

Textbooks and School Identity: The Content and Use of History Textbooks in Dutch Classical and Modern Education, 1863–1917

Hilda T.A. Amsing

University of Groningen

ABSTRACT

This article explores ways in which the different educational identities of the classical gymnasium and the modern *Hogere Burgerschool* (HBS) were reflected in the textbooks used for teaching history. From the intentions of publishers, the use of books by schools, and the content of the books, it appears that in the context of shifting boundaries, the differences between HBS and gymnasium had become permeable. Differences were found with respect to stylistic devices. This demonstrates that varying notions of citizenship found their way into schools, and it reveals the power of examinations.

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article explore comment les différentes identités institutionnelles du lycée Dutch Classical Gymnasium et de l'approche moderne du Hogere Burgerschool (HBS) apparaissent dans les manuels d'histoire utilisés par les deux types d'établissements. L'auteur appuie son analyse sur les intentions des éditeurs, le contenu des manuels et à la manière dont ils sont utilisés dans ces deux écoles entre les années 1860 et 1920. Il appert que dans le contexte d'évolution du système d'éducation, les dissemblances entre la HBS et le lycée n'ont pas été constantes. Il y avait d'importantes variantes dans les approches stylistiques des textes. Cela démontre que les deux institutions véhiculaient des notions distinctes du citoyen idéal, ainsi que l'importance des examens.

Introduction

Textbooks form a significant dimension of the curriculum and scholars regard them as a means for the dissemination of values.¹ And although we have to be aware of the fact that there is a gap between the “intended curriculum” as it appears in the books, the “taught curriculum” as delivered by teachers and the “learned curriculum” as absorbed in the mind of the pupils (Gilbert points to the fact that students’ interpretation of texts is varied and unpredictable),² these books are frequently used as sources for investigating cultural views, both in the present and in the past.³ Because

we can assume that pupils regard texts as definitively authoritative, they function as important discursive frameworks and their influence should not be underestimated.⁴ As an important component of the intended curriculum they reflect perceptions, for example, of women, cultural minorities and foreign countries.

A popular topic within textbook research is national identity and citizenship.⁵ Researchers are interested in the way textbooks prepared children for citizenship and confronted them with ideas about national identity. This article is not about national identity, but about school identities.⁶ School identity is understood as the specific and related characteristics of a school, such as student population, curriculum, educational content and notions of citizenship, that are recognized by the boards, teachers and students of the school, and by others. Like national identity it depends on the construction of boundaries, “which mark the difference between Self and Others.”⁷ In this study, school identity is restricted to the educational ideals concerning classical versus modern education.⁸ In the Netherlands, from the second half of the nineteenth century onwards, the relatively new non-classical secondary school, *Hogere Burgerschool* (HBS), competed against the “gymnasium,” which offered a traditional classical education.⁹ A struggle for student numbers and status began in 1863, the year the HBS was established. The initial phase ended in 1917 when HBS pupils were given full rights to study at university, at least in a limited number of faculties. Both competitors were supposed to have clearly distinct functions and as a result a distinctive cultural and social identity, that is, a different school character. The Minister of the Interior, J.R. Thorbecke (1798–1872) had in mind these different characters when he established the HBS.¹⁰ Moreover, scholars nowadays recognize that the schools had different identities, depicting them as representatives of two different, equally respectable, but opposite worlds.¹¹ According to Thorbecke and modern scholars alike, the HBS and gymnasium schools had distinctive populations and educational ideals and were focused on distinctive notions of citizenship. However, it appeared that the boundaries were shifting: both schools attracted pupils from the same pool and this led to competition between them.

This article asks whether and how the different educational identities were reflected in history schoolbooks, as part of the intended curriculum.¹² As Dutch curricular decision-making was not centralized, schools were free to prescribe their own books, so they could choose those that fit their educational ideals and their notions of citizenship. The different books used in the schools would support the dominant view of each having a clearly distinct identity and a distinct notion of citizenship. History education was chosen because, firstly, history education was in the curriculum of both the HBS and gymnasium school; secondly, history is the subject *par excellence* for transmitting notions of citizenship because it is aimed at transferring cultural and social identity;¹³ and thirdly, in the period discussed, history education was seen as a subject that reflected the different identities of the schools. The state commission on educational reform, which discussed the Dutch school system in 1910, stressed that there was a major distinction between HBS and gymnasium schools with respect to history education: “Those who are predestined for trade and industry need a different kind of history education than those who are being

prepared for scholarship.”¹⁴ This article describes the debate on the relationship between history education and school identity that took place in the period discussed and tries to find empirical support in textbooks as part of the intended curriculum for the differences that were supposed to exist. To determine what kind of history books were used, the booklists of individual schools were studied. The list analysis is followed by a description of the contents of a small sample of the books. But before discussing the textbooks, the article describes the two forms of Dutch schools in greater detail.

HBS and gymnasium

When the HBS was established by law in 1863, the gymnasium already had a long tradition, dating back to the medieval Latin School.¹⁵ The HBS was intended for the propertied upper-middle class, for example, the sons of industrialists, civil servants and traders, while the gymnasium was meant for the intellectual elite, the sons of university-educated men. Both schools pursued different notions of citizenship and targeted membership of different cultural groups. The HBS-educated citizen was focused on the economic and technological progress of society, while the gymnasium-educated citizen belonged to the intellectual elite, had a disciplined mind and a refined sense of human cultural values. In the educational ideal of the gymnasium, practicality and purposeful work were rejected in favour of the leisured cultivation of aesthetic interests, the educational ideal the Germans refer to as *Bildung*.¹⁶

The HBS offered five years of general education and was part of the secondary education system, whereas the gymnasium was a part of higher education. The HBS prepared students for a broad range of professions and for vocational training. The curriculum focused on science and modern languages and did not include classical languages. The school was established in a period of a thriving Dutch economy, although prior to the start of the real industrialization process. Dutch politicians regarded the HBS as a means of stimulating national industry, because they were aware of the backward state of Dutch education in technology. Speaking in parliament in 1862 as prime minister and leader of the Liberals, Thorbecke announced that he was willing to spend a considerable sum of money on these modern schools as “[t]he progress in general civilization, in industry, agriculture and trade, which should result from a well-managed body of intellectual and material tools, is indeed worth the expense.”¹⁷

Because of its relationship with the university, the gymnasium school was not part of the secondary education system, but the preparatory stage of university education. This school offered six years of education, with classical languages as key subjects as they were considered indispensable for the education of disciplined minds, a refined sense of human cultural values and a coherent general education. This educational ideal surpassed the educational ideal of the HBS. The Dutch case was not unique in this respect. In Western Europe in general there was a negative attitude towards applied knowledge so that the traditional classical education long retained its dominant status. However, in the Netherlands this negative attitude towards modern education seems to have been even more persistent than elsewhere and the gymnasium long

held a monopoly on university preparation.¹⁸ Unlike the situation in Germany and France, up until 1917 only those Dutch students with a classical education that included both Greek and Latin were eligible for a PhD, even in medicine and science.¹⁹

Despite the original intentions, however, many HBS graduates managed to go on to university. Because of economic, social and political changes there was a growing interest in applied knowledge and subjects directly related to economic growth, and this affected the status of the HBS. Initially HBS graduates who wanted to study at university had to sit an entrance examination like anyone else without a gymnasium school diploma. From 1876 onwards HBS graduates received dispensation for several sections of the exam. Now they only had to sit additional tests in Latin and Greek, which meant that the legislator had acknowledged the value of HBS education. Two years later, HBS graduates were even allowed to study medicine without taking the entrance exam, although they were not allowed to do a PhD. Eventually, by 1917, all faculties of the natural sciences were fully open to HBS graduates.²⁰

This development ended the monopoly of the gymnasium in pre-university training. It was accompanied by a fierce debate on the value of modern versus classical education, as well as a struggle for student numbers. In the period 1863–1920 the number of HBS schools grew considerably, compared to the gymnasium schools. In the 1860s the establishment of the HBS led to a decrease of nearly 50 per cent in the number of gymnasium school students. In 1860 about 1 per cent of 12–18 year-old boys attended a gymnasium. By 1868 this was only 0.5 per cent, indicating that the HBS did siphon off students from the gymnasium. But there is more to say about the student population. During this period increasing numbers of children attended some form of post-elementary schooling: Dutch secondary as well as pre-university education became more democratic. The gymnasium no longer was exclusively attended by children from the elite (university-trained men) but also by children from middle class families. Meanwhile, the HBS was also becoming increasingly attractive to the intellectual elite, and as a result both schools attracted students largely from the same social pool.²¹ Despite the popularity of the HBS, gymnasium schools managed to survive because municipalities regarded them as prestigious and because they received a generous subsidy from the state. In addition, parents continued to send their children to this classical form of education because of the social distinction it offered. Student numbers even rose after 1890 because parents were increasingly sending their daughters there as well.²²

While the gymnasium maintained itself, discussions in teachers' magazines show a fear of the growing popularity and status of the HBS. From the 1880s onwards, several proposals were made to change the gymnasium curriculum in order to better meet the needs of society. Teachers working in the gymnasium proposed reducing the portion of classical languages in favour of natural sciences, referring explicitly to the competition with the HBS. On 27 April 1886, 33 principals and deputy principals of gymnasium schools petitioned the Minister of the Interior to reduce the number of hours devoted to classical languages, especially for future physicians, mathematicians and physicists. The petition's authors believed that by doing this, the competitive standing of the gymnasium school in relation to the HBS would be

improved.²³ One of the adherents of changing the gymnasium school curriculum was Professor C.B. Spruijt, a philosopher. He spoke of the “crumbs of natural sciences” in the curriculum of the gymnasium school and about jurists who were blind and deaf to nature and did not have the slightest notion of scientific methods of inquiry.²⁴ In the new curriculum the gymnasium pupils would spend more hours on the natural sciences and less on classical languages.²⁵ The Council of State, the most important advisory council of the Netherlands, regretted the concessions made to classical languages but considered them an exigency. “One cannot wish for fully equipped classicists who stand outside the world, but one needs to be satisfied with semi-classicists within the world.”²⁶

The curriculum of the HBS was also discussed. Some teachers and members of parliament emphasized the value of the classical languages for modern secondary education.²⁷ However, Greek and Latin never became part of the HBS curriculum. Still, some minor changes were made. The hours spent on penmanship and drawing were reduced in favour of modern languages. HBS teachers argued repeatedly that the intellect would be sharpened greatly through the study of modern languages, mathematics and the natural sciences,²⁸ so that classical languages were not actually needed. In addition, the HBS was given a standard time table. Until 1916 the government provided a list of subjects and presided over the examinations, but within these boundaries each HBS could decide on its own curriculum because it was felt that these schools should have the flexibility to adjust to local circumstances. This was very much related to the character of the HBS, which was directed at providing useful knowledge. By 1916, the HBS had proven its ability to provide pre-university schooling and those HBS schools established by the central government were set a uniform time table; in 1920 the municipal establishments followed.²⁹

From this development we can conclude that by 1920 the HBS and the gymnasium school should no longer be seen as opposites, each with its own identity. Both schools were attended by the children of the intellectual elite and middle-class families and both were recognized as preparatory schools for university education. Nevertheless, attempts to integrate the schools failed, because politicians still related different notions of citizenship to the schools.³⁰

Debate on history education

In addition to the State Commission on Educational Reform, teachers also expressed their ideas about a school-specific interpretation of history education. One of the topics discussed was the value of ancient history. For the classical gymnasium school the importance of ancient history was beyond question, but not for the HBS. Proponents thought ancient history was indeed useful for HBS-students, because it could serve as a simple model to explain difficult phenomena as social structures. A teacher argued that classical antiquity had a rather simple policy, and because of that it was very useful for introducing subjects such as aristocratic and democratic government and society.³¹ However, the antagonists argued that ancient history conflicted with the spirit of the HBS.³² According to G. Bolkestein, then Minister of Education “The spirit of

the HBS distinguished itself from the spirit of the gymnasium because in the former 'knowledge of modern life is the object of education.'³³ In HBS schools ancient history was treated in the first year and Dr R. Broersma argued that ancient history was too complex for first-year HBS students and therefore history schoolbooks treated the subject poorly. He spoke of the "suit of rags" ancient history wore in these books. Clearly, Broersma felt that ancient history had no value for HBS students. However, he considered history itself to be very useful for this group: "Those who want to see progress, need to understand where we come from; in knowledge of the past lies the knowledge of the present." But ancient history was unnecessary. "One can understand one's own time and feel the meaning of facts without penetrating into the ancient world." However, for prospective theologians and jurists—thus students of the gymnasium school—Broersma felt ancient history was indispensable.³⁴

There was also a dispute about institutional history (politics, economics and war) versus the history of civilization (social circumstances, religion and culture). History education at the HBS was perceived as being overly focused on institutional history, because the state exams obliged the schools to lecture about the facts of these domains. In the written examination of 1912 for example, the candidates could write an essay on the administration of Requesens (1573–1576), The government of King Lodewijk (1806–1810), the French dominion in Spain (1808–1814) and the consequences of the February-revolution in Italy.³⁵ Also the oral examination, for which students sat before a regional committee, was focussed on institutional history.³⁶ This can be seen in a complaint of a member of the Committee on HBS-students: "Neither the influence of Alexander, neither the American war of freedom, neither the uprising against Spain, neither the peculiar talents of general Maurits, nor the difference between the politics of Jan de Wit and William III was understood by the candidates."³⁷ Critics proposed that far more attention should be given to the history of civilization. A.M. Kollewijn, a history teacher, stated in his brochure of 1889 that in choosing a textbook, history teachers should pay attention to the inclusion of "domestic, social and religious affairs" as well as law, science and the arts. History should be a "type of portrayed sociology."³⁸ Kollewijn argued that it was exactly this sort of knowledge that was of actual use to pupils in daily life. Adherents of this position also claimed that history education should be focused more on ordinary people such as traders, farmers and engineers, instead of on rulers and princes.³⁹ An analysis of all articles written on history education in the period discussed in the prominent journal for teachers called *Weekblad voor gymnasiaal en middelbaar onderwijs* [Gymnasium and Secondary School Education Weekly] shows that no such critique was brought forward with respect to the gymnasium. This can be explained by the fact that it did not have state-run examinations. Each school composed its own examination, which left history teachers free to set questions on the history of civilization.

The use of schoolbooks

In this period there were about thirty public gymnasium schools in the Netherlands. The number of public HBS schools offering a five-year education grew from

thirty-two in 1870 to 102 in 1920.⁴⁰ It is assumed that the need to emphasize school identity, to set boundaries between Self and Other, was most obvious in cities that accommodated both types of schools. In 1870, twenty-five cities met this criterion.⁴¹ Seven of these cities, located in different areas of the Netherlands, were selected for examination: Rotterdam, The Hague, Leiden, Utrecht, Amsterdam, Deventer and Leeuwarden.⁴² From archives of 14 schools, 52 booklists published in school programs were analysed to find out which books were prescribed by a particular school (see Table 1). The booklists were selected from four periods (1864–1870; 1873–1885; 1890–1895; 1912–1921), determined by the availability of lists. Altogether, the booklists contained 124 different titles. This is a remarkable number of school-books, as was also noted by contemporaries.⁴³ It might be assumed that the high total was the result of publishers producing different books for the two schools; however, they seldom did. The subtitles of the books make it clear that most of the books were published for both gymnasium and HBS schools. Although the books were not published specifically for one type of school, they may indeed have been used exclusively by one or the other school. To investigate this premise, the percentage of books prescribed by both schools was calculated. Some 20 per cent of the books were shared, as can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1
Number of schools, books and percentage of books shared

Period	Gymnasium		HBS 5-year education		Percentage shared	
	Number of schools	Number of books	Number of schools	Number of books		
1864–1870	5	21	6	17	7	23%
1873–1885	7	16	7	19	5	17%
1890–1895	7	31	7	13	8	22%
1912–1921	6	30	7	25	10	22%

Percentage books shared: the number of books the schools had in common divided by the sum of books the schools used, minus the books they had in common ($((x/(a+b-x)) * 100)$).

This outcome is compared to the total of books used school-specifically. Only nine titles for the gymnasium school (6.5 per cent of all the books used at gymnasium schools) and four books for the HBS (4.2 per cent) were used in this way, meaning that at least two different schools belonging to the same type, used a certain book, while this book was not used at a school of a different type. From this perspective, the 20 per cent for shared books can be considered substantial, from which it can be concluded that the use of history schoolbooks offers no empirical support for a difference in school identities.

The content of the books

The next step in this research was to analyse the content of the books. Because the aim was to trace differences in school identity, the study focused on books used school-specifically. As mentioned above, only a few books met this criterion. Six books were chosen for study: three used in gymnasium schools (two books on general history and one on national history) and three used in HBS schools (again two on general history and one on national history).

A general history book by J.A. Wijnne was the first to be studied in relation to the gymnasium schools. This book (954 pages) is divided in four volumes. The first volume was used in both Utrecht and Amsterdam. Wijnne was one of the most productive authors of the renowned textbook publishing house Wolters.⁴⁴ From 1861 to 1873 Wijnne was principal of the gymnasium in Groningen and after that a professor in history at the University of Utrecht. In this case there is a clear relationship between the background of the author and the use of the book. This does not apply to the national history book written by J.W. Pik who taught at a low status secondary school with a three years course. His work (406 pages) was used in the gymnasium schools of Leiden and The Hague. In his preface the author clearly states his intended target group: primarily the HBS. Interestingly, he declared that in addition to political science, significant attention was paid to the history of civilization. Furthermore, he mentioned references to historical sources as a means of providing further explanation or illustration. The third gymnasium textbook was written by T. Jorissen, professor in history at the University of Amsterdam. This book on world history (287 pages) was used by the gymnasium schools of Deventer, Rotterdam and Leeuwarden. The first edition of the book was explicitly written for HBS and girls' schools. It paid little attention to ancient history because, according to Jorissen: "The students of secondary education [HBS schools] need to learn to be at home in the time they live in [...]. Not the ruins but the life of history is what they need."⁴⁵ The gymnasium schools only used the second edition of the book. This second edition was rewritten by G.J. Dozy, a history teacher with experience in all forms of secondary education, but not in gymnasium schools. Nevertheless, in the second edition ancient history was treated more thoroughly and the authors considered this edition also suitable for gymnasium schools.

The first book analysed in relation to the HBS was written by A.M. Kollewijn, author of the 1889 brochure mentioned above, who supported the teaching of the history of civilization at HBS schools. Kollewijn wrote his book for the lower classes of secondary schools. This rather thin book (66 pages) on world history was used in the HBS schools of Leiden and Amsterdam. The second book on world history (320 pages), written by N.D. Doedes, a teacher at the state HBS in Leeuwarden, was meant for various forms of education, including gymnasium schools. The book contained more facts about military history than Doedes would have liked for HBS schools. He would have shortened it "if not in some exams [HBS school exams] much is still required of our pupils in this field of knowledge."⁴⁶ To make the book suitable for gymnasium schools, Doedes included a Greek name list. Nonetheless, the book was only found in

HBS booklists in Amsterdam and Leeuwarden. In both schools it was used throughout the five-year course. The last book analysed, on national history, was co-written by A.W. Geerling and D. de Geus. Geerling was teacher at a teacher training institution, De Geus taught history at a secondary school with a three-year course. The book (377 pages) was supposed to be suitable for a whole range of schools, running from secondary schools offering a three-year course to gymnasium schools, and as preparation for teacher training exams. However, the book was found only on HBS school booklists, namely in Leiden and in Amsterdam. In these schools it was used at all levels.

There were two main questions to be answered by the content analysis: 1) Did the content of the books differ? and 2) Can the differences traced be explained by the identity of the two kinds of school? These two questions are answered by looking at aspects that are considered significant features based on the debate on history education as described above. Firstly, the attention to different historical periods will be described to determine if books used at gymnasium schools indeed paid more attention to ancient history. Investigating the issue of institutional history versus the history of civilization, we will then discuss the perspectives taken by the books when describing a number of important historical issues. This is based on word-counts and a qualitative analysis of the texts. Finally, the way history is portrayed is studied. It appeared that books used different stylistic devices (e.g. linguistic usage, lay-out and the use of pictures) and we wondered whether there was a systematic difference between the schools. As the classical gymnasium was aimed at *Bildung*, more narrative structures can be expected at this school.

Historical periods

From the discussions about history education, one might expect to find differences in the emphasis given to the historical periods. However, based on the comparative analysis of the six books' contents, no conclusions can be drawn due to the large differences found regarding the historical periods between books used in either HBS or gymnasium. For example, in one of the HBS books (Geerling & De Geus) 16 pages were devoted to ancient history (4 per cent of the whole book), while another HBS book (Doedes) devoted 66 pages to this historical period (22 per cent of the total number of pages). The same variation can be seen in the study of the gymnasium school books. When the content of Ancient History of the book written by Doedes (HBS) and Jorissen (gymnasium) is compared, we see an emphasis on battles and state administration in both cases. However, a closer look at the curriculum did show some differences. The gymnasium schools taught ancient history in the final year, HBS in the first. Furthermore, it appeared that gymnasium schools also used supplementary books that dealt exclusively with ancient history. Fifteen different titles on ancient history were found in the booklists.⁴⁷ Clearly, ancient history was an important topic in gymnasium schools. Nevertheless, one of the HBS schools also prescribed a supplementary book on ancient history⁴⁸ and gymnasium schools sometimes also prescribed books solely on modern history.⁴⁹ So, although there were differences with respect to the historical periods, there was not a strict boundary between the schools.

Perspective: History of civilization versus institutional history

In this section we consider the perspectives from which history was discussed: “politics and war,” “constitution,” “economy” and “culture.” The first two are considered to comprise “institutional history,” while “history of civilization” covers the last two. Based on the debate on history education and the identity of the school we expected the HBS to focus on institutional history and economy. The gymnasium was expected to be focused on culture. This perspective includes a focus on the daily life of people, religion, mentalities, science, literature and arts. The content areas to be analyzed are: the Arab World to AD 632; the discovery of the New World and the French Revolution (general history); the Frankish Empire; the Twelve Years Truce and the Kingdom of Willem I (national history). To establish which perspectives were used, we categorized sentences according to established rules next to a qualitative analysis. The reliability of the quantitative part of the instrument was checked by an inter-rater reliability procedure and considered sufficient with a Cohen’s Kappa of .71.

The books described the episodes merely in terms of “politics and war,” and national history books paid more attention to “economy” than did the books on general history (table 2). In this regard no differences were found between books used at either gymnasium or HBS schools.

Table 2
Attention to perspectives in the selected episodes (in percentages)

Gymnasium	Wijnne	Jorissen	Pik
Politics & War	60	86	55
Constitution	4	1	8
Economy	8	4	19
Culture	29	9	18
HBS	Kollewijn	Doedes	Geerling & De Geus
Politics & War	78	63	51
Constitution	0	5	12
Economy	0	7	19
Culture	22	25	18

To illustrate the way the books on general history treated the episodes, we take the discovery of the new world as an example. Three of the four books were very similar: Both gymnasium books (Wijnne and Jorissen) and one of the HBS books (Doedes) described the aggressive and barbaric attitude of the Portuguese and de Spaniards to open new sources of trade, they discussed several discoverers (Columbus, Cortes, Magellaan and Pizarro) and the treks they made, they mentioned the treatment Columbus got from Bobadilla, religion, the faith of the Indians who suffered from inhumanly treatment by the Spaniards, the doubtful role of the Dutch and of the products of “the new world” to mention some important items. It is also interesting to notice that the book of Doedes made the same moral judgements as the

gymnasium books did and shared some details, for example the mentioning of the epos “De Loeziáden” that glorified the acts of the Portuguese. The very dense HBS books written by Kollewijn merely gave an overview of the different travels and abstained from moral judgement.

To illustrate the way national history was described in the books, the text about the Kingdom of Willem I is taken as an example. Both books discussed national politics in the same way. They were critical of the lack of control over the national budget and the actions of the government in response to critical voices. Furthermore, both books described the different interests of the industrial and Catholic South and the trading and Protestant North of the kingdom, among which the different views on the tax system, and the grievance of the South to the union with the North that took place in 1814 and ended in 1830 (“increasing hatred towards ‘la domination hollandaise’”). Although both books explained the grievance of the South, there is a preference of the interest of the North of the kingdom, because of the objections, throughout the texts, against protectionism (fitting the needs of the trading North) and a positive attitude towards a union between North and South. With regard to economy both books discussed the same topics: the establishment and goal of the Dutch Trade Company, developments in fishery, agriculture, traffic routes and industry. Surprisingly, the gymnasium book (Pik) explained the economic procedure of the Dutch Trade Company in far more detail than the HBS book (Geerling and De Geus) did. Pik explained the system of forced trading (*cultuurstelsel*) in detail, while the HBS book only mentioned this system. With regard to culture, both books noted that Dutch literature did not flourish under Willem I, but that it improved under the influence of the Romantic Movement. Furthermore, both books referenced the same writers and poets. Thus, with regard to the content of the books, the qualitative analyses found no significant differences

Stylistic devices

Next to content, the way history was portrayed is considered to be related to school identity. In studies of readability and comprehension of textbooks many variables have been used.⁵⁰ In this study we use three broad headings that can be related to school identity: language used (vocabulary, conceptual difficulty, genre –factual or narrative-), lay-out (e.g. typography, size of margins) and didactical clues (e.g. lists for memorization). Concerning language used both linguistic complexity and whether or not events are described in a narrative way (did they mainly give facts or did they present anecdotal information and opinions) can be related to the educational ideals of the schools.

This time systematic differences were found. The books analysed for the gymnasium were, as expected, more narrative than factual. Pik, whose book on national history was on the booklists of two gymnasium schools, used expressive language. This can be illustrated with a passage about the execution of Johan van Oldenbarnevelt. He was an important Dutch statesman who, after years of dedicated service, was convicted of high treason and decapitated in 1619 by order of Prince Maurits of Orange.

Following Van Oldenbarnevelt's reply to his conviction, the President of the Court called out to him:

“Forward! Forward! Your sentence is read” and he pointed authoritatively to the door. Without another word, the old man in black, wearing a brown gown, went out to the palace courtyard [*het Binnenhof*], leaning on his cane, to where the scaffold stood. A crowd filled the square, but the windows of the Stadholder's quarters, which looked out onto the square, were closed. Nobody in the livery of the prince was allowed to leave the palace. The prince himself had withdrawn to a room. On the scaffold Van Oldenbarnevelt murmured, “O God, how can people do things like this?” Then he raised his voice and spoke angrily to the crowd: “People, do not believe that I betrayed our country. I acted sincerely and piously as a good patriot and as such I will die.” Then he took the cap Francken handed him, pulled it over his eyes and with the words “Christ be my guide, O Father, my heavenly Father! Receive my soul” he bowed first to the south, where the sun flashed on his face, then to the north and then, trembling with indignation he knelt, asking the executioner to make it quick.⁵¹

This type of narrative was also found in other books used in gymnasium schools, although not always with such flowery style. The books used at HBS schools, however, differed a great deal from the ones used at gymnasium schools. Indeed, all the books analysed had a comparatively compact and impersonal style. A passage from the work of Doedes may illustrate this. This book contained a lot of tersely written information with a remarkable variation of typographical attributes and fonts, to show what concepts were important. The passage chosen is about the French revolution:

The *Constituante* declares “*Les droits de l'homme et du citoyen*” and cancels (night of 4th and 5th of Aug.) all privileges and feudalistic taxes, etc. Further it accepted the system of one Chamber of Deputies and the suspensive *veto* of the king. Lodewijk ratified everything, except “human rights.” New troop movements tempted the march of the masses to Versailles (5th Oct. 1789; ratification of “human rights,” battle in the castle; De la Fayette the saviour, not quickly).⁵²

The book was very informative, had a complex syntax, and was full of dry enumerations. According to Doedes the book was intended to help the process of memorization and it was the teachers' duty to explore orally on the topics. The same intended use (memorization) can be found in didactical clues in the books. For example, in discussing the causes of the Belgian Revolt that led to the splitting up of Belgium and the Netherlands in 1830, Geerling and De Geus explicitly told the students what to memorize: “In studying the Belgium revolt one should pay attention to 1. the motives that led to the union; 2. the objections related to it; 3. the grievances of the Belgians.” Also in Kollewijn's book, it is clear what students had to study because every chapter started with a short list of the episodes which he distinguished and discussed systematically. For example: “The history of the Middle Ages is divided in the

following episodes: 1. till Charlemagne, 800; 2. till the crusades, 1096; 3. the era of the crusades till 1292; 4. till the discovery of America.” Kollewijn states his intentions in the preface. He intended to write a factual book that would help students memorize the facts from history in their chronological order. For this dry enumeration was found to be very suitable, stories would only distract students, he claimed. Kollewijn succeeded in this. The book can be described as concise and impersonal.

Conclusion

Although HBS and gymnasium schools were originally meant to be quite distinct kinds of schools and the participants in the discussions expressed ideas about how this identity should be translated into history education, publishers seldom published separate history books for HBS and gymnasium schools. Furthermore, the schools themselves hardly made school specific choices, and with regard to the contents of the books analyzed no systematic differences were found. This can best be interpreted when understood in their material context.⁵³ The development of the HBS and gymnasium schools was the result of a dynamic relationship within the educational system, in which both schools constantly watched and imitated each other. In the context of shifting boundaries, the differences between HBS and gymnasium had become permeable. However, books did differ with respect to stylistic devices. The books used by gymnasium schools were more narrative, fitting the identity of the gymnasium as a school striving for the ideal of *Bildung*. The HBS books, on the other hand, were designed for learning facts by heart, so that the students would perform well at the state examination. The impersonal style fitted the desire for practicality which was central to the HBS. So, schools held on to their different notions of the ideal citizen. The HBS was designed to educate citizens who contributed to the economic and technological progress of society, while the gymnasium school was designed to create an intellectual elite. This small sample of school books on history education indicates that different notions of the citizen found their way into the schools not by means of a different content, but by means of the various stylistic devices used in history books. Furthermore, the study convincingly shows the power of educational regulation through the exam system.

Notes

- 1 Paul Coman, “Reading About the Enemy: School Textbook Representation of Germany’s Role in the War with Britain during the period from April 1940 to May 1941,” *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 17, 3 (1996): 327-340.
- 2 Larry Cuban, “Curriculum Stability and Change,” in *Handbook of Research on Curriculum*, ed. Philip W. Jackson (New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan, 1996), 216-247; Rob Gilbert, “Text Analysis and Ideology Critique of Curricular Content,” in *Language, Authority and Criticism. Reading on the School Textbook*, ed. Suzanna de Castell, Allan Luke and Carmen Luke (London: The Falmer Press, 1989), 61-73.
- 3 The Journal *Internationale Schulbuchforschung/International Textbook Research* published by the George-Eckert-Institut gives an overview of textbook research. In *Textbook*

- Colloquium*, connected to the University of London Institute of Education, the historical perspective is dominant (see their journal *Paradigm*). Ian Michael, "Textbooks as history: the work of the Colloquium," *Paradigm*, 25 (1998). The dominance of the historical perspective can also be seen in France. Alain Choppin, "L'Histoire des manuels scolaires: un bilan bibliométrique de la recherche française," *Histoire de l'éducation* 58 (1993): 165-185. See also e.g. *Paedagogica Historica, special issue: Political culture, school texts and Latin American Societies*, 43, 5 (2007).
- 4 Coman, "Reading about the Enemy," 327-340.
 - 5 Amy von Heyking, "Talking about Americans: the Image of the United States in English-Canadian Schools, 1900-1965," *History of Education Quarterly*, 46, 3 (2006): 382-408; Coman, "Reading about the Enemy," 327-340.
 - 6 See also: Hilda T.A. Amsing (2007). 'Een schoolboekje open over identiteit. Schoolboeken als bron voor historisch pedagogisch onderzoek met als casus HBS en gymnasium, Nederland, 1863-1920.' *Utile Dulci. Leer- en leesboeken voor de Nederlandse en Vlaamse jeugd*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 90-110.
 - 7 Ian Grosvenor. "'There's no place like home:.' Education and the Making of National Identity," *History of Education* 28, 3 (1999): 235-250, 246.
 - 8 Denominational identity is not discussed because in this period it was barely developed in secondary education; there were very few denominational secondary schools. Kees Mandemakers, *HBS en gymnasium. Ontwikkeling, structuur, sociale achtergrond en schoolprestatie, Nederland, circa 1800-1968* (Amsterdam: Stichting beheer IISG, 1996), 72-76.
 - 9 Hilda Amsing, *Bakens verzetten in het voortgezet onderwijs, 1863-1920* (PhD diss., Delft: Eburon, 2002). P. Boekholt, "Classical or Modern? University Preparatory Education," in *A History of Science in the Netherlands: Survey, Themes and Reference*, eds. K. van Berkel, A. van Helden, L. Palms (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 279-310.
 - 10 Amsing, *Bakens verzetten*.
 - 11 P.N. Karstanje, "Voortgezet onderwijs," in *Onderwijs, bestel en beleid 3* J.A. van Kemenade et al. (eds.) (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1987), 281-366: 288, 292; Mineke Bosch, *Het geslacht van de wetenschap. Vrouwen en hoger onderwijs in Nederland, 1878-1948* (Amsterdam: Sua, 1994), 99.
 - 12 For a comparison of history education at gymnasium schools and girls' schools see: Hilda Amsing, "Unexpected Similarities: Gendering Dutch history Textbooks for Secondary Education, 1870-1920," *History of Education Researcher*, 76 (2005), 69-79.
 - 13 Maria Grever, Terry Haydn, Kees Ribbens, "Identity and School History: the Perspective of Young People from the Netherlands and England," *British Journal of Educational Studies* 56, 1 (2008): 76-94; M. Grever & S. Stuurwold, eds., *Beyond the Canon: History in the Twenty-First Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007); Ann Doyle, "Ethnocentrism and History Textbooks: Representation of the Irish Famine 1845-49 in History Textbooks in English Secondary Schools," *Intercultural Education* 13, 3 (2002), 315-330.
 - 14 *Rapport van de Staatscommissie voor de reorganisatie van het onderwijs, Deel 1 (1910)*, 42 [Report State Commission of Education].
 - 15 Hilda T.A. Amsing, "Modern versus Classical Education: The Dutch Case 1963-1917," *History of Education Review* 34, 1 (2005): 35-50; Boekholt, 'Classical or Modern?' 279-310; This study only looked at HBS schools that offered five years of education. In the Netherlands there was also an HBS which offered three years of education; they are not included in this article.
 - 16 J.C. Alibisetti, *Secondary School Reform in Imperial Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 18.
 - 17 *Bijlagen Handelingen Tweede Kamer 1861-1862*, p. 934 [Supplement to the Hansard of the Dutch Lower House of the States-General].

- 18 P.T.F.M. Boekholt, "De positie van de klassieken in het Nederlandse onderwijs in de 19de eeuw," *Hermeneus* 65, 2 (1993), 106-112.
- 19 In Germany from 1859 onwards the *Realschule* was granted the right to prepare students for university and in 1890 even students without any classical education were admitted to university. F.K. Ringer, *Education and Society in Modern Europe* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979); Albisetti, *Secondary School Reform*, 18, 34-35. In France the *enseignement moderne* gained at least nominal parity with the *lycées* around the turn of the century. Ringer, *Education and Society*, 113-121; Ph. Savoie, "The Role of Cities in the History of Schooling: a French Paradox (Nineteenth-twentieth Centuries)," *Paedagogica Historica*, 39, 1-2 (2003): 37-51.
- 20 Amsing, 'Modern versus Classical Education,' 35-50.
- 21 Mandemakers, *HBS en gymnasium*, 230-231, 338.
- 22 Nelleke Bakker & Mineke van Essen, "No Matter of Principle. The Unproblematic Character of Coeducation in Girls' Secondary Schooling in the Netherlands, ca. 1870-1930," *History of Education Quarterly* 39, 4 (1999); 454-475.
- 23 J.B. Kan et al. "Aan Zijne Excellentie van Binnenlandse Zaken," *Conjunctis Viribus* 1, 3 (1886): 97.
- 24 C.B. Spruijt, "De kwalen van ons gymnasium onderwijs," *De Gids* 51, 2 (1887): 113.
- 25 Royal Decree of 7 June 1919, Law Gazette 313.
- 26 Author's translation. State Archive The Hague [GAH], no. 1698. Piece no. 29 (treatment Royal Decree of 21 June 1887, p. 5, 27 May 1919).
- 27 Amsing, *Bakens verzetten*, 202-208.
- 28 H.J. Smid, *Een onbekookte nieuwigheid? Invoering, inhoud en betekenis van het wiskundeonderwijs op de Franse en Latijnse scholen 1815-1863* (Delft: University Press, 1997), 53-55; Amsing, *Bakens verzetten*, 203-205.
- 29 Herman Snijders & A.A. Dalhuisen "Normaalprogramma voor de hoogere burgerscholen, memorie," *Weekblad voor gymnasium en middelbaar onderwijs*, 13 (1916-1917): 1316-1317; Royal Decree 16 June 1920, Law Gazette 299.
- 30 Amsing, *Bakens verzetten*, 86-126.
- 31 M.G. de Boer, "Het onderwijs in geschiedenis aan hoogere burgerscholen met 3-jarigen cursus," *Tijdschrift voor onderwijs en opvoeding* 6 (1904), 432-443.
- 32 R. Broersma, "De oude geschiedenis op de hoogere burgerschool en op het gymnasium," *Tijdschrift voor onderwijs en opvoeding*, 4 (1902), 102-107; "Verslag van de buitengewone algemene vergadering van de Vereeniging van Leeraren [...]," *Weekblad voor gymnasium en middelbaar onderwijs* 11 (1914-1915), 495-532, 515.
- 33 G. Bolkestein, "De zesjarige middelbare school," *Weekblad voor gymnasium en middelbaar onderwijs* 11 (1914), 515.
- 34 R. Broersma, "De Oude geschiedenis op de Hoogere Burgerscholen en op het Gymnasium," *Tijdschrift voor onderwijs en opvoeding* 4 (1902), 102-107.
- 35 Archives of Groningen [RHCGA], no. 54 (Archive HBS Groningen). Piece no. 642.
- 36 For the HBS in period 1870-1901 there were only oral exams; period 1901-1917 a combination of both oral and written exams and after 1917 the exam was only oral again.
- 37 RHCGA no. 54. Piece. 993 (minutes 1871).
- 38 A.M. Kolléwijn, *De geschiedenis als leervak* (Amersfoort: A.M. Slothouwer, 1889), 7.
- 39 A. de Vletter, *Over geschiedenisonderwijs. Beginsel en methode. Paedagogische voordrachten*, no. 7 (Groningen/ Den Haag: J.B. Wolters, 1919), 21-28; C. te Lintum, "Eenige opmerkingen over het middelbaar onderwijs in geschiedenis, I/II," *Tijdschrift voor onderwijs en opvoeding* 6 (1903-1904): 241-264, 356-368; Kolléwijn, *De geschiedenis als leervak*, 7-8, 11, 24.
- 40 C.A. Mandemakers, *Gymnasia en middelbaar onderwijs. Ontwikkeling, structuur, sociale achtergrond en schoolprestaties. Nederland ca. 1800-1968. Band II* (Ph. D. diss., Almere, 1996).

- 41 Appendix of the minutes of the Dutch Lower Chamber 1870–1871, 15.2 9-10; 24-25.
- 42 School programs are found in the following archives: Municipal Archives of Amsterdam [MAA]: Archives of the Gymnasium of Amsterdam, no. 260, inv. no. 206, 207; MAA, Archives of the Hoogere burgerschool met vijfjarigen cursus, no. 805, inv. no. 115; MAA Municipal Journal Department 3, 1877 no. 47, 1892 no. 52, 1917 no. 137. Municipal Archives of The Hague [MAH], Archives of the first municipal gymnasium school, no. 542, inv. no. 81, 82, 84, 86; MAH, Archives of the Public Thorbecke College, no. 545, inv. no. 65. Municipal Archives of Deventer, Archives regarding education, no. 13, inv. no. 94, 95, 205. Municipal Archives of Leeuwarden [MAL], Archives of Public Education in Leeuwarden, I Municipal Gymnasium, inv. no. 352; MAL Archives of public education in Leeuwarden, II Commission of inspection, inv. no. 98. National Archives of Leeuwarden, Archives of the RHBS Leeuwarden, no. 44-04, inv. no. 91. Municipal Archives of Leiden [MALEI], Archives of the Municipal Gymnasium, no. 521, inv. no. 14, 18, 20; MALEI Archives of the municipal HBS, no. 220, inv. no. 23; MALEI library municipal archive 50338/1. Municipal Archives Rotterdam [MAR], library municipal archives, archives of the Erasmiaans Gymnasium, no. 62, inv. no. 101; MAR Archives of the first HBS, no. 58, inv. no. 172, 173, 174, 175. Municipal Archives of Utrecht [MAU], Archives of the Hieronymusschool, no. 13, inv. no. 147, 147-1, 148; MAU Archives of the state HBS, no. 92, inv. no. 249a, 250a, Library of the Municipal Archives Utrecht.
- 43 A. Engelsman, “Opmerkingen en vragen over het geschiedenisonderwijs aan onze Hoogere Burgerscholen. Inleiding, gehouden in de Vergadering van Leeraren te Groningen, den 1sten december 1895,” *Berichten en Mededeelingen* 7, 11 (1895): 520.
- 44 Franck Smit *Boekjaar Wolters & Noordhoff honderdvijftig jaar uitgeven voor het onderwijs 1836–1986* (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1986), 13.
- 45 Author’s translation. Th. Jorissen, *Overzicht der algemeene geschiedenis. Vijfde druk, herzien en tot op den tegenwoordigen tijd bijgewerkt door G.J. Dozy* (Schoonhoven: S. & W.N. van Nooten, 1887), V.
- 46 Author’s translation. N.D. Doedes, *Volken en hoofdpersonen. Schets der Algemeene Geschiedenis. Tweede herziene druk* (Leeuwarden: A. Meijer, Firma H. Kuipers & J.G. Wester, 1889), preface.
- 47 W. Herbst, Hist. Hülfsbuch von Dr. W. Herbst, I, *Alte Gesch. Ausgabe für Gymnasiën*; Van Oordt, *Algemeene Geschiedenis, 1^{re} deel, Oude Geschiedenis*; Van Oordt, *De Oude Geschiedenis volgens de ‘Korte Schets,’* Kruseman en Tjeenk Willink; W. Pütz, *Schets der oude geschiedenis en aardrijkskunde*; Schlimmer, *Handboek der Rom. Antiquiteiten*; Wijnne, *Grieksche en Romeinsche Geschiedenis*; Van der Es, *Grieksche antiquiteiten*; Kiehl, *Oude Geschiedenis*; Margadant, *Geschiedenis der Grieken en Romeinen*; Van Veen, *Beknopt overzicht der Grieksche mythologie*; Van Gelder, *Leerboek der Oude Gesch. Voor de hoogere klassen der gymnasia*; Ernst Hoffmann, *Goden- en Heldensagen, naar het Duitsch*; Jacobsen & Engers, *Leerboek der Oude Geschiedenis*; Luckenbach, *Kunst u. Geschiede, Erster Teil: altertum, Abbildungen zur alten Geschichte*; Meys, *Handleiding der Grieksche en Romeinsche mythologie*.
- 48 Kiehl, *Oude Geschiedenis*, used by the HBS of Utrecht.
- 49 The gymnasium of Utrecht prescribed part four of *Leerboek der Algemeene Geschiedenis* which dealt with history from 1815, the gymnasium of Leiden used a book about the French Revolution: *Histoire de la Révolution Française* written by Rambaud.
- 50 Colin Harrison, *Readability in the classroom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 14.
- 51 Author’s translation. J.W. Pik, *Overzicht der vaderlandse geschiedenis. Deel 1* (Zwolle: W.E.J. Tjeenk Willink, 1912), 150.
- 52 Author’s translation. Doedes, *Volken en hoofdpersonen*, 234.
- 53 Gilbert, “Text Analysis and Ideology Critique,” 63.