

Henry Caldwell Cook's "Play Way" in Language Education

Manami YODA*

* Graduate School of Human and Environmental Studies,
Kyoto University, Kyoto, 606-8501 Japan

Summary In the present paper I have examined the content of Henry Caldwell Cook's original teaching method, "Play Way" in order to explore how effectively drama can be used in language education.

Cook developed W. H. D. Rouse's Latin and Greek teaching in Direct Method and introduced theatre into English education for the first time in England and Wales in the 1910's. Cook attempted to make the best use of drama as an educational means, recognizing its nature and advantages to reap the fruits. His teaching method exerted a far-reaching influence on the subsequent educational scenes in England and Wales, named as "The Play Way Method," in which all subjects were systematically dramatized. From the very beginning Cook used drama for English (as a first language) teaching. However, Cook never restricted the function of his "Play Way" to only an English teaching medium. Students performed written literary works so as to truly appreciate them, but at the same time the theatrical experience itself was significant in helping them prepare to be good citizens in society. Here drama is "the one means that is an end itself" for English education. Cook's "Play Way" comes from his belief of the theatricality of human existence.

Teachers in English education as a foreign language in Japan are paying less attention to holistic aspects of learners as human beings and more to superficial communication-oriented teaching focusing on learners' practical needs. The application of Cook's theatrical method "Play way" to English education in Japan must be stimulating and effective in saving the present problematic situations. On one hand, teachers should attempt to have students appreciate literary texts containing the highest level of rhetoric which must be stimuli for their language learning: on the other hand, teachers must have students experience acting and performances which will contribute to their future social lives based on theatricality. In that case it is needless to say that the teachers are required to correctly understand the nature of theatre, including the two-layers of meaning in theatre at the dramatist's and the characters' levels. It is in the very two-layer structure of meaning that lies the strong point of theatre which teachers use in language education.

Introduction

Henry Caldwell Cook introduced theatre into English education for the first time in England and Wales in the 1910's. In the present paper we propose to closely examine the content of Cook's original teaching method, "Play Way" in order to

explore how effectively theatre can be used in language education.

In Section 1 we examine the origin of Greek and Latin education through drama of W. H. D. Rouse which has a direct effect upon Cook's "Play Way" in teaching English as a first language. In Section 2 we make clear the fundamental ideas of Cook's theatrical education principles. In Section

3 we refer to the practical contents of his teaching method. In Section 4 we indicate the differences and similarities between Cook and David Hornbrook who criticizes the exclusion of drama from the national curriculum in the 1988 Education Reform Act. And we conclude that Cook uses drama as an educational means in English teaching, recognizing its nature and advantages and that his idea of theatre as an end in itself in education comes from his belief of the theatricality of human existence.

1. The Origin of W. H. D. Rouse's Language Education through Drama

W. H. D. Rouse's theatrical method of teaching Latin and Greek exerted a direct influence upon Cook's theatrical method of teaching English. Looking for the origin of Rouse's use of drama in language education, we go back to the Elizabethan age. In grammar schools of the 16th century in England theatrical ways were used in Greek and Latin education and performances of a variety of plays as well as oratorical speeches were enthusiastically given. Tracing back further the history of theatre in language education, we reach the theatrical scene of medieval churches in the 10th century: Latin plays were performed by troupes of monks. In the same way, in the 16th century Jesuits performed Greek and Latin plays whose characters were abstractions coming from grammar and literary books. Although a part of missionary work, this was still language education through theatre. The plays were intended to train students in speaking Latin and Greek and teach grammar.¹⁾ Language education through theatre before the Renaissance was meant to teach reading and writing for theology and philosophy, so teaching was deductive in nature, with normative grammar as its central tool. During the Renaissance, especially among the upper classes of England and Wales's high society of the 16th century, Latin became necessary as a means of

international communication as well as a scholarly language. At major universities, Latin education, aiming at reviving the art of oratory, was actively carried out through both classical plays and neo-Latin plays written by European humanists. In all of these cases, a new, oral method, aiming at improving Latin speaking skills, was used alongside the more traditional translation method dominating former classical language education.²⁾ David Blewitt writes that in the 16th century speaking Latin as the lingua franca of European countries was encouraged both at home and in school. In Latin school textbooks, themes concerning students' daily life were taken up and students were demanded to develop them into dialogues and debates leading to dramatic activities or performances. Theatrical methods such as role-plays and games were also introduced in order to cultivate students' drama skills which in turn served the purpose of improving their oratory skill.³⁾ We should direct our attention to the fact that language education and theatre were thus substantially linked for the first time in English school education. Thus, during the Shakespearean age, language education, in response to the demands of society, had as its object the fostering of Latin oral expression. However, after the Renaissance, as Latin literally became a dead language, the influence of both deductive and inductive teaching ways gradually began to decline.

In the period between the 17th and 19th centuries, language education after the medieval fashion, centering on the logical orientation of grammar and translation, was revived and took the place of practical language education of both classical and foreign languages.⁴⁾ The performance of classical plays never disappeared completely from education: plays were still staged in schools as late as the 19th century. This tradition stemmed from the custom of annually staging classical plays in grammar schools, founded towards the middle

of the 16th century as a part of the Renaissance classics curriculum. However, the way performance was approached was entirely different during the latter age. The texts of performed plays were expurgated of difficult words and the pre-classical spelling was modernized mainly for the convenience of young students. It was this simplification and modernization, seconded by the advent of a new teaching method focusing on colloquial speech, which produced a powerful effect on the teaching of modern languages.⁵⁾ In the early 20th century, language acquisition skills for international communication became a high priority; therefore, grammar knowledge, which used to be considered the central target of education, came to be seen only as a part of communication abilities. Thus, there gradually appeared new methods in foreign language education such as the Direct Method: they were based upon the idea that foreign language teaching should emulate the natural and direct acquirement of one's own mother tongue and put a stress on speech without depending upon translation and formal knowledge. Also in classical language education, it is the same practical teaching method that was introduced by W. H. D. Rouse and, as in the Renaissance age, theatrical elements came to be positively taken up again in school language education.⁶⁾

Rouse was appointed headmaster of the Perse School in 1902. It is well known that he used the Direct Method in his Greek and Latin teaching. He made students repeatedly read the whole of the original *Odyssey* and *Aeneid* texts and play each part of them. Rouse forced students not to learn by heart Cicero's speeches but to reenact them in theatrical ways. Students had to study the circumstances of each case in which Cicero had pleaded and to subsequently put on stage the scenes of the trials, improvising each given part, such as witnesses, defendant, jury, prosecutor and defender.⁷⁾

2. Henry Caldwell Cook's "Play Way"

Rouse's theatrical method in teaching classical languages was taken over by Henry Caldwell Cook: he came to Perse School in 1911, just before World War I. Cook further developed the Direct Method that Rouse had established and applied it to English education for the first time. In 1917 Cook published *The Play Way*. In this monumental book Cook tackles the problems of contemporary education, both knowledge-centered and utilitarian. Defining school education as children's preparation for a proper life as citizens of a modern society, Cook conveys his original ideas on education, as well as the accumulated results of his practice.⁸⁾

The fundamental idea of English education through "Play" as he advocates is that "Play Way" (meaning practical acting) enables teenager students to deeply consider realistic social, political and economical problems and to cultivate the skills necessary for living in a knowledge-oriented, commercially-minded society. It can be said to be an amalgam of the educational approach and the theatrical approach: the former emphasizes the value of school as "*a little world in itself*",⁹⁾ where students learn the theory and practice necessary in society, while the latter sees school as an epitome of the *Theatrum Mundi*. After quoting the following lines from Shakespeare ("the purpose of playing, . . . to hold, as 'twere, the mirror up to nature," (*Hamlet*, 2. 3. 24-26) "All the world's a stage, / And all the men and women merely players" (*As You Like It*, 2. 7. 139-140)) which express two ideas about theatre and the world, Cook points out that the play of children (who can also act very naturally) is similar to real life.¹⁰⁾ Behind Cook's fundamental idea, there was his conviction that, as an integral part of the process of improving social conditions in England and Wales after World War I, it was necessary to propose a proper form of education through living practice.¹¹⁾

At the same time, however, there were great influences from other contemporary scholarly tendencies. Probably one of the most conspicuous influences is that of John Dewey, a great scholar of pedagogy and philosophy from the United States. Dewey published one of his chief works—*Democracy and Education*—in 1916, a year before the publication of Cook's *The Play Way*. In his book Dewey insists that ideal education should put stress on active, experiential learning and democratic responsibility. By examining closely Cook's stance, we can ascertain that the significance of social and experiential nature in education emphasized by Dewey affected Cook's innovative theatrical education.¹²⁾ Cook writes *The Play Way* with the belief that "A natural education is by practice, by doing things, and not by instruction."¹³⁾ More concretely, after denying the traditional education in which the teacher forces students to read texts and do drills, he asserts that children's practical and experiential learning should be the core of education. In Cook's case the content of students' experience consists of the preparation for and performance of plays through discussion and cooperation inside a group. Each group takes charge of different aspects of production, such as "the adaptation of the story, or the working out of the characters, or the allotment of the parts, or the staging, or the provision of make-shift costume and properties, or the actual writing of provisional parts in the form of notes giving cues and a rough suggestion of the dialogue."¹⁴⁾ Students staged plays based on, for example, the porter scene from *Macbeth* or the grave-digger scene from *Hamlet*. The teacher had to keep his or her interaction to a minimum and put spontaneous theatrical activities to the forefront of students' education, in order to cultivate the spirit of self-government.¹⁵⁾

As far as the cultivation of self-government is concerned, we should notice yet another influence upon Cook, this time from Harriet Finlay-

Johnson, another contemporary: she is well known as a pioneer of drama education using classroom drama.¹⁶⁾ As suggested from what we stated above about students' group activities, Cook emphasized the idea of a group of students working as a unit and not individually. In other words, Cook attempted to foster student collaboration through theatrical group activities.¹⁷⁾ This presents a problem for advocates of DIE (Drama-in-Education), such as Dorothy Heathcote and Gavin Bolton: in DIE which began to develop in the 1960's, they used drama as an educational means across the curriculum and aimed at leading each student towards self-discovery, self-empowerment and an empathetic attitude towards fellow members of society. Cook's education remains, nonetheless, student-centered, attempting to stimulate each student's imagination through active acting experience and fostering their verbal understanding and self-expression. In spite of that, his main concern remains with the collaboration of students as a group. Bolton brings this problem into relief by highlighting Cook's penchant for using plural nouns ("boys," "the players") and collective nouns ("the class," "the form").¹⁸⁾ The problem seems to come from Cook's view of drama in education: for Cook the drama is not an objective but a means to an end of language teaching.¹⁹⁾

Cook therefore tried to educate students according to his theatrical education principles: he made students bring to life the words as knowledge acquired from books in the "Play Way" and change them into power for living. What is noticeable is that Cook sees the "Play Way" as "the one means that is an end in itself."²⁰⁾ It is in the process to reach the end that students are demanded to feel, act, and express words. Cook asserts that through learning words at the desk students can acquire only *knowing*,²¹⁾ but no *feeling* for the reality behind the contents of the book. Cook indicates the importance of acting

experience, which the former passive learning method based solely on reading books lacks: "*Learning how to move* is of immeasurably greater importance than *learning to sit still*."²²⁾ After defining "Play" as "the doing anything one knows with one's heart in it,"²³⁾ Cook remarks that "Playing" should be done by students' identifying themselves with the object they know as knowledge because "the final appreciation in life and in study is to put oneself into the thing studied and to live there *active*." In metaphorical terms, Cook describes how imperfect and ineffective is the type of education which only gives students knowledge, without them having to do or act anything: "You give him moulds for his brick-making, and overseers, and models and straw. But you give him no clay."²⁴⁾

Cook's method of active learning is also a consequence of his beliefs about art. According to Cook, "the source of all art is imitation in the fullest sense, not copy, but identification."²⁵⁾ The word "imitation" reminds us of Aristotle, the founder of theatrical studies, who defined theatre as imitation of action through acting. However, we must also notice that there is a great difference between Aristotle and Cook's viewpoints. The former uses the word 'imitation' to define the objective nature of the genre, the latter uses the word to describe one's style of commitment to an object in the genre. Cook, however, points out the fact that appreciation of literary works on a sentimental and instinctual basis alone is inadequate for acquiring a proper understanding of literature. For this reason, one must express in a more palpable way one's appreciation for the work. Thus for the first time we can "earn the high title of Play." In one concrete example he presents, students are made to read Wordsworth's "Daffodils", sing a song about flowers and, furthermore, draw a picture of daffodils. Yet this is still not enough. Students can never appreciate the poem in the truest sense until they manage to

physically represent the flowers by performing a "Dance of the Daffodils."²⁶⁾ Cook admits that "if Play is the doing anything with one's heart in it, a man's life-work is Play."²⁷⁾ The idea that man can live fruitfully by playing in real life is emblematic of Cook's philosophical conviction that, essentially, human existence in this world is itself just a play. Cook introduced the "Play Way" into English education in an age when average teachers saw theatre as wicked entertainment. Behind Cook's theatrical education there lay his belief in the theatricality of man's existence.

In his book Cook refers to the two principles of the "Play Way": "It is a principle that the finest conceptions of the mind are not lessened in value, but enhanced, by being put to use, brought into play. . . . And it is another principle of the "Play Way" that the use of certain forms of expression, forms of play, and traditional observances can themselves help us to appreciate the spirit which made them."²⁸⁾ He explains about the function of play, taking as an instance the relationship of religion and its formal ritual. According to Cook, a religion, which is stated on a tract or in a creed, may only accrue true validity after it is filtered through imagination. Religious faith can be articulated only through a variety of formal efforts, such as hymns, prayers, rites, ceremonies and sermons. Thus, while remarking on the similarity between the relationship of religious faith and its ritual and that of literature and Play, Cook remarks that one can appreciate literature, poetry or drama, in the truest sense of the term by heartily feeling and expressing it in traditional theatrical form.²⁹⁾ This is the fundamental idea of Cook's theatrical education, whose purpose was to further his students' acquirement of English ability and empower them to learn and live through their experience of dramatizing and playing what they read.³⁰⁾

One of the fundamental tools, used especially for younger students in the "Play Way" style of

education, is miming. Cook indicates that there are two kinds of gestures and signs—universal and conventional—used in miming exercises. The former are signs and gestures understood by everyone, while the latter are signs and gestures previously agreed upon by a number of people. And Cook insists that it is of importance, if necessary, to invent simple and direct conventional signs and gestures agreed upon within each group of students. Such newly invented signs and gestures must be plainly understood to “represent persons and things and simple ideas” without any verbal help. Necessary conventional signs and gestures can be devised from scratch in a variety of ways, but they can be invented also by the mutual interaction between signs and gestures. For instance, the word *King* may be suggested by making a ring around one’s head and *Boy* can be showed by “twiddling the forefinger just above the ear to imply “curly-head”: students can combine these two signs to indicate “crowned curly-head.”³¹⁾ In Cook’s education, miming is not an end in itself. Miming exercises are just preparation for the next step in which students realize the necessity for speech to be represented. As for the movement involved in miming exercises, Cook indicates that especially for very young students, action, not words or gestures, is the most effective medium to convey meaning: teachers can make them act Nursery Rhymes (e. g. *Humpty Dumpty* or *Jack and Jill*) by miming actions such as “getting up on something and falling down.” Only older students should be trained in “talking with their hands” so that they may properly act all kinds of stories through the means of miming. Cook presents the general procedure that teachers should follow when teaching how to mime. First, the teacher makes students act in miming bad events in their daily life. Next, the teacher makes them train themselves in acting anecdotes with gestures and then finally act in miming dramatized stories, including plenty of speech gestures.

Lastly, students are demanded to act traditional ballad stories. About the handling of ballads, Cook recommends an elaborate way of remembering them: the teacher makes students add the words “He said,” or “She cries” to the text of the ballads and remember, by reading or singing, their content, as it were, as some character’s speech. Cook asserts that, in so doing, students, given space and proper ballads, would become able to act them out without depending on books. As an extra stage, Cook recommends that particular students, who can deeply grasp the nature of ballads, be made to write a short ballad and act it.³²⁾ Cook summarizes the advantages of making students act the traditional ballads as follows:

It is one of the characteristic virtues of the traditional ballads that the players, by the time they know the story well enough to represent it in detail, will already have the stanzas almost by heart. And, as the story has never been thought of apart from its ballad form, the words and the phrasing, and the very rhymes and rhythms, will be running in everyone’s head all the time.³³⁾

Thus, students learn miming as a non-verbal expressive form by acting out ballads and appreciate in the truest sense of the term “the words and the phrasing, and the very rhymes and rhythms.” However, in Cook’s case this represents only the most basic stage of training and is to be followed by the performance of students’ own plays made in “Playmaking” or that of Shakespeare’s plays at the Mummery, his ideal theatre, which was purpose-built on purpose in the school site as a miniature Elizabethan playhouse. It is worth mentioning that the Mummery had, just like a real Elizabethan stage, a fore-stage as well as a main stage.³⁴⁾ Cook’s adhering to Shakespeare’s plays symbolically shows his intention to emulate true theatrical traditions.

Anyway, here we have to remember that Cook sees the performance of Shakespeare as the very final goal, as is suggested by these following words in a footnote: "After all, if you can act Shakespeare you can act anything, and if you cannot act even Shakespeare you might as well sit down again."³⁵⁾ Here we should mention the fact that Cook considers the understanding of Shakespeare by relating it to "Playmaking." Cook insists that students can truly come to appreciate Shakespeare's plays, as well as other literary works, only by acting them and, furthermore, that they should make their own plays on the basis of what they learned from Shakespeare's plots, poetry and so forth.³⁶⁾ This reflects his belief that "the word literature in school, according to the Play Way, means not only the reading of literature, but the making of it."³⁷⁾ As for the concrete plays students should make, Cook notes that they must be "romances" written in "poetic" style. These two words reminds us of Shakespeare's Romances and the poetic nature of his speeches.³⁸⁾

3. Learner Factors and Teacher Factors in Cook's "Play Way"

The principle of Cook's "Play Way" is simple, but the content of its practical education is not. For instance, Cook indicates that teachers should change teaching methods and the literary works to handle according to the student's age. He insists that for students above ten, Shakespeare's plays are the best material to learn all theatrical knowledge, including playmaking and conventions.³⁹⁾ On the other hand, for students under ten, he chooses the already mentioned traditional ballads as the most appropriate form of literature for teaching dramatization.⁴⁰⁾ Cook also recommends the dramatized *Beowulf*, especially for students around twelve. Concretely, the teacher, without using the original text, tells students about the whole story and minutely teaches, as occasion demands, each scene, mentioning alliteration or

the lay balance of phrasing of the narrative poem.⁴¹⁾ Already-written literary texts need not always be used. For students under fifteen, the teacher may have them create a free-styled play using topics from daily-life and act them out improvisatorially.⁴²⁾ In this case the teacher first teaches students the practical ways of staging their play, the use of traverse. Next, the teacher teaches "the meaning and force of certain literary and dramatic conventions, the distinction of styles, the power of tradition."⁴³⁾ At the end of this paragraph, we have to mention the fact that Cook admits that even his theatrical teaching way is not always effective, especially for students at the age of sixteen to eighteen years: it is difficult, because of their self-consciousness, to make them act impromptu before others without having any written texts.

Cook also takes into account the age of students when considering the acquirement of the sense of literary style through the experience of acting. Cook remarks that one of the reasons why he attempted to foster students' English ability by dramatizing literature was to make them learn literary style not as knowledge from books, but as a sense acquired only through acting experience. His belief that the most important thing in school education is "the imparting of a living style" appears also in his approach to teaching literary style.⁴⁴⁾ According to Cook, teachers have to be aware of two kinds of style when they make students learn about literary style through acting. One of them is the literary style in the more restricted sense, which students under fifteen cannot fully understand. Whether teachers should teach this style depends upon the age of the students. The other is style in the wider sense, which even young students can begin to grasp in child-play.⁴⁵⁾ It goes without saying that Cook stresses the significance of both of the two styles, but we have to pay attention to the fact that teachers should take into consideration students'

age in teaching literary style. We have to pay attention also to the fact that even in mentioning students' learning about style according to their age, Cook explicitly emphasizes the importance of the lively vocal expression of written words through acting, as is showed in the following quotation.

The method of "learning Shakespeare" through acting the plays instead of only through a reading and discussion of them... especially if due attention is given by the master to the clear enunciation of words... will do much to foster the student's appreciation of *style*. (Cook's italics)⁴⁶⁾

As we have already mentioned, Cook introduced theatre for the first time into English education. Taking this fact into consideration, we must naturally notice that Cook's educational belief in the "Play Way" was also backed by a very critical stance towards the contemporary reading-and-understanding-centered English education, which focused on reading texts and completing drills. At the beginning of the 20th century Cook pointed out several problems of knowledge-centered and utilitarian education. He considered school education as an opportunity for children to prepare for living honestly as citizens in society and insisted that in English education children should practice and experience what they learned from books. And it is theatre that Cook chose as the basis for students' experience. That is to say, Cook used drama as a means to break down the existing situation of English education. Concretely, he presented the "Play Way" as a practical experience in which students vocally express what they read. Here, acting, a theatrical element, is used as a tool to understand and truly appreciate literary works. For that matter, Cook's adherence to the age of students comes from his efforts to reap the crowning fruits from theatrical education.

It is obvious that he had faith in the effectiveness of drama as an educational means.

Cook's theatrical education method seems to have been rather similar to the DIE method, which was to thrive half a century later. However, there is a huge difference between Cook and DIE leaders: the next stage is in Cook's treatment of theatre. As we have seen thus far, Cook had students appreciate written literary works through their experience of acting them and, furthermore, had them perform the plays they created in "Playmaking" on the basis of Shakespeare's plays or other literary works on the stage of an Elizabethan-styled theatre. This fact shows that Cook considered his students' performance as his final education purpose: theatre becomes thus autotelic. Behind such a view of theatre as an education end in itself there seems to be the philosophy of *theatrum mundi*: the world itself is a stage on which human beings act as actors and actresses.

Nonetheless, it remains an undeniable fact that Cook's theatrical method anticipated DIE in a variety of ways. For instance, the two methods share the same view of the teacher's role. In Cook's theatrical education, the teacher's role is not to force students to sit at the desk and do subject-centered learning but to help them as "a person naturally helpful."⁴⁷⁾ It is students' physical practical learning that the teacher is expected to back up. Cook called the teacher "Playmaster,"⁴⁸⁾ which does not mean someone who completely controls students' theatrical work, but a leader who respects students' spontaneity and provides them with "freedom, ease, space" for their proactive theatre-making.⁴⁹⁾ Such a role which Cook insists on reminds us of that of both the DIE and of humanistic approaches, such as the Silent Way, Community Language Learning and so forth. DIE leaders focused on children's character-building and attempted to promote their growth and self-mastery as a person. In the

humanistic approach, which, influenced by humanistic psychology, appeared in the 1970's, as a secondary language teaching method, teachers had to devote themselves to playing the role of facilitators. However, there is a great difference in the way of dealing with students between Cook and the leaders of the humanistic approach. On the one hand, Cook decried previous subject-centered teaching methods, which were controlled completely by the teacher and insisted on student-centered play-method education, with minimum teacher control. On the other hand, in his practical teaching, he stressed the identity of his students as a group, rather than as individuals. Unlike the teachers of DIE or of the humanistic approach, Cook does not recommend that the teacher should urge students to learn on the basis of mutual trust with each student. It is important to understand the fact that Cook's attachment to the idea of the group stems from his conviction that students' spontaneity can be more readily set free inside a group minimally controlled by a teacher. For instance, in "Playmaking," Cook first splits students into little groups which are respectively in charge of "the adaptation of the story, or the working out of the characters, or the allotment of the parts, or the staging or the actual writing of provisional parts in the form of notes giving cues and a rough suggestion of the dialogue." Next, he had each group get engaged in discussion, argument and debate, which occasionally escalated into wild enthusiasm, tumult or quarreling.⁵⁰⁾ Cook finds educational value in such students' clamor and quarreling which he calls "the noise of disorder"⁵¹⁾, in that they can get an opportunity to directly touch with and feel literature. After emphasizing the fact that the finished plays are not what are usually called "school theatricals," Cook insists that they are the fruit of enthusiasm and collaboration of students as a group :

It [students' finished play] is a consummation devoutly to be wished, but one which is only when the master knows his boys almost as well as their parents know them, and when everyone can feel that his fellow's heart is in the work even as his own.⁵²⁾

These words convey the meaning of a group and the role of the teacher: the group is a place in which students, stimulating each other's imagination, spontaneously create a play and the teacher has a solid grasp of every happening in the group in spite of the fact that he only controls it to a minimum degree. As previously stated, Cook was very optimistic as to the usefulness of the group as a catalyst for bringing out each individual student's spontaneity.

Although Cook and DIE leaders superficially seem to share the common view of the necessity to maintain acute understanding of the group of students, there is a conspicuous difference between them. DIE leaders negatively regard the idea of the students' group as an object to be controlled by the teacher. In other words, they aim at making each student's spontaneity stand out and, naturally, see the group of students as an obstacle for this. This fact is symbolically reflected in such words as "crowd control," or "noise threshold," which Brian Way (the advocator of drama education as participants' direct experience to develop people's personality⁵³⁾) and Heathcote occasionally use concerning students' group activities. Heathcote remarks that "for the teacher's security" it is necessary to set "the noise threshold" and to judge how much noise is acceptable for teaching. In Heathcote's drama education, it is the teacher's questioning of his students' discussion which is to decide the development of their play⁵⁴⁾: some quality in sound might not be able to be ignored and cause the "teacher's discomfort or 'panic stations' behavior to come into operation."⁵⁵⁾ Way indi-

cates the importance of the teacher's full control by words, in order to lead children properly. For instance, to calm down children's excitement or to give them instructions, the teacher decides beforehand a sound with cymbals or a drum to call their attention and make them listen. Way calls such methods "crowd control": he believes that in so doing the teacher can foster children's self-discipline and sense of personal responsibility.⁵⁶⁾ This clearly reflects Way's fundamental educational idea, which insists that the main purpose of drama education is "to develop people, not drama."⁵⁷⁾

On the other hand, Heathcote thinks that the final purpose of drama education is "the discovery of the universal human experience"⁵⁸⁾: students, through drama, ponder and inquire as to what they will experience in their future lives. She attaches importance to the teacher's role in helping students acquire, through improvisational drama activities, the abilities to face reality and iron out difficulties.⁵⁹⁾ Although Way and Heathcote are similar to each other in that they regard a children's group as an object to control, the two drama leaders' opinions are in pronounced contrast when it comes to their ways of dealing with the noise caused by the group. Way, the long-time pioneer of DIE, thinks from the viewpoint of the children's emotional development that the noise of the group should be controlled, while Heathcote, the central DIE leader, handles it from the viewpoint of protecting the teacher's security in teaching. As we stated above, one of Heathcote's original methods was to have the teacher rain questions upon students and have them decide what will happen next in the development of drama.⁶⁰⁾ Heathcote herself clarifies the reason for doing so: it is the most effective way to overcome "group inertia," one of the greatest problems in teaching.⁶¹⁾ Here we can find Heathcote's negative treatment of the children's group as an object to control, in spite of the fact that she closely examines dynamic and static group

phenomena which are incidental to the education and which are dependent upon group activities.

4. Comparison with David Hornbrook

Cook tried to use performance as a means for students to acquire a true appreciation of written literary works. In the same way, David Hornbrook, who criticizes the exclusion of drama from the national curriculum in the 1988 Education Reform Act and insists on the restoration of drama's autonomy as a regular subject, also advocates the necessity of drama education aiming at performance based on written texts or play scripts as a final purpose. Hornbrook, taking drama education as a part of arts education, remarks that the theatrical elements such as designing, directing, acting, writing, and responding should be incorporated in teaching. He takes for granted the existence of written texts and play scripts as follows:

Debate about themes and issues, about plays as literature, may well be the legitimate province of the English department; such discussion in drama, however, should be seen as a way of understanding and shaping possible interpretations of the plays in performance. Unlike English, drama can provide opportunities for the realization of those interpretations, with students actively directing, designing and performing.⁶²⁾

Hornbrook was not satisfied with debate about plays as literature but tries to subordinate it to "interpretations of the plays in performance." True, for Hornbrook, performed plays take the precedence over written plays: we must not forget, however, the fact that he assumes written plays to be necessary things at the beginning of the production process aimed at actual performance. In other words, he makes a clear distinction between simply reading a play and reading the

same play in the theatre. Recognizing the written play as a precondition, he puts greater accent on its performance.

Hornbrook's respectful attitude to performance reminds us of Cook's. Nonetheless, we have to pay attention to the fact that they are fundamentally different. The reason why Cook aims at performance is that he sees value in the production process of theatrical performances based on written literary works: he sees the performance only as a result of the production process. This is because, in Cook's case, playmaking and performance are the only proper means to truly appreciate written literature. On the other hand, for Hornbrook, the production process and performance which Cook uses solely as means to achieve a particular goal, are the very object of education. He does not stay at that stage, however: he goes all the way up to the point at which the performance is received by the audience. In other words, he believes that the play's performance is not complete until it is presented before an audience. Strictly speaking, the audience reception means, in Hornbrook's case, audience response involving both interpretation and judgment. Hornbrook insists that it is important for students to acquire the ability for creating dramatic texts, but that it is equally important for them to interpret and judge these texts. He remarks that students should interpret not only as actors and directors, but also as audience, in order to complete the framework for audience response. Hitherto we have examined Hornbrook's dramatic process consisting of two great stages, "production" and "reception." It ranges from play-writing to performance with audience response.⁶³⁾ Hornbrook virtually covers all the principal elements framing theatre.

5. Conclusion

Cook uniquely attempted to make the best use

of drama as an educational means for English teaching, recognizing its nature and advantages in order to reap the fruits. His teaching method exerted a far-reaching influence on the subsequent educational scenes in England and Wales, named as "The Play Way Method," in which all subjects were systematically dramatized.⁶⁴⁾ Especially after the 1988 Education Reform Act in which drama lost its position as an independent subject, Cook's use of drama for English teaching has been inherited and developed until the present with substantial approval of the government. This is the case also with the actual methods of his theatrical education: his respect for written texts is actually taken over by Hornbrook who opposes the use of drama as an educational means.⁶⁵⁾

From the very beginning Cook introduced theatre into English (first language) teaching. In spite of that, Cook never restricted the function of his "Play Way" to only an English teaching medium. Students performed written literary works so as to appreciate them, but at the same time the theatrical experience itself was significant in helping them prepare to be good citizens in society. Here "Play" is "the one means that is an end itself" for English education. Cook's theatrical education seems to come from his belief of the theatricality of human existence.

In the history of English education in Japan, since the Meiji period the Grammar Translation Method focusing on form rather than meaning has dominated the country's educational scenes for years. The Audio-lingual Method which also focused on form appeared in the 1960's. During the last few decades the Communicative Teaching Approach which lays more stress on communicative competence has been introduced. In spite of the variety of these teaching methods, the final aim of English education in Japan actually has been to have learners acquire the foreign language as a means to meet their practical needs. English teachers have not paid much attention to the

education of English as a language involved in the whole existence of a human being. It is the learning of language expression concerning human existence itself that any given language acquisition should ultimately aim at. In this sense, there is no difference between first language acquisition and foreign language acquisition.

Cook's theatrical education in English teaching is not simply to help and accelerate the first language acquisition. It comes from his recognition that the purpose of any language teaching should be to have learners acquire the language expression concerning the whole of human existence and have them feel its theatrical heights achieved in literary works. On the other hand, it also comes from his recognition that human existence in the world is essentially theatrical. The difference between the acquisition of first language and that of second language is not relevant. Thus, we can reasonably apply Cook's theatrical method for first language education to foreign language education. The application of Cook's "Play Way" to English education in Japan must be stimulating and effective in solving the present problematic situations. On the one hand, teachers should attempt to have students appreciate literary texts containing the highest level of rhetoric which must be stimuli for their language learning: on the other hand, teachers must have students experience acting and performances which will contribute to their future social lives based on theatricality. In that case teachers should be conscious of the fact that they can make the best use of drama as a means for English teaching only after they correctly grasp its nature. Concretely, teachers should understand the two-layer structure of meaning in theatre and have both the dramatist's and the characters' viewpoints in mind when having students read plays or participate in acting or performance activities. It is in the very understanding of the nature of theatre that lies the strong point of theatre which teachers use in

language education.

Cook's healthy theatrical methodology has been taken over after the 1988 Education Reform Act by the New Wave Drama which is a new educational approach introduced in the primary education: in the New Wave Drama the nature of theatre used within English as a core subject in the National Curriculum is correctly recognized. We should learn from the history of theatrical education in England and Wales. Our final purpose is to continue to search for the best way to make use of the virtue of the nature of drama as an educational means.

Notes

- 1) Cf. Louis G. Kelley, *25 Centuries of Language Teaching*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa, 1969. 123.
- 2) Cf. Kelley. *op. cit.* 401-402.
- 3) Cf. David Blewitt. "Elizabethan England." John Hodgson and Martin Banham, ed. *op. cit.* 4-5.
- 4) Cf. Kelley. *op. cit.* 394.
- 5) Cf. *ibid.* 123-124.
- 6) Cf. Masayuki Sano. *Drama Techniques in Teaching English*. Tokyo: Taishukan-shoten, 1981. 13-14.
- 7) Cf. Kelly. *op. cit.* 125.
- 8) Cf. Henry Caldwell Cook. *The Play Way*. London: William Heineman, 1917. 342-349.
- 9) *Ibid.* 349.
- 10) *Ibid.* 5.
- 11) Cf. *ibid.* ix.
- 12) Cf. Gavin Bolton. *Acting in Classroom Drama*. Portland: Calendar Islands Publishers, 1998. 31-33.
- 13) Cf. Cook. *op. cit.* p. 1.
- 14) *Ibid.* 302.
- 15) Cf. *ibid.* 54-79.
- 16) Cf. Bolton. *op. cit.* 32.
- 17) Cf. Cook. *op. cit.* 37.
- 18) Cf. Bolton. *op. cit.* 30-31.
- 19) Cf. Gavin Bolton. *Drama as Education*. Harlow: Longman, 1984. 15.
- 20) Cook. *op. cit.* 8.
- 21) *Ibid.* 17.
- 22) *Ibid.* 47.
- 23) *Ibid.* 17.
- 24) *Ibid.* 10.
- 25) *Ibid.* 17.
- 26) Cf. *ibid.* 24-25.
- 27) *Ibid.* 17.

- 28) *Ibid.* 18.
- 29) Cf. *ibid.* 18–19.
- 30) Cf. *ibid.* 183.
- 31) Cf. *ibid.* 225–227. Cook and his students decided to express “man” or “woman,” “boy” or “girl” by the fashion of the hair.
- 32) Cf. *ibid.* 238–246.
- 33) *Ibid.* 246–247.
- 34) Cf. *Ibid.* 189. Cook himself chose the name “Mummery.” The reasons were, as Christopher Parry guesses, that the word was easy to pronounce and that it implied that “activity and a sense of the past belong to English as a subject.” Christopher Parry. *English through Drama*. Cambridge : Cambridge UP, 1972. 3.
- 35) Footnote, Cook, *op. cit.* 183.
- 36) *Ibid.* 267.
- 37) *Ibid.* 322.
- 38) Cf. *ibid.* 272.
- 39) Cf. *ibid.* 185–186.
- 40) Cf. *ibid.* 187.
- 41) Cf. Footnote. *ibid.* 184. Cook made students dramatize *Beowulf* and present the drama on the stage of the Mummery, a miniature Elizabethan playhouse. Bolton criticizes this way of teaching by indicating that there is “a double refraction”: “(1) dramatic form as opposed to narrative form and (2) architectural constrictions as opposed to a ‘real life’ presentation.” Bolton. *Acting in Classroom Drama*. 35.
- 42) Cook. *op. cit.* 303.
- 43) *Ibid.* 305.
- 44) Cf. *ibid.* 292.
- 45) Cf. *ibid.* 293.
- 46) *Ibid.* 296–297.
- 47) Cf. Cook. *op. cit.* 41.
- 48) Cook calls the leader “Playmaster.” Parry remarks that the leader should be a “teacher-producer.” Bolton sees such a teacher like Cook a “teacher-artist.” In *DIE* the teacher is occasionally called “leader.” Cf. Parry. *op. cit.* 32. Bolton. *Acting in Classroom Drama*. 35. Helene S. Rosenberg. *Creative Drama and Imagination*. New York : Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc, 1987. 31–38.
- 49) Cf. Cook. *op. cit.* 41–53.
- 50) Parry was taught both as a student and as a teacher by Douglas Brown who supported Cook’s educational theory and faithfully put it in practice at Perse School. Parry also carried out Cook’s theatrical method at Perse School. In his book *English through Drama* Parry describes scenes where theatrical group activity done in spirited argument and debate not merely fostered exultation and a sense of solidarity among students but caused chaos and anarchy. Cf. Parry. *op. cit.* 1–7.
- 51) Cf. Cook. *op. cit.* 302.
- 52) *Ibid.* 324.
- 53) Cf. Brian Way. *Development through Drama*. London : Longman, 1967. 1.
- 54) Cf. Betty Jane Wagner. *Dorothy Heathcote*. Portsmouth : Heinemann, 1999. 55–62.
- 55) Cf. Heathcote. *op. cit.* 63–64.
- 56) Cf. Way. *op. cit.* 69.
- 57) Cf. *Ibid.* 6.
- 58) Cf. Rosenberg. *op. cit.* 37.
- 59) Cf. Wagner. *op. cit.* 26–36.
- 60) Cf. *ibid.* 55–62.
- 61) Cf. *ibid.* 9.
- 62) Cf. David Hornbrook. *Education in Drama*. London : Routledge Falmer, 1991. 5.
- 63) *Ibid.* 108–109.
- 64) Cf. Gavin Bolton. *Drama as Education*. Harlow : Longman, 1984. 7.
- 65) Cf. Hornbrook, *op. cit.* 5.

Works Cited

- Blewitt, David. “Elizabethan England.” Hodgson, John and Banham, Martin. eds. *Drama in Education 3*. London : Pitman Publishing, 1975. 4–5.
- Bolton, Gavin. *Acting in Classroom Drama*. Portland : Calendar Islands Publishers, 1998.
- , *Drama as Education*. Harlow : Longman, 1984.
- Cook, Caldwell Henry. *The Play Way*. London : William Henieman, 1917.
- Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education*. London : Macmillan Company, 1916.
- Hornbrook, David. *Education in Drama*. London : Routledge Falmer, 1991.
- Kelley, G. Louis. *25 Centuries of Language Teaching*. Ottawa : University of Ottawa, 1969.
- Parry, Christopher. *English through Drama*. Cambridge : Cambridge UP, 1972.
- Rosenberg, Helene S. *Creative Drama and Imagination*. New York : Holt, Rinehart and Wiston, Inc, 1987.
- Sano, Masayuki. *Drama Techniques in Teaching English*. Tokyo : Taishukanshoten, 1981.
- Wagner, Betty Jane. *Dorothy Heathcote*. Portsmouth : Heinemann, 1999.
- Way, Brian. *Development through Drama*. London : Longman Group Limited, 1967.

語学教育における Henry Caldwell Cook の演劇的手法

依 田 真奈美

京都大学大学院 人間・環境学研究科 共生人間学専攻
〒606-8501 京都市左京区吉田二本松町

要旨 この論文は、Henry Caldwell Cook の独自の教授法である“Play Way”の内容を吟味し、いかに効果的に演劇を言語教育に利用できるかを探るものである。

Cook は、1910年代のイギリス (England and Wales) において、W. H. D. Rouse の Direct Method によるラテン・ギリシャ語教育を発展させ、はじめて国語 (英語) 教育に演劇を導入した。Cook は、その本質と効果を認識した上で、演劇を一つの教育的手段として最大限に利用しようとした。彼の教育法は、劇形式をすべての教科の指導に使用する“The Play Way Method”として、イギリスのそれ以降の教育に多大な影響を与えた。最初から、Cook は演劇を英語 (国語) 教育のために使った。それにもかかわらず、Cook は“Play Way”の働きをただ単に国語教育の手段に限定したわけではない。学習者たちに文学作品を真に鑑賞する力を身につけさせるために、実際にそれを演じるという方法で学ばせたが、その演劇的な経験は同時に、彼らがよき市民になるための準備を手助けすることにおいて意味をもった。つまりは、演劇は、国語教育において、「手段であると共にそれ自体目的」でもあった。この教育における「それ自体目的」とする Cook の演劇観は人間存在の演劇性についての彼の信念にからきているように思われる。

日本における外国語としての英語教育は、学習者の人間としての総体性よりも、むしろ学習者の実用的ニーズを優先したコミュニケーション中心の教育に突りなく終始してきた。Cook の提唱した演劇的手法である“Play Way”を日本の英語教育に応用することは、そのような問題をはらんだ現在の状況を打開するのに効果的であるにちがいない。指導者は、外国語学習のために最大の刺激となるはずのレトリックをもつ文学作品を学習者に真に鑑賞させると同時に、演劇性に基づいた社会生活に貢献するものとして、実際にそれを演じる経験をさせなければならない。その際指導者には、劇作家と登場人物レヴェルの意味の二重構造を含む、演劇の本質の正しい把握が求められることは言うまでもない。その本質の理解があってはじめて、言語教育において演劇が十全に利用できると考えられるからである。