Cadernos de História da Educação, v.24, p.1-20, e2025-39, 2025
ISSN: 1982-7806 (*on-line*)

https://doi.org/10.14393/che-v24-e2025-39

PAPERS

Chastisements and punishments in the Lancasterian method: (un)humanist education in the 19th century[1]

Castigos e punições no método lancasteriano:
a educação (des)humanista no Século XIX

Los castigos y las puniciones en el método lancasteriano:
la educación (in)humanista en el siglo XIX

Dirce Nazaré de Andrade Ferreira
Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo (Brasil)
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5679-2823
http://lattes.cnpq.br/0727886623679126
dircenazare@hotmail.com

Abstract

The Lancasterian punishments contained in the Decree Law of 1827 were attached to a fragment of the Book of Lancaster translated by William Skinner. The literature on the history of education and the description of Lancasterian punishments in Brazil are described in a hermeneutic overlap of this manuscript without going to the primary source. We did an on-site search at the British Museum in London on Joseph Lancaster's original books. The objective was to understand directly from the author's work the description of punishments in the schools of first letters and their form. We used as methodology the indicia method with on-site research and qualitative, documentary, and bibliographic interpretation. The results indicate that Lancasterian punishments were humane and contrary to physical suffering but represented moral embarrassment, psychological suffering, and physical constriction: punishments similar to those used in adult prisons.

Keywords: Lancasterian punishments; Education; First Letters.

[1] English version by S.Iacovacci Translation Service. E-mail: siacovacci@gmail.com.

Resumo

Os castigos lancasterianos contidos no Decreto Lei de 1827 ficaram adstritos a um fragmento do Livro de Lancaster traduzido por Guilherme Skinner. A descrição dos castigos lancasterianos no Brasil são descritos em uma sobreposição hermenêutica desse manuscrito sem ir à fonte primária. Fizemos uma pesquisa *in loco* no British Museum em Londres nos livros originais de Joseph Lancaster. Objetivo foi entender diretamente da obra do autor a descrição dos castigos nas escolas de primeiras letras e sua forma. Utilizamos como metodologia o método indiciário com uma pesquisa *in loco* e interpretação qualitativa, documental e bibliográfica. Os resultados demonstram que os castigos lancasterianos se diziam humanos e contrários aos suplícios físicos, mas representava constrangimento moral, sofrimento psicológico e constrição física: penas similares às usadas em cárceres nos adultos.

Palavras-chave: Castigos lancasterianos; Educação; Primeiras Letras.

Resumen

Los castigos lancasterianos contenidos en el Decreto Ley de 1827 se unieron a un fragmento del Libro de Lancaster traducido por William Skinner. La literatura sobre la historia de la educación y la descripción de los castigos lancasterianos en Brasil se describen en una superposición hermenéutica de este manuscrito sin ir a la fuente principal. Hicimos una búsqueda in situ en el Museo Británico de Londres en los libros originales de Joseph Lancaster. El objetivo era entender directamente de la obra del autor la descripción de los castigos en las escuelas de las primeras letras y su forma. Utilizamos como metodología el método indicia con una investigación in situ e interpretación cualitativa, documental y bibliográfica. Los resultados muestran que los castigos lancasterianos eran humanos y contrarios al sufrimiento físico, pero representaban vergüenza moral, sufrimiento psicológico y constricción física: castigos similares a los utilizados en las prisiones de adultos.

Palabras clave: Castigos lancasterianos; Educación; Primeras Letras.

Received: 2025/03/03
Approved: 2025/06/29

Introduction

The Lancasterian Method is a notable part of the history of education. Important perspectives on the method include those of Manacorda (1992), Faria Filho (2011), Bastos (1999), Gondra (2008), Neves (2003), and Chizzotti (2005), among others.

Brazilian works on the subject are mostly narratives and interpretations based on an excerpt from Lancaster's book translated by Guilherme Skinner in 1833 (archived at the Petrópolis Museum), as well as Primitivo Moacyr's book from 1936. In Brazil, there are interpretive overlaps regarding the Lancasterian method: modern thinkers comment on classical authors in a hermeneutic spiral, forming a chain of univocal interpretations. Therefore, there is a gap that needs to be filled by bringing Joseph Lancaster's teachings from the primary source: books written by Lancaster himself.

In 2012, as part of our doctoral research, we visited the British Schools Museum in London and acquired four books written by Lancaster as primary sources for our research. They were: Improvements in Education (1807), The British System of Education (1812), The Lancasterian System of Education, with Improvements (1821), and Epitome of Some Chief Events and Transactions in the Life of Joseph Lancaster (1833). Additionally, we found the book Joseph Lancaster (1903), a biography of the author of the Lancasterian teaching method written by David Salmon.

In addition to its collection of books and documents, the British Schools Museum has preserved a Lancasterian classroom where visitors can observe the furniture, methods, and teaching style of London's mutual education system from the early 19th century. The work of Joseph Lancaster and his method is complex and rich in detail. In this article, we limit our study to the theme of Lancasterian punishments, which are described in the chapter "Instruments and Modes of Punishments" in The British System of Education.

Although Lancasterian teaching artifacts are well known in Brazil, little is known about the methods of punishment in 19th-century Lancasterian schools.

To shed light on this subject, this article presents original excerpts from Lancaster's 1812 books in the footnotes, with corresponding Portuguese translations in the main text, to directly elucidate nineteenth-century education for the reader. In this sense, the objective of this article is to demonstrate and understand:

1) What types of Lancasterian pedagogical punishments were used
2) How Joseph Lancaster describes and recommends them in his pedagogical reports.

The methodology employed in this research is multidisciplinary, combining a historical study with Carlo Ginzburg's Indiciary Method and qualitative, in loco research for the analysis of primary sources. Additionally, we conducted documentary research in the archives of the British School Museum and the Lei Januário da Cunha Barbosa.

Next, we demonstrate the most general features of the Lancasterian method and reveal that its selection in 1827 as the first Brazilian teaching method was political and economic. Finally, we will discuss Lancasterian punishments, the core subject of this paper.

1. The Lancasterian method: civility and discipline

This study focuses on the 19th century (specifically, 1827) to highlight education in post-independence Brazil. This period was chosen because, in the early 19th century, efforts converged to organize education in Brazil as a nascent state. This began with the formalization of the Lancasterian Method through the October 15, 1827, law, which discouraged physical punishment in Brazilian schools and recommended adopting Lancasterian punishments.

Created by Pastor Joseph Lancaster in 19th-century2 London, the method aimed to expand literacy by rationalizing the teaching process to intensify student literacy and promote writing in schools. The Lancasterian method helped create formalized rules and regulations, prescribed behaviors, and social interactions in schools. It also generated administrative support organizations, including school guidelines, professor notebooks, student records, report cards, and school conduct rules. Now, let's take a quick step back to understand how it began.

During the turmoil of the 19th century, Joseph Lancaster proposed a pedagogical procedure consisting mainly of teaching hundreds of students with the help of monitors. Thus, the student and teacher are embodied in the figure of the monitor, who acts as a link between the professor and the other students and begins to teach as an active collaborator with the professor. This approach led to the concept of mutual teaching or shared learning, combining the ability to educate large numbers of students at a low cost.

Although David Salmon (1904) criticized Joseph Lancaster in his biography, he also recognized the importance of the pedagogical work in Lancasterian schools in 19th-century London.

> he [Lancaster] had many of the qualifications of a great teacher – zeal, self-confidence, ingenuity in devising methods, intuitive insight into the nature of children, an ardent love for them, and rare power of managing. He threw himself into the work of his new school with characteristic enthusiasm [3](SALOMON, 1904, p. 5)."

The mutual system allowed the number of schools to be replicated, with the monitors acting as new teachers in a chain of pedagogical expansion. Thus, other units proliferated in adjacent neighborhoods in London. An example of this is that "[...] a school at Clewer, near Windsor, another school at Canterbury, and […] at Denver" (Idem, p. 9). (SALMON, 1904, p.9, free translation).[4]

Lancaster's work is quite complex and intriguing, as is his method, which was aimed at serving disadvantaged students, which in a way caused intense unrest in society, both in the form of political and financial support, as well as rejection and strong opposition to the method. Lancaster experienced mainly disapproval, as he behaved like a commercial strategist in acquiring funds for schools[5], but he was also cited as an important disseminator of education.

It is important to note that it was necessary to obtain funds for the schools to operate, as education was subsidized by the community itself and not by the state, a peculiarity that made pedagogical actions more arduous, given the uncertainty of their continuity. In this regard, Joseph Lancaster already demonstrated the distress of teachers,

---

[2] As for primary education in the 1800s, it was technical training or a school for reading and writing. This training, says the author, is a legacy of Enlightenment rationality.

[3] In the original: *"[...] he had many of the qualifications of a great teacher – zeal, self-confidence, ingenuity in devising methods, intuitive insight into the nature of children, an ardent love for them, and rare power os managing. He threw himself into the work of his new school with characteristic enthusiasm* (SALOMON, 1904, p. 5)."

[4] In the original: "*opened a school at Clewer, near Windsor, other school at Canterbury, and […] at Denver*" (Idem, p. 9).

[5] Regarding financial strategies, David Salmon, his biographer, points out that Lancaster did not seek monetary wealth, living modestly to the point of not having the financial means to write his biography and preserve his memories. What was written in 1840, two years after his death, were brief sketches of his life by his friend William Corston, which reveal Lancaster's imprisonment for debt. In encyclopedias and articles published about him, Lancaster is described as wasteful and extravagant. On this subject, see: http://www.encyclopedia.com/topic/Joseph_Lancaster.aspx.

> Complaints about low pay and difficulty obtaining it are repeated and almost universal throughout education. This dissatisfaction has a powerful, depressing, and discouraging effect on professors' mental energy. Most of the school's administrative functioning, which is merely mechanical, falls under the teacher's responsibility. Undoubtedly, this adds to the workload compared to other professions, and it is the lowest salary paid in London.[6] (LANCASTER, 1803, p. 6, free translation).

Lancaster outlined pedagogical strategies, such as community administration of the school and a strategy of multireligious coexistence, which he considered beneficial to the Lancasterian Method. This was evident in his approach to community relations and his conservative outlook, both of which were consistent with the Victorian era in London.

Salmon (1904) highlighted Lancaster's pioneering spirit in reaching out to the community and admitting students of different religions to the school. His method is considered multireligious in both elementary education and teacher training in England at a time when teaching was traditionally delegated to Catholic clergy.

However, although the mutual teaching model demonstrates a mixture of creeds, it is the result of Lancaster's Quaker religion.[7] According to this conception of faith, the school was considered a space of disciplinary acquiescence combined with devotion and piety, regardless of the students' beliefs. These factors were relevant in teaching and mainly directed at the underprivileged in England. The goal was to interconnect civility, education, and religion regardless of the religious faith of the school's members.

This religious tolerance, termed "unsectarian education" (Salmon, 1904, p. 10), deserves close attention as it reveals the school as a multireligious space. However, this heterogeneous arc of tolerance was a strategy to attract the largest number of supporters since the financiers of the Lancaster project came from different social strata and diverse creeds.

Thus, the religious plurality of the Lancasterian Method was pragmatism for school attendance. It emphasized the sacred, venerable divine name and stressed that, regardless of the belief professed, education is "reverence for the sacred name of God and the sacred scriptures" and "abhors vice and preaches love of truth, due attention to parents, duties, and society[8]."

It is worth noting that, although Lancaster's religious perspective was utilitarian, it showed respect for devotional training and religious tolerance. For him, "above all things, education should not become subservient to the propagation of principles peculiar to a particular sect [religion][9]" (LANCASTER, 1803, p. 5, free translation). (Lancaster, 1803, p. 5, free translation). This inclination toward coexistence and religious otherness attracted the attention of the English nobility and royal court but provoked the hostility of the Anglican Church10, which desired to educate the poor under its religious guidance.

---

[6] In the original: "[…] *the complaint of bad pay, and difficulty in obtaining it, is almost generally reiterated through every department of education. It operates powerfully to depress and discourage the energy of the teacher's mind: in particular when (as is commonly the case) much of that part of the business of school which is merely mechanical falls on the master's shoulders: it becomes indeed laborious with the addition of a poor consolation that it is worse paid for than any other employ in London*" (LANCASTER, 1803, p. 6).

[7] The term Quaker refers to a religious group formed by a British Protestant movement in the 17th century. Created in 1652 by the Englishman George Fox, the group sought to restore the original Christian faith. They preached pacifism, solidarity, philanthropy, and above all, hard work. They strongly opposed the Anglican Church. Persecuted by Charles II, the Quakers emigrated to the United States and established the colony of Pennsylvania.

[8] In the original: *"[...] a reverence for the sacred name of God and the scriptures of Truth, a detestation of vice, a love of veracity, a due attention to duties and parents, relations, and to society" (*LANCASTER, op. cit., p. 2).

[9] In the original: *"[...] Above all things education ought not be made subservient to the propagation of the peculiar tenets of any sect"* (Idem)

[10] In 1815, James Mill published two texts on education and privilege: "School for All, Not Only for the Clergy" and "Education." The texts criticized the Anglican Church's opposition to philanthropic schools for poor boys in London, which were sponsored and directed by Joseph Lancaster (GILES, 1987, p. 223).

In addition to the religious bias associated with the production of knowledge, the Lancasterian Method adds a concern for sociability and peaceful coexistence. Education makes it prudent to avoid bad company and brings civility. Thus, it "[...] provides civility and peaceful behavior in youth[11] [...]" (LANCASTER, 1803, p. 5, free translation). Lancaster's observation is consistent with Brazilian education, which is described as "a pedagogical form of guidance for young people" (MOACYR, 1939, p. 12).

Lancaster emphasized education as a means of forming devout spirits and civil citizens. In fact, he considered education essential and of national urgency because it "becomes beneficial to society in the principles and better conduct of its members and is consolidated in private life by the firmness and kind disposition of parents, teachers, and children who are influenced by its precepts[12]" (LANCASTER, 1803, p. 6, free translation).

Regarding the right to citizenship, Lancaster questions the state and himself, asking: "When I see the devastating effects of poverty on the unprotected and excluded members of society, what can I say?"[13]. He retorts: "I believe that poor children in shelters are often helpless and trapped impoverished, depression, and addiction. They are also without education and hope[14]" (LANCASTER, 1803, p. 10, free translation). Faced with this discouraging reality, Lancaster asserts that education is so necessary for society that it benefits both the population and the state.

In the midst of London's neo-industrial society, there was a need for instruction and to fill positions in factories and workshops, which required some reading and writing skills. Fatima Neves (2003) also highlights the shift in responsibility for English education, which was subtly transferred from the state to the private sector. For example, in 1802, the English state enacted the Factory Act[15], which determined that factories should provide education to their apprentices. Although the state recognized the urgency of education, it delegated this responsibility to the private sector, granting it primacy. The Factory Act, in its infancy, highlighted the need to meet two demands. First, it aimed to educate poor children to improve their living and working conditions. Second, it sought to formalize this education through a school system implemented by the private sector, including factories, communities, and ecclesiastical organizations, which was subsequently recognized by the state.

In this respect, mutual education seems to fill this gap since it proved essential for obtaining jobs in the future, especially for those who had not experienced any educational opportunities, with the support of factories. In fact, Lancaster (1803) points out a difference in social conditions: wealthy people can provide education for their children, while those who live on wages earned in industry lack education. Regarding this issue, the author emphasizes that(NEVES, 2003, p. 64).

---

[11] In the original: *"[...] carefulness to avoid bad company, civility without flattery, and a peaceable demeanor, may be inculcated in every seminary for youth, without violating the sanctuary of private religious opinion in any mind*". (Idem).

[12] In the original: *"[...] proves beneficial to society, in the improved principles and conduct of its members; and in private life, by the steadiness and amiable disposition of parents, masters, and children, who are influenced by its precepts".* (Idem).

[13] In the original: "*[...] When I view the desolating effects produced amongst the unprotected and unbefriended orders of society, what shall I say" (*LANCASTER, 1803, p. 3*)*

[14] In the original: *"[...] I mean the poor children who are in parish workhouses, who are often friendless, and immured in those receptacles of poverty, depression, and vice; without education and without hope*" (LANCASTER, 1803, p. 10).

[15] The *factory acts* were laws enacted by the English Parliament that regulated the labor activities of women and children in the textile industries. Among other aspects, the Factory Act of 1802 allowed children between the ages of 9 and 13 to work only 8 hours per day. Children under the age of 9 were not allowed to work but had to enroll in elementary schools maintained by the factories.

> The rich possess ample means to realize any theory they choose to adopt in the education of their children, regardless of the cost; but it is not so with him whose subsistence is derived from industry[16] (LANCASTER, 1803, p. 6, free translation).

From Lancaster's allusion, one can perceive a divide between education and social class. This leaves citizens unable to meet their own educational needs on the margins of the pedagogical process. Mutual Education directed its strategies to this segment of the population. In this regard, Lancaster himself asks, "Why not put this idea of teaching into practice for the poor?[17]" (LANCASTER, 1803, p.7, free translation).

The author emphasizes the importance of early literacy, stating that "school is of particular importance to the poor" and that "many children of this class have no education" and "many poor children will never have a second chance[18]" (LANCASTER, 1803, p. 10, free translation).

Regarding family economic deprivation, it is important to highlight the conflicts education faced in the early 19th century due to child labor. This is because, amid the Industrial Revolution, there was a demand for labor to fill jobs.

Thus, there was a great conflict between two opposing forces: on the one hand, families who occupied their children with work to help support the household, and on the other hand, schools that wanted to educate children as a way of preparing them for the manufacturing market in the medium term.

These two currents have one thing in common: the use of child and youth labor in the nascent industry. Lancaster's two works supporting mutual education confirm this feature of 19th-century English society and highlight the impediment families allegedly posed to working children attending school. In this context, Lancaster states that parents or family members often become antagonistic towards school, "[...] mainly when their children are their assistants at work[19]" (LANCASTER, 1803, p. 10, free translation).

Although Lancaster's method does not oppose child labor, which was common in 19th-century England, it attempts to delay children's entry into the labor market. It accomplishes this by convincing children that school is the most appropriate educational environment for them, including teaching them work ethics. He emphasizes that "at school, their morals could be properly formed, and they would be trained for a useful future for themselves and the community[20]" (LANCASTER, 1803, p. 9, free translation).

The author strongly defends the pedagogical importance of education in his books, but he emphasizes the relevance of school as a space for religious and civil preaching in his demonstration of the English education system. Hence, there is a need to attract numerous students to promote sociability.

In addition to teaching and preparing apprentices for "a promising future" (NEVES, 2003, p. 23), his pedagogical actions were considered preventive in that religious discipline could deter them from turning to crime. Indeed, education's prophylactic nature could prevent rebellions and popular uprisings, which were common in 19th-century English factory environments.

---

[16] In the original: *"[...] the rich possess ample means to realize any theory they choose to adopt in the education of their children, regardless of the cost; but it is not so with him whose subsistence is derived from industry".* (Idem)

[17] In the original: "*Why not realize this idea among the poors?"* (LANCASTER, op. cit, p.7).

[18] In the original: *"[...] is of peculiar importance to the poor, that these schools should be better regulated, [...] many children of that class have no education [...] for many poor children never obtain a second opportunity".* (Idem)

[19] In the original: *"[...] "This mostly happens when their children are able to assist them at work*" (Idem).

[20] In the original: "*[...] school, where their morals might be formed aright, and they trained to future usefulness, to themselves, and to the community".* (Idem)

Before the Lancasterian method, school instruction was individualized. The professor focused on a specific student, which provided personalized attention and unique performance but caused dissent and indiscipline in the classroom. This was due to the method itself, since the professor was deeply involved in examining one student while the others had to return to their seats for self-directed learning activities. However, this was not always the case. Pierre Lesage (1999, p. 4) clarifies this situation, stating that, due to the professor's near absence from the group, "slaps rained down" among the students.

Thus, the common school space was considered chaotic and full of gibberish because it centralized authority in the professor, who was unable to handle large groups of students who needed individual attention. To address the limitations of the individual method, Lancasterian teaching is appropriate because teaching authority is shared with the monitors, which reinforces discipline.

Regarding teaching authority and school order, Lancaster (as cited in Salmon, 1904, p. 8) compares the two methods, advocating for the mutual method's qualities and emphasizing that

> In a regular school [that uses the individual method], the professor's authority is individual, and the cane [physical punishment] is their pedagogical tool. His absence [the professor's] is an immediate sign of confusion and mutiny. But in a school run according to my plan, when the professor needs to leave the classroom, the same conditions remain as if he were present, because authority is not personal [concentrated in the professor[21] (SALMON, 1904, p.8).

Thus, there was a correlation between teaching functionality and discipline as students adjusted to the academic path. Therefore, education not only prepared bodies to work in the workshops created by the Industrial Revolution but also educated students to live well in society. To this end, it was necessary to teach skills beyond reading and writing. Students needed to learn discipline and immerse themselves in the sociability of 19th-century London. This is where the Lancasterian school's important role comes in, as it was based on religious morality, vigilance, and discipline. This required vigilance and supervision.

These concepts made the Panopticon school a safe institution and were adopted by the Lancasterian method as a way of organizing the school environment. This included the professor's desk on a raised platform, rows of desks, and the professor's and monitor's watchful eye, which maintained control and discipline by purging loitering and insubordination.

In the name of civility, the Lancasterian school introduced a series of punishments and moral penalties that were considered humane and kind. We emphasize to the reader that Lancaster's books contain interesting motivational pedagogical strategies, but they are not the focus of this article. Here, we have chosen to focus only on pedagogical punishments. We will describe them in separate sections to highlight them more effectively. Let's take a look.

[21] In the original: "*In a common school the autority of the máster is personal, and the Rod is his sceptre. His absence is the immediate signal for confusion and riot. But in a school properly regulated and conducted on my plan, when the master leaves school, the business will go on as well in his absence as in his presence, because the autority is not personal"* (LANCASTER, apud SALMON, 1904, p.8).

2. Punishment materials in the Lancasterian Method

Lancaster did not recommend physical punishment in schools, replacing it with moral or psychological punishment. He believed that the classroom was a sacred temple of restraint and silence. To this end, he described a range of punishments and penalties for cases of noncompliance and disrespect of the rules of conduct. According to Lancaster (1812, p. 66, free translation), the main infractions committed by students stemmed from "the liveliness and active disposition of childhood." [22]

However, disregarding the characteristics common to children, Lancaster's book uses the term "delinquent" to describe students who acted contrary to the rules and disrespected them. These students were subject to a corrective system of serious reprimands, usually public. The 19th century, characterized by punishment and affliction, also brought physical torment as part of everyday school life. Therefore, it is appropriate to recall some 19th-century Brazilian adages, such as "You have to start young," "He who spares the rod hates his son," "Punish one, warn a hundred," and "Punishment makes the madman sane."

Physical punishment in the 19th century was a corrective culture intended to produce the good, upright man who would replace the base spirit corrupted by Brazilian society's very practices. Father Siqueira's reports on society in 1835 illuminate these characteristics. The author states that "the bad habits planted in Brazil could not bear perfect fruit. To subject the inhabitants to order and discipline, brute force, corporal punishment, the whip, and the pillory were necessary." Under such conditions, Father Siqueira says that society was ruled by fear. In fact, it became familiar with [1]. In the original: "[...] chief offenses committed by youth at school arise from the liveliness of their active dispositions" (Lancaster, 1812, p. 66).

> With scenes of blood, torpor, and misery, the people identified with these violent practices: outbursts of revenge, public and private prisons, and leather whips and rosewood and gramarim paddles.

He goes on to explain that,

> If the government bosses were tyrants in society, the parents were monsters, and the teachers were executioners in the family. Barbaric punishments were inflicted on all subordinates by law, family, and education. At home, in schools, and in public, mistakes were punished with cruel instruments of physical punishment, even the slightest ones (Siqueira, 1999, p. 74).

Father Siqueira reports on discipline in schools, highlighting punishments, especially when students misbehave. According to the priest, professors were emphatic and would punish students with blows to the fingers and slaps to the head. Verbal abuse was also a common form of moral punishment, with professors reprimanding students as follows:

> What's that? Do you have crab fingers? Look at the book. Lift your body and straighten your head! Then, wham! A deafening ear pull! It burned like pepper, and my ears buzzed like a beehive for hours (Siqueira, 1999, p. 79).

[22] In the original: "*[...] chief offences committed by youth at school, arise from the liveliness of their active dispositions"* (LANCASTER, 1812, p. 66)

However, Lancasterian theory was considered disciplining yet respectful because it transformed schools by eliminating the use of canes, paddles, and corporal punishment. Many authors acknowledge the progress made in replacing physical punishment with moral discipline.

> Mutual schools are publicly recognized for banning corporal punishment, such as paddling and whipping, which were used until then. It is worth acknowledging that they sought to replace fear with honor and a sense of shame (Lesage, 1999, p. 12).

It is not uncommon to find arguments asserting that Lancasterian punishment was a humane yet conservative approach ideal for families and traditional churches. These punishments met the precepts of a more modern, humane education. However, this assertion should be used with caution, especially when analyzing Lancaster's work, The British System of Education (1812). This is because Lancasterian punishments were no less distressing. They were carried out through subtle techniques of psychological humiliation and public physical suffering and intentionally caused embarrassment and shame in students.

Judged by the instruments of punishment used, mutual teaching schools are often equivalent to prisons, where students are subjected to penalties as severe as those imposed on adults. We emphasize that Lancaster uses the term "delinquent" (LANCASTER, 1812, p. 68) for transgressing students. However, in this article, we have respectfully and intentionally translated the term as "offender" because we understand that the subjects were children.

Salmon points out that "punishments were varied and curious[23]" and were used whenever possible, replacing "the rod[24]" (SALMON, 1904, p. 11). However, the author notes that, given the severe nature of the punishments, it is unlikely that students would opt for moral punishment over physical discipline if they had the choice. Lancaster (1812, p. 77) points out that the instruments were effective within a few minutes because merely mentioning their names to students made their hearts "freeze with fear and horror"[25]. We will now describe them.

3. Wooden log

After repeated verbal warnings in the form of public humiliation, students who continued to behave inappropriately received a card or badge from the monitor as a penalty. Immediately,

> The monitor shows the disciplinary card to the offender and attaches it to his neck. [The disciplinary card] functions as a pillory[26] [an instrument used to punish and expose the punished to public view], then he returns to his seat (LANCASTER, 1812, p.68, free translation).

[23] In the original: *"[...] the punishiments were varied and curious"* (SALMON, 1904, p.11).
[24] In the original: *"[...] the rod"* (SALMON, p.11).
[25] In the original: "[...] frozen his heart with horror and almost frightened" (LANCASTER, 1812, p.77)
[26] In the original: *"[...] the lad to whom an offender presents the card, places a wooden log round his neck, which serves as a pillory, and with this he is sent to his seat"* (LANCASTER, 1812, p. 68).

The student's continued presence in the classroom, sitting at their desk with the sign displayed, embarrassed both the offender and the entire class. Lesage (1999) points out that if an atmosphere of embarrassment was intentionally created to intimidate the entire class, making the punishment preventive, pedagogical, and publicized, then "[...] the intimidating purpose of the punishment was fulfilled, the fear that corners everyone" (Jesus, 1999, p. 519).

It is worth noting that, in addition to the public humiliation suffered by the offender (now the offended), the punishment was actually distressing from physiological and bodily pain perspectives, considering the dynamics of the action and the plaque's constitution. The plaque was a wooden artifact similar to a cervical collar[27] that was affixed to the offender's neck.

> This wood could weigh between four and six pounds (a unit of weight equivalent to 453.59 grams). The neck is not tightened or confined; rather, it is mainly subjected to pain when the offender moves to the right or left. While the offender remains upright, balance is preserved; however, at the slightest movement, the plate acts as a weight[28] (LANCASTER, 1812, p. 68, free translation).

Undoubtedly, adopting this punishment aligns with the prison system, which inflicts physical punishment on people who have committed real crimes. In other words, it is even crueler than the prison system because it involves inflicting suffering on children through sophistry that highlights the abolition of physical punishment in schools. In this respect, mutual schools were even more insensitive due to their astute ability to convince children of the benefits of school and pedagogical punishments.

When discussing penalties and punishments, Foucault (2004, p. 18) points out that a punishment is almost always accompanied by subtle, falsely pedagogical rhetoric and meets three main criteria: "[...] it must produce a certain amount of suffering, which, if not measurable, can at least be appreciated; [...] it must have a punitive ritual or liturgy; and [...] it must be memorable for the victim." These three elements are contained in the distressing set of Lancasterian punishments, which, at the time, were considered normal and appropriate alternatives to physical punishment.

When a wooden board around the neck did not contain students' energy, Lancaster recommended using more severe instruments to banish inappropriate behavior in the classroom.

---

[27] Without fear of anachronisms, since the researcher looks at the history of the past, immersed in his own historicity, we make a metaphor of the wooden plate (Lancasterian card) with the cervical collar, a medical device used to immobilize the bones of the neck and shoulders, since in Lancaster's books the plate is described as having this purpose. Unlike the Lancaster card, the cervical collar is lined with foam to provide comfort to the patient, whereas the 19th-century Lancasterian collar was roughly carved entirely from wood.

[28] In the original: *"[...] the neck is not pinched or closely confined — it is chiefly burthensome by the manner in which it encumbers the neck, when the delinquent turns to the right or left. While it rests on his shoulders, the equilibrium is preserved; but on the least motion one way or the other, it is lost, and the log operates as a dead weight"* (LANCASTER, 1812, p.68).

4. Of Shackles

Shackles were devices made of iron chains and pieces of wood that were fastened to the legs of unruly students. Depending on the offense,[29] one or more shackles were used because they functioned as physical repression and a very physically constrictive and psychologically embarrassing reprimand. Restraining the legs was a means of restraining students with too much energy in the classroom. The purpose of the shackles was to restrict movement and keep students seated at their desks, either through physical immobility or psychological incapacity produced by embarrassment.

> The shackles are pieces of wood, sometimes six to eight inches long, tied to each leg and fastening the two together. When tied, the student can only walk in very slow steps. They are forced to walk around the room until they are tired and beg for their freedom in front of everyone. Upon obtaining it, they promise to behave well in the future[30] (LANCASTER, 1812, p. 79, free translation).

The shackles were used to restrain students' inappropriate behavior with a refinement of imagination, creativity, and cruelty. The wooden pieces were not only used on the neck and legs but also on the hands. They could be used on one or all limbs according to the severity of the misbehavior. This form of punishment was at the discretion of the professor or monitor, who chose it according to their judgment. So,

> If the desired result was not achieved through punishment, the professor could choose other, combined punishments. These included tying the left hand behind the back, making it difficult to write, or shackles binding the hands from elbow to elbow, like handcuffs. Occasionally, the legs were tied together. This is an excellent punishment for boys who leave their seats and want to walk around the room (LANCASTER, 1812, p. 69).

At school, the way inappropriate behavior was dealt with was publicized in the classroom and throughout the school. This generated a series of labels and prejudices against students who did not adhere to the rules. The shackles could be used individually, in which case the student would remain in their classroom. Alternatively, they could be used collectively to tie up a group of students and force them to parade through the corridors and schoolyards, thereby externalizing and publicizing the punishment. This group of tied-up students was called "the caravan[31]." Here's how it worked:

> Students who are frequent offenders are tied together, sometimes with pieces of wood [shackles or chains] around their necks, and lined up; they walk through the school, walking backwards, and are forced to pay close attention to their steps for fear that the shackles will hurt their necks or [for fear that the student himself] will fall. [A group of] four or six [students] can be tied together [with the shackles][1] [32] (LANCASTER, 1812, p. 70, free translation).

---

[29] In the original: *"[...] one or more, according to the offence"* (LANCASTER, 1812, p. 69).

[30] In the original: "*The shackle is a piece of wood mostly a foot long, sometimes six or eight inches, and tied to each leg. When shackled he cannot walk but in a very slow measured pace; being obliged to take six steps when confined, for two when at liberty. Thus accoutered, he is ordered to walk round the school-room, till tired out — he is glad to sue for liberty, and promise his endeavor to behave more steadily in future"* (LANCASTER, 1812, p.69).

[31] In the original: *"The caravan"* (LANCASTER, 1812, p.70).

[32] In the original: "*[...] old offenders are yoked together, sometimes by a piece of wood that fastens round all their necks; and thus confined, they parade the school, walking backwards — being obliged to pay very great attention to their footsteps, for fear of running against any object that might cause the yoke to hurt their necks, or to keep from falling down. Four or six can be yoked together this way"* (LANCASTER. 1812, p.70).

5. The basket

One of the most distinctive—and terrifying—punishments was the basket, an intimidating device consisting of a pulley that lifted a basket containing a student to the classroom ceiling. Also known as "disciplinary sacks or baskets[33]" (LANCASTER, 1812, p. 69, free translation), it was one of the most feared punishments because it was extremely humiliating. Students feared that the rope would break, causing the basket to fall from the ceiling to the floor. Like the caravan, the basket publicly singled out the student in front of the others in the classroom. It consisted of

> Put the student inside a sack or basket and suspend the basket from the school ceiling in full view of all the students. Often, the students laughed at the bird in the cage[34], ridiculing and discriminating against it (LANCASTER, 1812, p. 70, free translation).

The punitive aspect of the mutual teaching school was feared. Salmon (1904) points out that the mere mention of the word "basket" caused great embarrassment and terror for students, who saw it as the perfect instrument for debasing the body and spirit. As if the psychological terror were not enough, the students' mockery afterward was even more perverse. From this, one can infer the method's high degree of intimidation and effectiveness. The author of the Mutual Method himself acknowledged that

> This punishment [the basket] is one of the most terrible [punishments] that can be inflicted on students. Furthermore, monitors terrorize [students with the basket]; [just mentioning] the name is enough, and therefore, it is rarely used[35] (LANCASTER, 1812, p.70, free translation).

Therefore, it should be noted that the public display of punishments in mutual schools was part of a ritual that Foucault (2004, p. 30) referred to as "ostentation of torment." This ritual was intended to purge the crime, remind spectators of the mistake made, and fix in their memories the physical and psychological pain of exposure and embarrassment. Thus, it was not uncommon for students' missteps to be publicized in every possible way. This could include exposing marks on the student's body as a form of discrimination or demonstrating the student's fault in an open environment, whether at school or outside of it. Thus, the basket was a public symbol of misbehavior.

---

[33] In the original: *"[...] sacks or baskets"* (LANCASTER, 1812, p.69).

[34] In the original: *"[...] occasionally boys are put in a sack, or in a basket, suspended to the roof of the school, in sight of all the pupils, who frequently smile at the birds in the cage*" (LANCASTER, 1812, p.70).

[35] In the original: *"[...] this punishment is one of the most terrible that can be inflicted on boys of sense and abilities, above all, it is dreaded by the monitors: the name of it is sufficient, and therefore it is but seldom resorted to on their account*" (LANCASTER, 1812, p.70).

6. Labels of disgrace

The labels or tags, referred to by Lancaster as "Labels of disgrace." They worked as follows:

> When a student is disobedient, [...] profanes their beliefs, commits some moral offense, or lacks diligence, it is common to label them [written papers] describing their misconduct, [a tin or paper hat is also placed] on their head, so that they walk around the school with two students in front of them who publicize their mistakes (LANCASTER, 1812, p.74, free translation).

Lancastrian punishments, in addition to being carried out publicly, exerted ostensible psychological pressure, as they gradually became more severe.

7. The confinement

As a penal system, there was a hierarchy of reprimands, and as in prisons, the Lancasterian Method also recommended the confinement of students, which was characterized as one of the cruelest psychological forms of punishment. It is worth reiterating that one of the most striking characteristics of Lancasterian teaching was discipline, enforced mainly through obedience to the hierarchy and the faithful performance of tasks strictly within the established schedule. Thus, upon completion of the tasks, the act of leaving school also symbolized the act of duty fulfilled, the return home, rest, and joy.

Therefore, one of the most cruel forms of punishment for a disobedient student was to make them stay at school after class. However, this detention did not mean mere presence in the environment; on the contrary, it was actually a confinement of the student, drawing an analogy between the school environment and a prison cell.

Similar in nature to prison detention, confinement required supervision, which meant that it also ended up penalizing the professor or monitor, who had to remain with the student confined. Hence, Lancaster recognized a duality confined because while he considered it very effective, he also considered it inconvenient, saying that:

> Few punishments are as effective as detention after school. However, [this punishment] has an unpleasant aspect. To confine bad students to the classroom, it is necessary for the professor or a substitute to remain with the student to maintain order [the effectiveness of the punishment][36] (LANCASTER, 1812, p. 71, free translation).

[36] In the original: *"[...] few punishments are as effectual as confinement after school hours. It is – however - attended with one unpleasant circumstance. In order to confine the bad boys in the school-room, after school-hours, it is often needful that the master, or some proper substitute for him, should confine himself in school, to keep them in order"* (LANCASTER, 1812, p. 71).

Strictly speaking, Lancaster explains that there is no reason to punish the professor as well, extending the punishment to him by keeping him at school with the student during confinement. Therefore, it would not be reasonable for the student who behaved badly to have his punishment extended to a third party who did not contribute to the mistake, the author asserts. In addition, the presence of another person confined could mitigate the punishment, turning the companion into a friend. Thus, Lancaster created an alternative method that did not detract from the effectiveness of the punishment and, moreover, freed the professor from the burden of confinement, as he considered his presence in the room (cell) inappropriate.

> This inconvenience [the presence of the professor confined] can be avoided by tying [the student] to the chairs or immobilizing them with shackles. The goal is [to leave them alone] to tire them out, humiliate them, and probably remove the bad behavior, [replacing it] with better behavior in the future[37] (LANCASTER, 1812, p. 71-72).

The punishment of confinement was aggravated if the student was a repeat offender, in which case confinement was transformed into a more serious punishment.

> When a boy repeats the fault many times or is incorrigible, he is sometimes tied up in a blanket, and left to sleep at night on the floor[38], in the schoolhouse" (LANCASTER, 1812, p. 53).

Lancaster considered one night to be the ideal length of time for confinement but pointed out that it could be extended if a student exhibited a grave fault, which he called "truancy," meaning a lack of interest in school. In 19th-century London, truancy was treated as a crime. Thus, it was common in Lancasterian schools for students to be confined overnight in the classroom, preferably on the cold floor, during the harsh winter. Tying students to thin sheets did not mean mercy or protection on winter nights; according to Salmon (1904), it was a physical restraint to prevent escape.

The punishments described by Lancaster ranged from terrifying to bizarre. The former was intended to instill fear in students, while the latter was cloaked in feelings of humiliation and shame. These two feelings intertwine to shape the nature of the punishments.

8.The bitter chamomile tea

On the other hand, some examples described in his works are truly eccentric. They are linked to a connotation of contempt for students who display excessive energy. Lancaster reports on the work of a professor who, due to the children's noise and restlessness, decided to serve unsweetened tea to the students during class. The author reports that this method was so successful that he recommends it to other professors.

> Have a container of chamomile tea in the classroom [...] and when a child won't stop talking, give them a spoonful of this tea, and if they repeat what they said, repeat the tea. [...] we can imagine many twisted mouths [with the administration of tea] because the tea was very bitter, but almost immediately the need [to administer the tea] ceased and the school continued to be an example of order[39] (LANCASTER, 1812, p.76, free translation).

---

[37] In the original: *"[...] this inconvenience may be avoided by tying them to the desk or putting them in logs"*(LANCASTER, 1812, p. 71)

[38] In the original: "*When a boy repeats the fault many times or is incorrigible, he is sometimes tied up in a blanket, and left to sleep at night on the floor, in the schoolhouse"* (LANCASTER, 1812, p. 53).

[39] In the original: *"[...] a respectable female kept a small school for children of that sex. Her health was delicate, and the task became so arduous from the noise of the children, when at school, that she had no prospect*

Throughout the chapter "Other Modes of Punishment," Lancaster recounts several experiences of extravagant punishments. Let us examine the dynamics of the pillow strategy, which consisted of shaming the sleepy child by placing a pillow on top of his or her school desk[40] (LANCASTER, 1812, p. 75).

9. SLOVENLINESS: The boy's filthiness

One way to publicly embarrass a boy with sweaty or unhygienic hands or face was to have a girl humiliate him in front of the group. This punishment caused the child intense shame due to the ridicule in front of the group and also involved embarrassing physical contact between the boy and girl. Here's how it unfolded:

> A girl is assigned to wash the face of the dirty boy in front of the entire school. This usually generates a lot of laughter, especially when she slaps the dirty cheeks as a form of correction. This is the type of punishment that keeps the boys' faces clean for about two years[41] (LANCASTER, 1812, p.71).

One notable aspect of this punishment was that after the boy's face was washed, he was made to walk around the school in front of other students holding signs announcing his fault in large letters: "Dirty student," "Filthy student," "Unclean student."

10. Slothfulness: the girl's laziness

One habit considered intolerable in 19th-century London was loitering. This behavior was vehemently opposed by religious leaders and professors. Loitering, defined as the practice of doing nothing, fooling around, or wandering, was associated with poets, the unemployed, and vagrants, who were often blamed for causing unrest and riots. Furthermore, loitering was considered a magnet for crime that could lead to alcoholism and other bad habits. Therefore, it had to be fought with fervor and was even considered a crime punishable by imprisonment.

Therefore, at Lancasterian schools, lazy girls could not be tolerated. Although no specific details have been found regarding what constituted lazy or idle behavior in Lancaster's work, it is known that the punishment for such behavior should be severe and publicly disclosed, exposing the student's name, to cause "[...] the public spirit of the entire school to turn against that transgressor[42]." (LANCASTER, 1807, p. 87).

---

but that of declining school altogether. In the interim, she was advised to make one trial more: to have a cup of chamomile tea always by her, and when any child was found talking to regale her with a tea-spoon-full: and if she repeated her offence, to repeat the punishment. We may suppose many wry mouths were made on the occasion, but the punishment wanted little repetition; it was too bitter to be endured, and almost immediately ceased to be deserved, and the school continued an example of order and usefulness" (LANCASTER, 1812, p.76).

[40] In the original: *"[...] Sometimes an idle boy may have a pillow fetched from a feather bed, and placed on the desk for him to lay his head on, as if asleep, in the face of the school"* (LANCASTER, 1812, p. 75).

[41] In the original: *"[...] a girl is appointed to wash his face in the sight of the whole school. This usually creates Much diversion, specially When she gives cheeks a few taps of corretion with her hand. One punishiments of this kind has kept the boys's face clean for two Years.*

[42] In the original: *"[..] a proceeding that turns the public spirit of the whole school Against the culprit*".

Final considerations

In the 19th century, the Lancasterian Method was considered a significant advancement in education because it eliminated corporal punishment in schools. The absence of physical punishment generated intense anxiety among families and professors, who feared student rebellion and the unrest that could shake society through incivility and popular revolutions.

The Lancasterian Method filled this void by creating a set of moral or psychological penalties. As the author describes, these penalties were necessary to "expose to ridicule[43]" and force behavioral change in students through humiliation. The method was intended to prepare students for life and work.

This dynamic of producing feelings of shame and humiliation in students is the perfect way to terrorize a child. Although Lancaster declares that religion should preach love and respect for students, his book subtly reveals that these punishments were an effective way to embarrass and cause intense suffering, even driving students, especially the most timid, away from school. The author emphasizes in several parts of his work that these punishments were effective because they produced panic in the offender and mockery and scorn in the spectator. As the author points out, the penalties brought a sense of "laughability" to the group (LANCASTER, 1807, p. 89).

The rhetoric used to convince parents and society that the penalties were pedagogically corrective and necessary was even more ingenious and skillful than the punishment apparatus used in schools. This rhetoric created fervent acceptance of the penalties. Lancaster himself pointed out that the severity of the cane in the past could scare students away from school. He convinced others that his punishments were severe but less harsh than the paddle or cane.

However, even though he argued that his methods did not result in physical violence, the apparatus of shackles, plaques, and handcuffs was intimidating and produced intense physical pain by immobilizing bones and muscles that were still forming. It should be noted that Joseph Lancaster was criticized for using a pedagogical apparatus that was also used on enslaved people. The author defended himself by arguing that he was a staunch abolitionist and that the criticism was foolish and unfounded.

It should not be forgotten that 19th-century schools were the result of a fractured society during the nascent Industrial Revolution in London, a city that was still using slave labor since abolition only occurred in 1833. The proposal for a humane school without corporal punishment was a sophistry to distinguish the innovative pedagogy of abolishing corporal punishment. However, it reproduced the suffering of enslaved people in the cruelest ways. The difference was that the enslaved were Black, while the students were poor.

References

BASTOS, Maria Helena Câmara. O Ensino monitorial/mútuo no Brasil. In: BASTOS, Maria Helena Camara (org). *Histórias e memórias da educação no Brasil*. Petrópolis, Rio de Janeiro: Vozes, 1999, p.63-75.

BASTOS, Maria Helena Câmara. *A instrução pública e o ensino mútuo no Brasil:* uma história pouco conhecida (1808-1827). História da Educação. Vol.1,1997. Disponível em: http://seer.ufrgs.br/asphe/article/view/30631. Acesso em 16/09/2012.

[43] In the original: *"[...] force to ridicule*"

BASTOS, Maria Helena Câmara. *A educação elementar e o Método Lancaster no correio brasiliense (1816).* História da Educação. Vol. 9, 2005. Disponível em: http://seer.ufrgs.br/asphe/article/view/29207. Acesso em 16/09/2012.

BASTOS, Maria Helena Câmara. O ensino monitorial/mútuo no Brasil (1827-1854). In: *Histórias e memórias da educação no Brasil, século XIX.* Petrópolis: Vozes, 2011. p. 34-51.

CHIZZOTTI, Antonio. A Constituinte de 1823. In: Omar Fávero. *A educação nas constituintes brasileiras (1823-1988).* Campinas: Autores Associados, 2005.

FARIA FILHO, Luciano Mendes de. Instrução elementar no Século XIX. In: FARIA FILHO, Luciano Mendes. *Escola, política e cultura:* a instrução elementar nos anos iniciais do império brasileiro. Belo Horizonte: Argumentum, 2011.

FRANCISCO FILHO, Geraldo. *A educação brasileira no contexto histórico*. Campinas: Alínea, 2004.

FRANCISCO FILHO, Geraldo. *Escola, política e cultura:* a instrução elementar nos anos iniciais do império brasileiro. Belo Horizonte: Argvmentvum, 2006.

FRANCISCO FILHO, Geraldo. Estado, cultura e escolarização em Minas Gerais, no século XIX. In Vidal, Diana Gonçalves. *A memória e a sombra:* a escola brasileira entre o império e a república. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 1999. p. 117-135.

FERNANDES, Rogério. A difusão do Ensino Mútuo em Portugal no começo do Século XIX. In: BASTOS, Maria Helena Camara. *A Escola Elementar do Século XIX.* Passo Fundo: Ediupf, 1999. p.17-30.

FOUCAULT, Michel. *Vigiar e punir.* Petrópolis: Vozes, 2004.

FOUCAULT, Michel. *Microfísica do poder*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1998.

GILES, Thomas Ransom. *História da Educação.* São Paulo: EPU, 1987.

GINZBURG, Carlos. *O fio e os rastros:* verdadeiro, falso, fictício. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2002.

GINZBURG, Carlos. *Mitos, emblemas, sinais:* morfologia e história. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1989.

GONDRA, José; SCHUELER, Alessandra. *Educação, poder e sociedade no império brasileiro.* São Paulo: Cortez, 2008.

HERBART, Johann Friedrich. *Pedagogia geral.* Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Glbenkian, 1971.

HILSDORF, Maria Lúcia Spedo. O Ensino mútuo na província de São Paulo: primeiros apontamentos. In: BASTOS, Maria Helena Camara (org). *A Escola elementar do século XIX:* o método monitorial/mútuo. Passo Fundo: Ediupf, 1999. p.101-112.

LANCASTER, Joseph. *The British System of education:* Being a complete epitome of the improvements and inventions practiced by Joseph Lancaster: to which is added, a report of the trustees of the Lancaster School at Georgetown. Published by: Joseph Milligan and by William Cooper. Washington, 1812.

LANCASTER, Joseph. *The Lancasterian system of education,* with improvements. Baltimore:WN Ogden Nilles, printer. 1821.

LANCASTER, Joseph. *Improvements in education, as it respect the industrious classes of community.* Piccadilly, London: Darnton & Harvey, 1803.

LANCASTER, Joseph. *Epitome of some of the chief events and transactions in the life of Joseph Lancaster:* containing an account of the rise and progress of the Lancasterian system of education and the author's future prospects of usefulness to mankind. New York: Baldwin & Peck. 1833.

LESAGE, Pierre. A pedagigia nas escolas mútuas no século XIX. In: BASTOS, Maria Helena Camara (Org). *A escola elementar no século XIX:* o método monitorial/mútuo. Passo Fundo: Ediupf, 1999. p. 4-17.

LINS, Ana Maria Moura. O Método Lancaster**:** educação elementar ou adestramento? In: BASTOS, Maria Helena Camara. (Org). *A escola elementar no século XIX:* o método monitorial/mútuo. Passo Fundo: Ediupf, 1999. p.49-61.

LOPEZ, Claudina & Narodowski, Mariano. El mejor de los métodos posibles: La introduccuón del método lancasteriano em Iberoamerica em el temprano siglo XIX. In: BASTOS, Maria Helena Camara. (Org). *A escola elementar no século XIX: o método monitorial mútuo.* Passo Fundo: Ediupf, 1999. p.30-42.

MANACORDA, Mário Alighiero. *História da educação:* da antiguidade aos nossos dias. São Paulo: Cortez, 1992.

MOACYR, Primitivo. *A instrução e o império:* subsídios para a história da educação no Brasil, 1823-1853. São Paulo: Ed. Nacional, 1936.

NEVES, Fátima Maria. *O Método lancasteriano e o projeto de formação disciplinar do povo (São Paulo, 1808-1889).* Universidade Estadual Paulista/Faculdade de Ciências e Letras, 2003. Tese de Doutorado em história. p.2-145. Disponível em: www.unesp.br. Acesso em 02/06/2012.

NEVES, Fátima Maria. *O método de Lancaster e a memória de Martim Francisco.* Disponível em: http://168.96.200.17/ar/libros/anped/0210T.PDF. Acesso em 26/09/2012.

NÓVOA, Antonio. Apresentação. In: BASTOS, Maria Helena Camara. (Org). *Histórias e memórias da educação no Brasil, século XIX.* Petrópolis: Vozes, 2011. P.9-13.

PIRES DE ALMEIDA, José Ricardo. *História da instrução pública no Brasil (1500-1889).* São Paulo: EDUC, 1989.

RICHARDSON**,** Robert Jarry. *Pesquisa social métodos e técnicas.* São Paulo: Atlas, 1999.

SALMON, David. *Joseph Lancaster.* London: The British and foreign school society, 1904.

SAVIANI, Dermeval. *O Legado educacional do século XIX.* Campinas: Autores Associados, 2005.

SCHNEIDER, Omar e GONDRA Gonçalves José (Org.). Educação e instrução na província do Espírito Santo. in: *Educação e instrução nas províncias e na corte imperial (1822-1889).* Vitória: EDUFES, 2011**.** p. 239-270

SIQUEIRA, Francisco Antunes de. *Memórias do passado:* a Vitória através de meio século (1832-1897). Vitória: Florecultura, 1999.

TOBIAS, José Antonio. *História da educação brasileira.* São Paulo: Editora Juriscredi, 1974.

VIDAL, Diana Gonçalves; Hilsdorf Maria Lucia Spedo (Org). *Brasil 500 anos:* Tópicos em história da educação. São Paulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, 2001.