practice held was in home, church and the kindergarten.

In the last chapter of the main body of this study parents and home education, the child and the church, and the teacher and the kindergarten as Froebel’s education practice were discussed in the connection with Christian education for young children. In the section on parent and home education, three things were examined: how Froebel contributed to parents and home education, the roles of parents and the family life given by Froebel.

His contributions to parents and home education are enlightening for parents.
with regard to the early Christian education of children in the home, giving them guidelines for rearing their children, providing parents and children with the invented materials and providing training for women. Froebel considers parents as guardians, partners, connectors, and educators of/for their children. According to Froebel, the family as the community of love should operate as the first social group and school of the child, as the basis and medium of Christian education, and as the place to link and support the school life.

We can see what Froebel accomplished for parents and home education in Christian Education for young children through this study. Considering the current trends of our society in relation to the family life and parents' primary and most essential duty given by God as Lloyd-Jones indicates, I think that these teachings given by Froebel have important value for our attention.

I believe that the church is the second field for Christian education of children. In order to clarify Froebel’s influence to Church education in the history of Christian education, the relationship between Froebel and the church, his influence on children’s education of church were fully discussed. Brought up in the Old Lutheran Protestant Church as a son of pastor, he attended Sunday service twice, sitting in the choir, listening to his father’s sermons with great attention, and he was confirmed at the age of fifteen. I think that his admiration of Luther and his thoughtful consideration for Luther’s descendants can be regarded as one of the evidences of his attachment to the church.

Although Froebel’s objection to dogmatic teaching for children and his statement on children’s public worship attendance may have been regarded as the factors causing conflict between church community and Froebel, it was argued that he did not deny church dogma and the importance of attendance at church worship, but he demanded rather that religious instruction should be given matching the age and worship should be reformed corresponding to their age.
Having proved the uses of Froebel’s educational principles and methods in the history of Christian education by tracing Froebelianism and Sunday school movement in America and England, this study suggested three functions of church for young children’s education. Firstly, the church should lead children’s worship according to the level of their development as Froebel asserted. Secondly, the church ought to carry out parents’ education in the pastoral care and the educational dimensions like Froebel did. Lastly, the church should provide young children with the caring or/and educational system in various forms based on a full-time or part-time programme according to the situation of the church.

I think that the teacher and the kindergarten as the third field of Christian childhood education have very crucial meaning in this study. In order to see whether Froebel’s kindergarten was for the Christian education of childhood, his intentions and motives in founding the kindergarten, its nature, his training course for the kindergarten teachers, and four cases of Christian education which were carried out in his kindergartens were fully discussed.

Through his statements, the content of his training course for teachers and four illustrated cases we can see clearly the fact that Froebel had given Christian education to young children through his kindergarten. We, therefore, come to the conclusion that these historical facts and events keep us from doubting that Froebel was one of the great Christian educators and his theory and practice of education have something valuable to draw our attention in order to accommodate our current Christian education for young children.
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We are now in a position to bring this study to a close. In doing so, first, we will briefly summarize some arguments and their significance in each chapter. Then, we will draw further conclusions for the Christian education of young children.

Realizing the present need in Korea for the Christian education of young children, this study begins with the presumption that study of the past can offer insight into present problems so that some of them might able to be solved. As the rapid growth of economy in the developing countries has brought out many social problems, so the rapid increase of education institutes for preschool children during the last decade in Korea has caused many problems. In fact, Christian institutes for young children (4 to 6 years old), such as kindergartens affiliated to churches and Sungyowon prominent in the history of Korean Kindergarten have problems, too.

Christian education for young children in Korea, unlike England and Wales, is carried out not by state schools but private institutions such as the churches. The presupposition that studying one of the models in the history of education while paying attention to the current trends of Christian education will be beneficial to deal with the problems which the circle of Christian education in Korea faces has led me to study Froebel. Froebel who devoted himself to educate young children during the last part of his life, asserted that all education should be based on Christian religion. This study, therefore, as one of the studies of educational history, has examined Froebel and his religious education in the light of Christian education for young children.

It was argued in Chapter II that there are two important reasons to take both the philosophical analysis and the biographical approach in studying Froebel. The first
one is that the philosophical approach, which has been more popular and common, may fall into fragmentary and unessential points without seeing the subject’s idea as a whole. The second is Froebel’s ambiguous expression which might lead people to misunderstand what he intended to convey.

Following these two methodologies, Froebel’s study life, his contemporary thoughts and philosophers have been described in Chapter II. He liked reading books for his self-study and enrolled at three universities for short periods to take some lectures which he had interest in for his job and for his educational theory development in his later university life. He faced German romanticism and idealism through his study life.

Goethe, Schiller, Fichte, Schleiermacher, Hegel, Novalis, Schelling, Herbart, Weiss, and Krause as his contemporary philosophers were chosen in order to examine their thoughts on God, man, and nature, because Froebel had his relationships with them through their lectures, books, or close personal contacts. As the result of his relationships with them it can be said that Froebel was influenced by German romanticism and idealism. As far as philosophical ideas are concerned, it seems to me that Froebel did not choose any particular circle of ideas to follow. As he said, he was not absorbed in Kantian ideas even though he was a student of philosophy at Jena which was a centre of Kantian studies. He acknowledged that he got the intellectual impulse through philosophical teaching and thought at Jena.

As he also stressed that the educator must study his subject from a philosophical as well as from a practical point of view, I think that he held the same attitude in his study life. In my view, Froebel did not build up his educational idea after taking a particular line of philosophical thought. As already indicated above, he rather sought various ideas through many subjects to solve his main educational problem such as the law of unity, the progress of human development and the education of man. The range of the ideas which Froebel faced and studied are very wide and different. In this context, I argue that we had better not categorize the idea
of Froebel as a whole even in a broad sense although his particular thought can be categorized.

What is the position of Froebel among these thoughts? On which criteria did Froebel take some particular ideas to build up his educational theory? It was suggested that Froebel basically kept his own Christian belief in choosing some ideas among Romanticism, Naturalism, Idealism and Pietism. In my view, his educational aims and his ideas of Christianity, as has been discussed in Chapter III, are fundamentally tied to Christian teachings. I think that he took some ideas developed by his contemporary philosophers with his Christian belief for his educational theory.

This study, however, did not regard Froebel’s contemporary philosophers as the only influential factor. It was argued in Chapter II and the following chapter that if we try to understand Froebel and his educational life more accurately, Pestalozzi, his colleagues, and his Christian life should be regarded as the other important influential factors in developing Froebel’s ideas.

Pestalozzi appeared to be a great figure to have an effect on Froebel in Froebel’s works. Pestalozzi was introduced to Froebel by Gruner who had worked with Pestalozzi in Burgdorf. Froebel also read the works of Pestalozzi. Furthermore, having believed that Pestalozzi was to be the watchword of his life, he visited Pestalozzi twice to observe the educational activities at his school with his own eyes. I think that we can see Pestalozzi’s influence upon Froebel’s education in two aspects; general education and religious education.

Of Pestalozzi’s general education Froebel set a high value on the early training of the child, *Mother’s book*, the mother’s duty to develop sense-impressions by repetition, the role of the father and the teachers for over seven years old children, how to develop children’s thinking power, teaching plan and exchange classes. In spite of these good things he criticized the want of unity both as to means and aims in Pestalozzi’s education, because he believed that he could see something higher and
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a closer unity of the whole educational system. Concerning Pestalozzi’s religious education Froebel criticized his vague devotional addresses. As has been shown in the previous chapters, I think that Froebel owed Pestalozzi very much in developing his religious education for young children.

Apart from his family’s involvement in education activity, he was lucky enough to have three faithful friends - Middendorff, Langenthal and Barop who had all studied theology before joining Keilhau and became Froebel’s relatives by their marriage. Langenthal became a Protestant minister. Middendorff and Langenthal shared their difficulties in teaching and training children entrusted them with Froebel during their student life at Berlin. Froebel’s life with them in the educational community was also strongly influenced by their ideas and life, because they also expressed their Christian faith and conviction for their work with Froebel. In my view, if they did not agree with Froebel regarding his religious education, they could not work for him so faithfully and devotedly throughout their life.

Because Froebel claimed that every form of education which is not based upon the Christian religion is deficient and limited, and his terminology is related to Christianity, it was necessary to examine his Christian life and ideas of God, man, and nature in Chapter III. I think that it is not wise, as Froebel indicates, to separate Froebel’s educational work from his religious life and ideas in the study of Froebel. That is why we have examined Froebel’s life and ideas in connection with Christianity in Chapter III before seeing the theory and practice of his religious education. In order to see his life in relation to Christianity, his life was divided into two periods (childhood and adulthood) by his confirmation.

Born as a son of Lutheran church minister, Froebel received constant and consistent Christian education from his father and his uncle who were all Protestant ministers at his home and his uncle’s home, churches and schools until his confirmation. His faith grew through his religious experiences such as daily family service, Sunday worship, school religious instruction, and hearing his father’s
teachings and conversations. So he held his conviction of salvation and felt deep religious feelings and joy in his mind. He seemed to see no conflict arising from the different values requested by school and home, for his home life became in complete harmony with the discipline of the school. As Liebschner suggests, I think that Froebel experienced both the justice of God and the love of God from his father and his uncle. His confirmation prepared and conducted by his uncle remained as a momentous event in his life.

I, therefore, think that we can just assume his Christian faith through the various evidences in his educational works. In the Lutheran Church confirmation is a rite rather than a sacrament and the recipient offers it as a confirmation in his heart of those baptismal vows which his parents assumed on his behalf. Because there are no evidences about his sudden change of religious life and his expulsion from his church after his confirmation, we may think that he might have kept his baptismal vows throughout his lifetime.

He also attended church services and made his confession several times. He identifies himself as a Christian by using a phrase like "we, as Christians" and believes in the guidance and providence of God. Froebel who believed the Bible to be the Holy and Sacred Writing and book of God left his own Bible whose leaves were worn quite thin by constant use and whose margins were written over with remarks.

His Christian life was also supported by his contemporary witnesses. Marenholz-Bülow, his nephew, Poesche and Middendorff equally said that Froebel never lost his Christian faith throughout his life. So it can be concluded that Froebel may have been regarded a Protestant Christian through his Christian life, his own confession and his contemporaries' witnesses even though there are some doubts about Froebel's Christianity. But it does not mean that all his ideas are in accordance with orthodoxy. Nonetheless his religious education has value for current Christian Education for young children.
But it can be suggested that it would be good for Christian education if he had clearly stated about the things that he believed, because Christian education should be based on Christian doctrine which is definitely clarified. Although Froebel’s education, in this viewpoint, has a vague position for the Christian education of young children, there are other aspects which show us his Christian identity with his Christian life described above.

Froebel has more than a passing commitment to God as Trinitarian. A standard criticism of him is that he is pantheistic, or merely theistic in a general sense. However, this seems to miss his profound understanding of the trinitarian structure of the being of God. Froebel is fascinated by the problem of unity in diversity throughout the universe, and it is his trinitarian commitment that enables him to grasp this apparent paradox as an expression of the very nature of God. He repeatedly confesses his belief in God as Father, Son and Spirit, not merely some philosophical idea of Absolute Being, or Ultimate Reality.

From the biblical perspective, pantheism has two deficient points: the denial of the transcendence of God and the personal character of God. In Froebel’s faith, there are dimensions of both immanence and transcendence. As indicated above, he also admitted the personal character of God. As far as this perspective is concerned, it can be argued that Froebel may not be called pantheist, though there are some phrases in his works like "The Spirit of God dwells and lives in nature" and "The Spirit of God dwells in his works." which could lead one to think he was. I think that it would be best to scrutinize Froebel’s religious education for young children after adding the redemptive work of Christ to his view on God rather than entirely refuse to take any notice of it because of controversy over pantheism.

Froebel’s view of Jesus Christ is more difficult to express in a precise, coherent, final way. In many ways he is a product of general nineteenth century German philosophical-theological speculation and moralism. Generally, he portrays Jesus as a perfect model of human behaviour and life before God. Jesus is the perfect
revelation of the nature of humanity. Jesus displayed the Fatherhood of God towards all humanity. He came to believe that "it is not impossible for man to live the life of Jesus in its purity, and show it forth to the world, if he will only take the right way towards it". However, Froebel sometimes shows a deeper, more ontologically superior perception of the person and work of Jesus Christ e.g. "The Christian religion, the religion of Jesus, satisfies to perfect completeness the mutual relations of God and man; and indeed creates them". Elsewhere Froebel is able to speak of Jesus as the Mediator between God and humanity, and even as the Saviour. Thus, Froebel is not contented with the merely Divine Teacher and Example theology that was so popular in so much 19th century religion: he knew that if he was to take his trinitarian thought seriously he could not neglect or underplay the uniqueness of Christ as the very foundation of Divine-human encounter.

It is slightly ambiguous as to how important the Holy Spirit is in Froebel's thought. If his talk of the Divine Spirit is specifically about the Holy Spirit, then his theology is immensely Holy Spirit orientated. The Holy Spirit would then be the Person of the Divine Being most committed to relationship with humanity, whereas in classical Christian thought it is the Son who is the ground and priest of all divine-human relations. However, if Divine Spirit simply refers to God in a general sense, then Froebel does not appear to have anything substantial to say about the Holy Spirit at all.

Froebel believed that the Bible is God's Holy and Sacred writing. It was not just a collection of historical documents of equal status with any other historical documents. In Germany during his lifetime the Bible had been treated as an account of human thought about God e.g. the Tübingen school led by F.C. Baur used the New Testament as a presentation of the clash between the Jewish followers of Christ and the Gentile followers of Christ, and explained the development of the Church from this human perspective. Froebel seems to have maintained a view of the Bible most common among the Pietists in Germany at that time, even though Froebel was very influenced by the critical rationalism of people like Hegel.
Traditionally the centre point of Christian thought is the Cross and Resurrection of Jesus Christ. This has been understood to refer to the way in which human disobedience is atoned for, and new, God-approved life is given to alienated humanity. However, Froebel, like so many 19th century thinkers, did not concentrate upon this sin-orientated understanding of Christ. Froebel does not seem to have anything to say about the meaning of the Cross, nor about the necessity for atonement. This might be because such subjects did not really fall within his area of concern, or it might mean that his thought was more philosophically based than Biblically based. It is difficult to draw definite conclusions about this matter with the evidence available.

Froebel’s description of humanity is in some ways his controlling idea for education. He denies that there is such a thing as original sin i.e. the belief that humanity, because of Adam’s first sin, has become corrupt at heart, even from the moment of birth. Froebel believes that humans are good from birth and that they are in good standing with God right from the beginning. He says that we are born children of God, and our very existence is carried out within, through and for God. This does not mean that we are all incapable of wrong action or wrong thinking, because we are moral agents, with the capacity for self-determination. We are free to live out of harmony with God’s moral and spiritual laws, but by doing this we will be unable to understand the world around us, given that nature itself is in complete harmony with the will and mind of the Divine Spirit.

It is Froebel’s understanding of nature that is most distinctive, and yet is so profoundly Christian. Nature is an inter-related unity, governed by the Laws of the Divine Spirit, and thus revelatory of the Divine Spirit. Christian theology in the 16th century especially had focused on nature as being revelatory of God. The great Reformers like Luther and Calvin taught that humanity unavoidably knows God, because of the creation that surrounds us at every moment in everything that we do. Froebel re-emphasises and deepens that aspect of Christian theology, at a time when so much of popular Christian thought was trying to see the universe as a closed,
mechanistic, non-personal arena for life. Froebel asserted the intensely personalistic environment of God's creation, given that it all speaks of Him, and is governed by Him. Physical laws are in accordance with the Divine mind, and govern all the purely physical phenomena that are presented to the human mind. But, there are also moral and spiritual laws which God has established to govern human behaviour too. Moral, physical and spiritual laws are all manifestations of God's Law, His Mind and Character. To the extent that a human conforms his life and thought to these moral and spiritual laws, he will understand the physical world correctly, and live in harmony with it. In this way Froebel has used Kant's basic dualism between the physical realm of Buber's I-It relations and the noumenal realm of I-Thou relations, and yet Froebel has breathed into these categories a fundamentally Reformational view of nature and God. He is not content to see the realm of nature as basically amoral and areligious, confining all religious content to the noumenal. No, Froebel floods the law-governed realm of nature with the personal categories usually reserved for noumenal description. Our relationship to the creation cannot be divorced from our personal relations to one another and our spiritual relationship to God Himself. The three relationships of God, humanity and nature become so profoundly interrelated in Froebel's thought, that one cannot grasp just one aspect of his thought and successfully understand it without grasping the whole. In this way Froebel anticipated much Christian thinking of the 20th century in taking the reality of God's revelation in nature so seriously.

It was described in the last part of Chapter III that Froebel's view of nature which is essentially related to his education had been built up from his early life, his career, his studies and his Christian life. I think that if we fail to see Froebel's nature from the various angles as Cole and MacVannel did, we cannot fully understand his view of nature in his works. As he believed that nature is a manifestation, a revelation of God, the book of creation, and God's handiwork, it was also suggested that it is necessary to hold an attitude to look at Froebel's view of nature from the Christian perspective. It was concluded that Froebel's main idea of nature is sound enough to be grounds for the Christian education of the young children.
In conclusion, Froebel’s thought is not merely theistic and it cannot in any way be described as pantheistic. His commitment to Christian concepts and controlling beliefs is not at the periphery of his thought, but occupies a central position. Although on some details of Christian doctrine he is obscure or silent, this cannot be taken to mean that he was not authentically Christian: after all, Froebel was not trying to write a systematic theology. Froebel’s thought is deeply Christian in most ways even if in certain areas he fails to articulate Christian belief with classically orthodox terminology and clarity.

Having seen Froebel’s life and ideas in connection with Christianity, Froebel’s educational theory and practice have been considered in the light of Christian education for young children in the subsequent chapters. The aims, subjects and the methods of Froebel’s educational theory were dealt with in connection with Christian education for young children in Chapter IV. In discussing Froebel’s educational aims, some typical educational aims in the history of education and four approaches to the aims of religious education were presented. A number of educational aims given by Froebel were arranged under five headings: the law of unity, the individual, humanity, nature and God.

The range of his aims of education are quite comprehensive. They include a number of aims described by the great educators: preparation for citizenship (Plato, Erasmus), sound moral development (Herbart, Locke), God-fearing life (Calvin, Commenius, Pestalozzi), good life on earth and eternal life with God (Luther, Milton), making children Christians (Bushnell) and education for life (Montessori).

It was suggested that if Froebel had carefully, clearly, concisely explained his definite idea of unity in his book *The Education of Man* which has been regarded as his main work then, I think that there may have been significant differences in the general understanding of his educational aim. Several detailed examples of his aims in this study, which are quoted from various works of Froebel, including *The Education of Man*, according to the law of unity, the individual, humanity, nature,
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and God, may help us to see his aims of education more clearly and systematically than ever before.

Froebel’s educational aims have been examined according to Moore’s three criteria: i) Are they realistic? ii) Is it possible to show whether or not they have ever been realised? iii) Are they morally acceptable? In my view, Froebel’s educational aims are not unrealistic. The answer to the second question is positive, too. The fact that Froebel’s aims are rooted in Christianity can show us whether his aims have ever been realized. We can easily point out the fact that there are numerous people such as St. Paul, Martin Luther King, who lived in accordance with the teaching of unity with God, himself, others and nature in the history of Christianity. I also think that the educational aims of Froebel are in no way morally objectionable, in terms of Christian teaching. More than that: they are desirable, though I doubt that I can convince an atheist of the fact.

Having looked at some statements of Froebel’s educational aims in the history of education, they have been examined to see the adequacy of these as interpretations of Froebel’s vision. My contention is that Froebel’s educational aims are so intimately tied up with his basic Christian beliefs that it is misleading them to detach from their Christian framework. Some ‘secularized’ aims are a travesty of Froebel’s purposes. Some religious educational aims seem to be abstract and obscure and others are quite reductive.

In the light of this discussion how can we restate Froebel’s vision? I think that it is possible to put his educational vision in this way: Education aims to bring children into the understanding that the whole of reality, (God, fellow humanity and the physical world in all its manifold aspect), is a single, integrated unity, and that authentic human life must be lived in harmony with God, humanity and Nature.

As he said that all his efforts in the cause of education were in harmony with the words of Jesus, we can see that he tried to base his aims of education on the
teaching of the Bible. In my view, this attempt can be regarded as a very encouraging fact in the history of Christian education. As already has been mentioned in Chapter III, his ideas on God, man, and nature are developed on the basis of the Bible. I think that his approach to the aim of Christian education is "the across-subject approach" that is, "the Neo-Confessional or the Neo-Dogmatic approach" including the child-centred and development approach.

Before considering the subjects in Froebel's educational theory the epistemology of Froebel's educational position was dealt with, because I think that educational theory is nothing less than a theory of knowledge for conveying knowledge. Froebel's answer to the insoluble problem of epistemology is that the human mind is made in the image of the Divine Spirit. As the human mind conforms itself to this Divine image, it may make true statements about creation, given that the creation bears the same rational basis as its creator. This means that I can make true statements about the universe, but I cannot make exhaustive statements about individual things, because I am merely finite in capacity. Because I think like the creator, I am able to truly analyze my experience, but I cannot exhaustively know anything, because to do so would mean that I had to know everything exhaustively. I may predicate on the basis that the Divine Spirit has enabled me to know because the Divine Spirit is the final source of all knowledge and interpretation. I cannot creatively interpret my experience. I am able only to reinterpret my experience in the light of the Divine Spirit's definitive interpretation. His position is the same of the twentieth Century Christian thinkers such as Karl Barth(1886-1968), Herman Dooyeweerd(1894-1977), Cornelius Van Til(1895-1987).

His Christian views of God, man, and the world can be found among the subjects. In spite of having the above points, I think that there is one thing to point out concerning his aims of education. Froebel missed out a crucial thing in his aims of Christian education for young children. As Byrne insists, the true aim of education for the Christian must be redemptive. As the cross of Jesus Christ is the centre of the message which Paul preached (ICor.2:2, Gal.6:14), so the aims of Christian education
must have a redemptive element in them as an essential one. I think that Froebel’s aims of education should have included it.

Froebel proclaimed that human education requires the knowledge and appreciation of religion, nature, mathematics, and language in their intimate living reciprocity and mutual causality. Christian education, natural science, mathematics, language, and art are his curricula. Froebel also explained the reasons to teach children each subject and its importance in Christian education. For instance, he said that the more children get to the knowledge of nature, the more they can get to the knowledge of themselves and God.

Having seen Froebel’s subjects for Christian education, we can notice that he tried to develop every single subject on the basis of his understanding and belief of Christianity. Furthermore, he tried to teach each subject not separately but interrelated with others. In other words, he dealt with the nature, aim, and importance of each subject in the light of its relationship with the rest of curriculum. We can, therefore, say that Froebel who dealt with subjects for Christian education in such ways is one of pioneers in the history of Christian education for young children.

In the last part of Chapter IV, the methods of Froebel’s Christian education with four faith developmental theories of Fowler, Westhoff, Moran and Keen was examined. I think that these theories help us to see how Froebel’s methods are relevant to developmentally appropriate programme in Christian education for young children. According to Froebel, the methods of education must be suitable for children’s developmental stage. Alongside many well-known methods such as self-activity, learning by living and knowing by doing, his methods for Christian education for young children were presented.

Mother’s prayer for and with child, observation, play, symbolism and others (memorizing religious sayings, attending regular meetings, and love) were put as the methods which Froebel himself took and encouraged others to use. So Froebel can
be regarded as the developer of these methods and the man who put them into practice for Christian education for young children.

Parents and home education, the child and the church, and the teacher and the kindergarten as Froebel’s education practice were discussed in the connection with Christian education for young children in Chapter V. In the section on parent and home education, three things were examined: how Froebel contributed to parents and home education, the roles of parents and the family life given by Froebel.

His contributions to parents and home education are enlightening parents on the early Christian education of children in the home, giving them guidelines for rearing their children, providing parents and children with invented materials and providing training for women. Froebel considers parents as guardians, partners, connectors, and educators of/for their children. According to Froebel, the family as the community of love should operate as the first social group and school of the child, as the basis and medium of Christian education, and as the place to link and support the school life. We can see what Froebel accomplished for parents and home education in Christian Education for young children through this study. Considering the current trends of our society in relation to the family life and parents’ primary and most essential duty given by God as Lloyd-Jones indicates, I think that these teachings given by Froebel have important value for our attention.

Under the title of the child and the church as the second field of Christian childhood education, the relationship between Froebel and the church, his influence on children’s education and the church ministries for young children were fully discussed. Brought up in the Old Lutheran Protestant Church as a son of pastor, he attended Sunday service twice, sitting in the choir, listening to his father’s sermons with great attention, and he was confirmed at the age of fifteen. His admiration of Luther and his thoughtful consideration for Luther’s descendants were also discussed as the one of his attachment to the church.
Although Froebel’s objection to dogmatic teaching for children and his statement on children’s public worship attendance may be regarded as factors causing conflict between church community and Froebel, it was argued that he did not deny church dogma and the importance of attendance at church worship, but he demanded rather that religious instruction should be given matching the age and worship should be reformed to correspond to the age of children.

Having proved the uses of Froebel’s educational principles and methods in the history of Christian education by tracing Froebelianism and Sunday school movement in America and England, this study suggested three functions of church for young children’s education. Firstly, the church should lead children’s worship according to the level of their development. Secondly, the church ought to carry out parents’ education in the pastoral care and the educational dimensions. Lastly, the church should provide young children with the caring or/and educational system in various forms based on a full-time or part-time programme according to the situation of church.

The teacher and the kindergarten as the third field of Christian childhood education was considered in the last part of Chapter V. In order to supply proofs that Froebel’s kindergarten was for the Christian education of childhood, his intentions and motives in founding the kindergarten, its nature, his training course for the kindergarten teachers, and four cases of Christian education which were carried out in his kindergartens were presented. Through his statements, the content of his training course for teachers and four illustrated cases we can see clearly the fact that Froebel had given Christian education to young children through his kindergarten. We, therefore, come to the conclusion that these historical facts and events keep us from doubting that Froebel was one of the great Christian educators and his theory and practice of education have something valuable to draw our attention in order to accommodate our current Christian education for young children.

As we come to the end of this study which examined Froebel in the light of
Christian education for young children, we might do well to consider briefly some significant points for Christian education of young children and for the understanding of Froebel’s education, though this may raise further questions, which call for further studies.

1. As the study of Froebel’s life and educational work has shown, his religious education may be regarded as Christian education for young children. However, that does not mean that his presentation of the foundational truths of Christianity is as thorough and complete as it might be. Clearly, further work needs to be done to bring his ideas more thoroughly into the realm of classical, orthodox Christian theology. For example, his total lack of teaching concerning the central soteriological themes of Christology needs serious attention.

2. Froebel’s efforts to build a theory of Christian education for young children and to put it into practice should be seen as a very important and beneficial stage in the history of Christian education.

3. Froebel has clearly shown that every subject in Christian education must be understood and applied according to Christian truth. The world of nature is not a ground of religious neutrality, but a revelation of the Being of the Triune God, who works out His purposes in this sphere of existence.

4. As Froebel has suggested and accomplished, methods for Christian education must be in accordance with the development stage of children. Children think differently as they intellectually mature and this must not be disregarded in education. Creative methods and educational play-things are all to be utilised in developing a more complete teaching program.

5. Froebel brilliantly displayed the vital connections between church, home and school. If education is the holistic, life-encompassing activity that Froebel claims that it is, then responsibility falls very heavily upon the home to provide the essential
educational nurturing right from the child's earliest stages. The church, as the community of God's grace and love, must provide the religious atmosphere and instruction necessary to bring the child into a proper knowledge of and love for the Triune God. Against such a background the Christian school must encourage the child to learn and observe the wonder of the universe and human relations as revelatory of God. Teaching must not descend into a secular, anti-theistic humanism, but must do nothing less than lift the pupil to a knowledge of God, of his own self, of humanity generally, and of nature. This should issue in a pure and holy life to which such knowledge leads.
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