

2005

The Thirty-Third George Eliot Memorial Lecture, 2004 'School-Time': George Eliot and Education

Dinah Birch

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/ger>

 Part of the [Comparative Literature Commons](#), [Literature in English, British Isles Commons](#), and the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

Birch, Dinah, "The Thirty-Third George Eliot Memorial Lecture, 2004 'School-Time': George Eliot and Education" (2005). *The George Eliot Review*. 493.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/ger/493>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the English, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in The George Eliot Review by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

THE THIRTY-THIRD GEORGE ELIOT MEMORIAL LECTURE, 2004

Delivered by Professor Dinah Birch

‘SCHOOL-TIME’: GEORGE ELIOT AND EDUCATION

In George Eliot's first piece of published fiction, the hero – if that's the right word for the hapless Reverend Amos Barton – is no advertisement for the conventional schooling of a middle-class Englishman. Though he has managed to struggle through the university degree he needs to qualify him for a clerical life, his years as a student have not made an intellectual of Amos: 'Mr Barton had not the gift of perfect accuracy in English orthography and syntax, which was unfortunate, as he was known not to be a Hebrew scholar, and not in the least suspected of being an accomplished Grecian. These lapses, in a man who had gone through the Eleusinian mysteries of a university education, surprised the young ladies of his parish extremely; especially the Miss Farquhars, whom he had once addressed in a letter as Dear Mads., apparently an abbreviation for Madams. The persons least surprised at the Rev. Amos's deficiencies were his clerical brethren, who had gone through the mysteries themselves.'¹ Such deficiencies are not uncommon in George Eliot's work. Badly schooled people, men or women, are the rule rather than the exception, in her novels, and she repeatedly returns to the subject of the muddled thinking and false values that lead to these failures.

Though George Eliot famously made herself one of the most learned women of her time, she had sharply divided feelings about what formal teaching could achieve. This is a matter worth attending to, for it takes us to the heart of what engaged her most deeply as a novelist. Some of what Eliot has to say about education is a question of social observation and satire, to do with her pungent sense of what had been denied her, and also of the limitations of what had been denied. She is consistently sceptical about the benefits of the kind of masculine classical and theological education in Oxford and Cambridge that had produced such poor results with Amos. Both class and gender had excluded her from that kind of schooling – as of course most English men and all women of her generation were excluded. One of her objectives is to reveal the narrowness and injustice of the system, and also to remind her readers that the benefits offered by such education might not after all be so very worthwhile, as the Misses Farquhar discovered. This is part of her work as a politically sophisticated and progressive writer, a woman whose objective it is to analyse and sometimes to condemn the patterns of power that governed cultural life in mid-Victorian England. Her consistent advocacy of rigorous and broadly based courses of study for both boys and girls, with a strong practical element, and including serious attention to modern languages and science, and to the traditions of European thought, is one of the most telling ways in which she intervened in the cultural debates of her period. But George Eliot's engagement with processes of education is not simply a matter of political criticism, or even of satire. Thinking about what pedagogy meant was a matter of understanding the autonomy of the self, and the necessary limits of that autonomy. It involved questioning the nature of what could be taught, or learned, through fiction, or more specifically through the development of the realist narrative forms of the novel that were her central concern. The transition from the small Mary Anne Evans as a disoriented schoolgirl to the dignified George Eliot, most eminent of British women writers, was a journey in which changing concepts of pedagogy played a central part. They involved processes of desire and subjugation, in tension and sometimes in contradiction with the will to self-assertion. They also

involved George Eliot's understanding of the cultural identity of women, caught between opposing social and individual obligations, or oppressions. Her ideas about education are closely bound up with her expanding sense of authenticity and subjectivity, within the development of a post-Christian framework of thought.

The deepest convictions in George Eliot's thinking about education stem from her own experiences. Born in the English Midlands in 1819, she was able to profit from women's growing enterprise and initiative in running their own schools. Though her sex and social background meant that there was no question of her attending a major public school, still less of going to a university, the young Mary Anne Evans was not wholly an autodidact. Nor, exceptionally among prominent female writers of her period, was she educated primarily within a family setting. She was first sent away to school in 1824, at the unusually early age of five. Though this seems not to have been a traumatising experience of a kind to be compared with the Brontë girls' joining the austere Clergy Daughters' School in the same year, it can hardly have strengthened any sense of unthinking identification with her parents' world. It was her teachers who gave her the means both of confirming her family's belief in hard work and the possibility of progress, and challenging their assumption that women would play a secondary and subservient role within the drive for prosperity, or even eminence. The provincial schools she attended as a girl were not intellectual powerhouses, but they were nevertheless serious and ambitious institutions, and they laid the foundations for the passionate engagement with the life of mind and spirit that was to form the fiction of the mature woman. It was at school that Mary Anne Evans's powers were first taken seriously, and it was at school that she learned to take herself seriously. She owed her teachers a great deal.

Mary Anne's fervent friendship with the devout Maria Lewis, the principal teacher of Mrs Wallington's boarding school at Nuneaton where she was a pupil between the ages of nine and thirteen, was especially fundamental to her expanding confidence. It was an association that continued for years beyond her days at Nuneaton, and the surviving correspondence reflects the intensity of the association. Maria Lewis's teaching first prompted the evangelical thoughtfulness and inwardness that began to separate her from the more conventionally Anglican values of her parents and siblings. The three final years of her formal education, spent at the Miss Franklins' school in Coventry, were less ardent in terms of the emotional and intellectual allegiances they generated. But here too Mary Anne found that the forceful Baptist beliefs and social aspirations of Rebecca Franklin, the charismatic woman who dominated the school, allowed glimpses of a world richer and more stimulating than anything that the practical common sense of Griff House could provide. It was important that both of these schools offered a direct experience of female community, and of female authority. In considering the formation of powerful and ambitious literary women in the nineteenth century, it is common to find that their aspirations were triggered by the example of a close male family member. Elizabeth Barrett reflects this pattern, encouraged as she was by a proud and protective father. Christina Rossetti was influenced by the presence of her scholarly father, and the collaboration and rivalry of her creative older brothers. The Brontë sisters also had the example of a forceful and literary father before them. Mary Anne's experience was crucially different. Her father supported and took pleasure in her achievements, and he paid for lessons in Italian and German when she came home to take on family responsibilities as a young woman. But Robert Evans was not scholarly, or literary, and he did not serve as a model for

her ambitions. Later, she did come to identify authoritative men as mentors and sponsors of her intellectual development – Charles Bray, Herbert Spencer, John Chapman. But this happened when she had left the experiences of school behind. This is one of the most important of the many ways in which Mary Anne Evans had a different experience from that of her near contemporary Charlotte Brontë, who did encounter men in positions of power as a schoolgirl – William Carus Wilson at Cowan Bridge School, remembered in *Jane Eyre* as the repellingly hypocritical Mr Brocklehurst, or the masterful and finally very desirable Monsieur Heger in Brussels, who was in part the model for *Villette*'s Paul Emmanuel. Mary Anne's early learning took place in a much more female world. Later, the erotic dimension of the pedagogic relation between master and pupil that had always figured in Brontë's understanding of education also becomes important to Mary Anne Evans, though it is differently figured because it takes place outside the formal structures of the institution of school.

The diverse experiences she had at school were the starting point for the broad and essentially Continental concept of learning that she advocated all her life. One of the reasons that she was so critical of the kind of education on offer for the middle-class men who dominated the cultural life she knew was that it was so blinkered, so parochial, so very English. The kind of reform that Thomas Arnold had famously attempted in his work at Rugby School had, as George Eliot saw the matter, done little to change things. Writing to Harriet Beecher Stowe about the reception of the Jewish element in *Daniel Deronda*, she noted acerbically that 'I find men educated at Rugby supposing that Christ spoke Greek. To my feeling, this deadness to the history which has prepared half our world for us, this inability to find interest in any form of life that is not clad in the same coat-tails and flounces as our own lies very close to the worst kind of irreligion. The best that can be said of it is, that it is a sign of the intellectual narrowness – in plain English, the stupidity, which is still the average mark of our culture.'² The most culturally prestigious patterns of masculine education were not only hidebound in their Englishness, but also in their religious identity. Rugby School, and the numerous schools that followed Thomas Arnold's patterns of reform, was an intensely and consciously Anglican institution. Thomas Arnold was an ordained Anglican minister, and an important figure in the Church. Throughout George Eliot's lifetime, most undergraduates at Oxford or Cambridge were destined to become clergymen in the Church of England. Masculine stupidity in religious and intellectual matters go hand in hand, in George Eliot's novels. It is not an accident that the weakest and most destructive representatives of the world of learning in her fiction are all Anglican clergymen – Amos Barton, Mr Stelling, Casaubon.

The schools attended by the young Mary Anne Evans had certainly not been feminine rivals for Rugby. But she had at least been exposed to modern languages, in a way that was eventually to open the door to European thought, and that was not a common experience among the conventionally educated graduates of Oxford and Cambridge. French, Italian or German were considered valuable social accomplishments in a young woman, while boys were expected to concentrate almost exclusively on Latin and Greek. The most devastating condemnation of the 'intellectual narrowness' resulting from that particular deficiency is to be seen in the pedant Edward Casaubon, whose laborious scholarship is rendered worthless by his inability to engage with dynamic new thinking emerging from the universities of Germany. The only young man in her fiction who seems to profit from a British university education is Christy Garth, son of the idealised Caleb Garth in *Middlemarch*. Christy goes to university in Glasgow rather than

one of the English universities, and in Scotland he would have been more exposed to a Continental tradition of thought. Daniel Deronda chooses to leave Cambridge in order to acquire a broader European basis for his education. His guardian Sir Hugo approves: 'I'm glad you have done some good reading outside your classics, and have got a grip of French and German. The truth is, unless a man can get the prestige and income of a Don and write donnish books, it's hardly worth while for him to make a Greek and Latin machine of himself and be able to spin you out pages of the Greek dramatists at any verse you'll give him as a cue. That's all very fine, but in practical life nobody does give you the cue for pages of Greek'.³ That emphasis on the practical, alongside the Continental, is a recurrent theme in George Eliot's work, and it is one of the ways in which the example of her father, the very practical estate manager Robert Evans, can be seen to linger as a positive model in her work. In *Adam Bede*, Arthur Donnithorne remarks to Mr Irwine: 'I don't think a knowledge of the classics is a pressing want to a country gentleman; as far as I can see, he'd much better have a knowledge of manures ...'. Fred Vincy, in *Middlemarch*, does not take the degree that was intended to qualify him as a clergyman, a calling for which he is wholly unsuited. His real education takes place at the hands of the capable Caleb Garth, just as the most useful phase of Tom Tulliver's education begins when he abandons the futile classical lessons which are all that the clerical Mr Stelling has to offer him, and begins to earn a living. Here George Eliot's thinking seems clear: a robustly practical education is likely to be productive. Yet even here she is careful to avoid a universal prescription. Education should be tailored to the needs of the child. In the short story *The Lifted Veil*, the sensitive and dreamy Latimer is given a very practical education, and it profits him as little as Latin grammar suits Tom Tulliver: 'I was very stupid about machines, so I was to be greatly occupied with them ...'.⁴

The practical competence that George Eliot generally favours was not just for boys. It could be as effective in schoolmistresses as it was in schoolmasters. Susan Garth, Caleb's wife, supplements the family income by teaching, and treats her small pupils, both boys and girls, in a very down-to-earth way.

She had sometimes taken pupils in a peripatetic fashion, making them follow her about in the kitchen with their book or slate. She thought it good for them to see that she could make an excellent lather while she corrected their blunders 'without looking,' – that a woman with her sleeves tucked up above her elbows might know all about the Subjunctive Mood or the Torrid Zone – that, in short, she might possess 'education' and other good things ending in 'tion,' and worthy to be pronounced emphatically, without being a useless doll.⁵

The tone here is in part comic, and Susan Garth is not altogether an intellectual heroine – she is, George Eliot tells us, 'a trifle too emphatic in her resistance to what she held to be follies'.⁶ Nevertheless, Susan's approach to the processes of education is seen to be wholesome, and it was one which George Eliot followed when she found herself sharing the responsibility of choosing a school for the sons of George Lewes in 1856. After careful research, Lewes and his partner opted to send the boys to the progressive Hofwyl School near Berne in Switzerland, founded by the philanthropist Emanuel Von Fellenberg (1781-1844), where the education followed the radical teachings of the Swiss educationalist Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746-1821) in combining a strong moral training with the exercise of agricultural skills and the

disciplines of scholarship. Pleased to find the boys 'picking up all sorts of practical knowledge as well as "school learning"',⁷ Lewes and George Eliot considered that the experiment of sending the boys abroad in search of a rational and humane education was a success.

Choosing a school for boys was one thing. The education of girls posed different problems, and here George Eliot enters a debate that was heated and persistent throughout the years in which she was publishing fiction. She treads carefully and delicately, reluctant as always to be identified as aggressively feminist. Shortly before she began to publish fiction, she addressed the question in her article on 'Margaret Fuller and Mary Wollstonecraft', published in 1855:

There is a notion commonly entertained among men that an instructed woman, capable of having opinions, is likely to prove an impracticable yoke-fellow, always pulling one way when her husband wants to go the other, oracular in tone, and prone to give curtain lectures on metaphysics. But surely, as far as obstinacy is concerned, your unreasoning animal is the most unmanageable of creatures, where you are not allowed to settle the question by a cudgel, a whip and bridle, or even a string to the leg. For our own part, we see no consistent or commodious medium between the old plan of corporal discipline and that thorough education of women which will make them rational beings in the highest sense of the word.⁸

The marriage of Mr Tulliver, who foolishly chooses an especially stupid wife on the grounds that she will offer him no domestic opposition, is in part an extended fictional demonstration of the destructive wrong-headedness of male anxieties on this score. 'I picked the mother because she wasn't o'er 'cute', he remarks.⁹ Mrs Tulliver is loyal and affectionate, but her untaught stupidity does her husband real harm. The conciliatory point is that men will profit alongside their wives, if women are thoroughly educated. George Eliot is not prepared to be identified with an oppositional interpretation of the problem. A different observation made in the same essay also approaches the question from the point of view of the interests of men:

Men pay a heavy price for their reluctance to encourage self-help and independent resources in women. The precious meridian years of many a man of genius have to be spent in the toil of routine, that an 'establishment' may be kept up for a woman who can understand none of his secret yearnings, who is fit for nothing but to sit in her drawingroom like a doll-Madonna in her shrine. No matter. Anything is more endurable than to change our established formulæ about women, or to run the risk of looking up to our wives instead of looking down on them.¹⁰

'Our wives' – the male persona of George Eliot had yet to come into being when Marian Evans wrote that, but she is very explicitly not choosing to write from the perspective of a woman. The point she makes is one that she explores with poignant intensity in *Middlemarch*, in her portrait of the mutually destructive marriage of Lydgate and Rosamond. Like Mr Tulliver, Lydgate marries an ignorant and wilful woman for the wrong reasons. He too pays a heavy price.

Men suffer, but so of course do women. A trivial and defective education blights the lives of

many of George Eliot's girls. Gwendolen Harleth's easy satisfaction with her superficial education is a clear indication of her moral and intellectual limitations. George Eliot voices Gwendolen's complacency with the biting ironic edge that characterises much of her writing on education:

With regard to much in her lot hitherto, she held herself rather hardly dealt with, but as to her 'education' she would have admitted that it left her under no disadvantages. In the schoolroom her quick mind had taken readily that strong starch of unexplained rules and disconnected facts which saves ignorance from any painful sense of limpness; and what remained of all things knowable, she was conscious of being sufficiently acquainted with through novels, plays and poems. About her French and music, the two justifying accomplishments of a young lady, she felt no ground for uneasiness¹¹

Such views are a clear indication of the kind of trouble that lies ahead for the dangerously self-contented Gwendolen.

More thoughtful heroines have a clearer sense of the inadequacies of their training. Dorothea Brooke is said to have been educated 'on plans at once narrow and promiscuous, first in an English family and afterwards in a Swiss family at Lausanne.'¹² Unlike Gwendolen, Dorothea has the imaginative and moral depth that leaves her hungry for more than this apology for an education has given her. With no experience of formal learning, she is easily seduced by Casaubon's apparently profound scholarship – 'something beyond the shallows of ladies'-school literature'.¹³ But Casaubon is a desiccated shadow of what she needs. Like the classical and clerical university education of which he is one of George Eliot's most telling representatives, he cannot escape a paralysing past, a remembered history which has lost its fertility in tangled muddles of confusion. In a moment of rare self-knowledge, he confesses that he lives 'too much with the dead. My mind is something like the ghost of an ancient, wandering about the world and trying mentally to construct it as it used to be'.¹⁴ Casaubon's melancholy house at the appropriately-named Lowick exposes his dispiriting intellectual life. Dorothea's boudoir is ominously decorated with images of her husband's faded mind: 'A piece of tapestry over the door ... showed a blue-green world with a pale stag in it. The chairs and tables were thin-legged and easy to upset. It was a room where one might fancy the ghost of a tight-laced lady revisiting the scene of her embroidery.'¹⁵ Moving from her sterile first marriage to a more fruitful union with young and vigorous Will Ladislaw, Dorothea never succeeds in establishing a public role for herself, and this is among the sadnesses of *Middlemarch*. But a hint of what might be possible for women is to be found in the novel's history of Mary Garth, who, like her mother Susan, makes her own gentle contribution to the model of domestic education. Mary's husband Fred Vincy, who develops into a worthy man under her patient influence, becomes a capable 'theoretic and practical farmer'. That word 'practical' is always a good sign when George Eliot assesses a man's work. When Fred publishes a book 'on the "Cultivation of Green Crops and the Economy of Cattle-Feeding"', the conservative people of Middlemarch are inclined to give the credit to his capable wife. 'But when Mary wrote a little book for her boys, called "Stories of Great Men, taken from Plutarch," and had it printed and published by Gripp & Co., Middlemarch, every one in the town was willing to give the credit to Fred, observing that he had been to University, "where the ancients were studied," and might have been a

clergyman if he had chosen.¹⁶ Mary is one of George Eliot's most effective educators, and in her quiet way she overturns some central cultural assumptions of gender. But she does her necessary work within the framework of the family, and not in a school. Like Dorothea, and unlike Marian Evans, she has no public career.

The Mill on the Floss offers the most deeply considered example of George Eliot's thinking about education, and this is the novel where the divisions in her thinking are at their starkest. Defects of schooling are clearly among Maggie Tulliver's problems. At an especially bleak moment in her story, she is pitied by the narrator:

Poor child! as she leaned her head against the window-frame with her hands clasped tighter and tighter and her foot beating the ground, she was as lonely in her trouble as if she had been the only girl in the civilized world of that day, who had come out of her school-life with a soul untrained for inevitable struggles – with no other part of her inherited share in the hard-won treasures of thought, which generations of painful toil have laid up for the race of men, than shreds and patches of feeble literature and false history – with much futile information about Saxon and other kings of doubtful example, but unhappily quite without that knowledge of the irreversible laws within and without her which, governing the habits, becomes morality, and, developing the feelings of submission and dependence, becomes religion.¹⁷

The dismissal of the futility of what Maggie has been taught is characteristically sharp – 'shreds and patches of feeble literature and false history'. Such phrases fall in with the patterns repeated elsewhere in George Eliot's fiction. What is more interesting here, and darker, is the brief sketch of what education should have provided for Maggie. That knowledge of 'irreversible laws within and without her, which governing the habits, becomes morality and, developing the feelings of submission and dependence, becomes religion' is framed here in an unexpectedly sombre linguistic register. Eliot speaks of government rather than liberation, in the language of spiritual discipline. What is projected here is dependence rather than the independence she spoke of in her 1855 essay on Fuller and Wollstonecraft, submission rather than intellectual activity. Maggie has lacked, it seems, the inward education that would have strengthened her capacity to deal with life's inevitable struggles. It is hard, however, to imagine quite what form such a moral education might have taken. Even those supposedly sustaining 'treasures of thought' sound peculiarly bleak here – 'hard-won'; earned by 'painful toil'. The passage is a reminder that though George Eliot is consistently hostile to the conventionalities of an Anglican education, with all of its gendered and oppressively class-ridden implications, her own concepts of education remain deeply embedded in the evangelical thought whose supernatural justifications she has abandoned. The education that would have sustained Maggie is, it seems, grounded in inevitable suffering. In fact this solitary education of the heart is precisely what Maggie gets – and it is what we get, vicariously, in reading of her sorrows and her death.

For all her advocacy of educational reform, and she is no hypocrite in urging a more open and rational approach to the whole question, George Eliot retains a marked distrust of the necessarily social or communal aspects of the intellectual life of a school or university. Her

own life as a schoolgirl had been isolated, and she had profited from intense relations with individual teachers, rather than the breezy rough-and-tumble of life in the classroom or dormitory. It is worth noting that George Eliot's most effective teachers are not seen in front of a class, nor are they concerned with the business of scholarship. Mr Tryan teaches Janet Dempster, Dinah Morris teaches Hetty Sorrel, Dorothea Brooke teaches Rosamond Vincy, Daniel Deronda teaches Gwendolen Harleth. Their teaching is not intellectual, but it is what Maggie needed, and lacked – the kind that is motivated by human affection, and given a dark force through the suffering that makes these women apt pupils. It is an interiorised form of the teaching that George Eliot had defined in her 1855 essay on Carlyle:

It has been well said that the highest aim in education is analogous to the highest aim in mathematics, namely, to obtain not *results* but *powers*, not particular solutions, but the means by which endless solutions may be wrought. He is the most effective educator who aims less at perfecting specific acquirements than at producing that mental condition which renders acquirements easy, and leads to their useful application; who does not seek to make his pupils moral by enjoining particular courses of action, but by bringing into activity the feelings and sympathies that must issue in noble action.¹⁸

Because this is the kind of education that matters most to her, George Eliot is persistently reluctant to show her readers either a school or a university, successful or unsuccessful, in operation. She sees learning as essentially a solitary process, as it had been in her own life. Even Tom Tulliver, whose education provides us with the most detailed picture in George Eliot's fiction of day-to-day school life, has only Philip Wakem as a strange and detached classmate. We are told something of what Maggie, or Dorothea, or Gwendolen learn at school, and something more of what they do not learn. But we do not see the process in action. Nor do we see what kind of experience Maggie has in teaching, as she briefly does, as a governess to Dr Kenn's younger children, and in a 'third-rate' school. The education that George Eliot values happens when her young men and women are alone with the loving but stern voice of a single teacher, as we readers are alone with the voice of our uncompromising teacher, in reading of these lessons. Writing to Sara Hennell, Marian Evans remarked that 'I think "Live and teach" should be a proverb as well as "Live and Learn"'.¹⁹ Unlike Charlotte Brontë she had no inclination to keep a school – 'one of the most fluctuating, dubious occupations beneath the changing moon', she caustically noted to Maria Lewis.²⁰ Her business is with those unchanging and irreversible laws of suffering and morality, within and without us, which the pedagogic novel can teach.

This ambivalence helps to account for some of George Eliot's notorious reluctance to involve herself actively in public campaigns for better educational practice. With one part of her mind, she does not believe in any educational practice other than that bought by the disciplines of suffering. In 1869, when the movement for the higher education of women was especially active, she remarked sadly that 'It is not likely that any perfect plan for educating women can soon be found, for we are very far from having found a perfect plan for educating men.'²¹ Imperfection was the point. If suffering was the best and most necessary part of a woman's education, or indeed of a man's but perhaps especially of a woman's, then procedures that would remove the necessity of suffering might after all be a mixed blessing. The capacity for

nurturing tenderness that she valued most among human qualities, in men like Daniel Deronda or Silas Marner as well as women like Romola or Dorothea Brooke, might be learned through exclusion and distress, but no school could teach it. It was especially the province of femininity. She admitted as much in a guarded letter of 1868, addressed to Emily Davies, the spirited reformer and founder of Girton College in Cambridge, confessing she feared we cannot 'afford to part with that exquisite type of gentleness, tenderness, possible maternity suffusing a woman's being with affectionateness, which makes what we mean by the feminine character.'²²

There is no persuasive suggestion that Maggie Tulliver can be saved, or save others, through the formal processes of education. School is of no use to her, or to her brother. She can only be rescued – insofar as she is rescued at all – through her quiet attachment to the loving bonds of the past. 'If the past is not to bind us, where can duty lie?' as Maggie asks, in one of the many Wordsworthian moments in this most Wordsworthian of novels.²³ George Eliot's understanding of education is layered, sometimes contradictory. She trusted in its energies. They had transformed her life, and enabled her to shape the literary culture of a generation. School had played some part in that, but not the lessons of the school-room. The most serious aspects of education, as George Eliot understood them, could not be contained in the experiences of a group. They were a matter of spiritual communication and emotional discipline, privately sustained, resulting in educated feeling alongside educated thought. Suffering was the price to be paid for such learning, a price which, if paid willingly and patiently, conferred distinction and growth rather than limitation. Women, and men, had the right to a wisely-managed school-time. But they would always learn their defining lessons outside the classroom, or the lecture theatre.

Notes

- 1 George Eliot, 'The Sad Fortunes of the Rev. Amos Barton', *Scenes of Clerical Life*, ed. Thomas A. Noble (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), p. 23. 'Amos Barton' was first published in two parts in January and February 1857.
- 2 *The George Eliot Letters*, ed. Gordon S. Haight, 9 vols (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1954-79), VI, p. 302.
- 3 George Eliot, *Daniel Deronda*, ed. Graham Handley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), p. 161.
- 4 George Eliot, 'The Lifted Veil', *The Lifted Veil, Brother Jacob*, ed. Helen Small (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 6.
- 5 George Eliot, *Middlemarch*, ed. David Carroll (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), p. 239.
- 6 *Middlemarch*, p. 238.
- 7 Gordon S. Haight, *George Eliot: A Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), p. 242.

- 8 George Eliot, 'Margaret Fuller and Mary Wollstonecraft', first published in *Leader*, VI (13 October 1855), 988-989; *Essays of George Eliot*, ed. Thomas Pinney (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963), p. 203.
- 9 George Eliot, *The Mill on the Floss*, ed. Gordon S. Haight (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), p. 17.
- 10 'Margaret Fuller and Mary Wollstonecraft', pp. 204-5.
- 11 *Daniel Deronda*, p. 34
- 12 *Middlemarch*, p. 8.
- 13 *Middlemarch*, p. 24.
- 14 *Middlemarch*, p. 17.
- 15 *Middlemarch*, p. 73.
- 16 *Middlemarch*, pp. 818-9.
- 17 *The Mill on the Floss*, p. 252.
- 18 George Eliot, 'Carlyle', first published in *Leader*, VI (27 October 1855), 1034-1035, *Essays of George Eliot*, p. 213.
- 19 *The George Eliot Letters*, I, p. 242.
- 20 *The George Eliot Letters*, I, p. 91.
- 21 *The George Eliot Letters*, V, p. 58.
- 22 *The George Eliot Letters*, IV, pp. 467-8.
- 23 *The Mill on the Floss*, p. 417.