

The establishment and significance of the *Luxemburger Schulbote*, 1844–1942

Peter Voss

“... until we possess our own school periodical in both languages.”

The establishment of an operational school system was for the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, as indeed for many other countries, an integral part in the foundation of the nation state. Having gained independence in 1839, the small country in the heart of Europe passed a Primary School Act in 1843 and christened its own school periodical, the *Luxemburger Schulbote*, just one year later. The publication was neither a news bulletin intended to improve public relations *avant la lettre*, nor a public service provided by the *Commission Royale Grand-Ducale d’Instruction*, the Board of Education of the Grand Duchy. The periodical is best described as a political instrument used by the school authorities to communicate with teachers, allowing essentially one-way traffic only, with information flowing solely from the top down. The publication served as a source of information, education and training and, crucially, as a means of controlling and disciplining teachers. Aside from biannual school inspections and attendance at local school conferences, the village schoolteachers of Luxembourg were left to their own devices for most of the year. Communication between the upper echelons of the school authorities and teaching personnel took place almost exclusively in written form; hence, the regular editions of the *Schulbote* were an important means of ensuring a continuous and direct link between the two levels. In this respect, the *Schulbote* took on a key directional role, particularly during the early stages of development of the primary school system in Luxembourg. The Board of Education could communicate with the primary school teachers of the Grand Duchy through this compulsory publication and be certain of getting its message across to the majority of teachers.

According to the theory presented here, despite its principal role as a means of exerting control, the official periodical also, somewhat paradoxically, had an emancipatory effect on teachers. Despite its relative unpopularity among its intended readership, it was only with assistance from the *Schulbote* that the teachers of the Grand Duchy were able to form a galvanized corps with a sense of professional consciousness as well as begin to gain an awareness and understanding of the specific occupational requirements of their profession – a process that helped pave the way for the creation of a free

journalistic market and an independent teaching press. The so-called “Correspondenzblätter”, which started to be published by the teachers of Luxembourg in the 1860s, deliberately disassociated themselves with the official *Schulbote*. The release of this alternative periodical empowered teachers, enabling them to escape their state of ‘self-incurred immaturity’ and discover their own voice – a series of events which would be difficult to piece together without factoring in role of the *Schulbote* as a catalyst.

This thesis will be set out in three sections. The first section outlines the creation and development of the *Luxemburger Schulbote* both within the framework of the legislative reform of the Luxembourg school system from 1843 and in an international context, whereby particular attention will be paid to developments in neighbouring countries. The second section presents the organisation and objectives of the official periodical and also seeks to clarify how and to what extent these objectives were realised. Finally, the third section investigates the significance of these findings for historical research into communication through official publications in particular and historical educational research in general.

Creation and development of the *Luxemburger Schulbote*

In Luxembourg, the publication of a school periodical was one of a number of measures slated to advance the development of the primary school system in the 1820s. Speaking at a graduation ceremony for a summer training course at the *Ecole modèle* in 1829, the director, Michel-Nicolas Mueller, outlined an ambitious plan for the reform of state education policy. He called for the formation of a professional corps of teachers, as well as establishing school conferences that would serve as a forum for pedagogical exchange about school education. In addition, he advocated for facilitating the construction of school buildings, the foundation of a teacher-training institution and the establishment of a widow’s pension fund. “Also, we will not rest,” he continued, “until we possess our own school periodical in both languages as befits the level of spiritual and religious education of this self-sufficient, independent and also very much Catholic country.”¹

In setting this objective, Luxembourg was brought in line with the state of the art in terms of education. In the states of the German federation, Prussia in particular, initial efforts were already being made to set up a pedagogical press, which continued to develop and diversify throughout the 1820s. Notable

1 Victor Kalmes, *Vom Tagelöhnerkittel zum Gehrock: Eine Studie über die materielle und soziale Lage des Luxemburger Lehrers im 19. Jahrhundert* (Luxembourg: Editions du Syndicat national des enseignants, 1990), 51. See also Rede des Herrn Müller, *Mémorial administratif du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg/Verwaltungs-Memorial des Groß-Herzogthums Lützembourg* 48(13 Août 1829):116–128, 122.

examples are the yearbooks of the Prussian primary school system, *Jahrbücher des Preußischen Volks-Schulwesens* (1825–1829)² edited by Ludolph Beckerdorff, the *Allgemeine Schulzeitung* published in Darmstadt from 1824 and the *Rheinische Blätter für Erziehung und Unterricht mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Volksschulwesens* edited by Adolph Diesterweg, first published in 1827.

There were also developments in the pedagogical press in France.³ Prior to 1830, French primary school teachers could only call on one or two specialist journals. However, the French school press expanded significantly in the period from 1830 to 1839, a development that can be attributed to a positive shift in the attitude of the public toward schooling and education that coincided with the adoption of the Education Act of 1833 (*Loi Guizot*). In the period from 1830 to 1879, there were already eight to twelve specialist journals available to French primary teachers.⁴ A crucial development in this context took place at the end of 1832 – the establishment of the *Manuel général de l'instruction primaire* by François Guizot, the education minister of the July Monarchy from 1832 until 1837, who recognised the importance of the press to state policy on schooling and education.⁵ The *Manuel général* published not only official announcements and school regulations, but also pedagogical and methodological articles intended to create “an ethos of hard work, success and competitiveness”⁶ among French primary school teachers.

2 Frank-Michael Kuhlemann, *Modernisierung und Disziplinierung: Sozialgeschichte des preußischen Volksschulwesens 1794–1872* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 320.

3 Pénélope Caspard-Karydis and André Chambon, eds. (1981–1991), *La presse d'éducation et d'enseignement. XVIIIe siècle – 1940: Répertoire analytique établi sous la direction de Pierre Caspard* (Paris: Institut national de recherche pédagogique – Editions du CNRS, 4 vol., 1981 – 1991). For Belgium see: Maurits de Vroede, ed., *Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van het pedagogisch leven in België in de 19de en 20ste eeuw: De periodiken* (Gent, Rijksuniversiteit/Leuven, Katholieke Universiteit, 4 vol., 1973–1987).

4 Pierre Caspard and Pénélope Caspard-Karydis, 'Presse pédagogique et formation continue des instituteurs (1815 – 1940)', *Recherche et Formation* 23 (1996): 105–17. For Switzerland see: Anne Bosche, '171 Zeitschriften in 175 Jahren Zürcher Volksschule', in Daniel Tröhler and Urs Hardegger, eds., *Zukunft bilden. Die Geschichte der modernen Zürcher Volksschule* (Zürich: Verlag Neue Zürcher Zeitung, 2008), 157–171.

5 See: Guizots 'Rapport au roi' (October 1832), in Caspar-Karydis and Chambon, *La presse d'éducation et d'enseignement*, 1: 77.

6 Circulaire du ministre de l'instruction publique aux instituteurs, relative à l'exécution de la loi du 28 juin 1833 sur l'instruction primaire, 4 juillet 1833, in *Une histoire de l'école: Anthologie de l'éducation et de l'enseignement en France. XVIIIe – XXe siècle*, ed. François Jacquet-Francillon (Paris: Retz, 2010), 503; Caspard-Karydis and Chambon, *La presse d'éducation et d'enseignement* 3 (1986): 76–79; Article 'Manuel général de l'instruction primaire', in *Nouveau Dictionnaire de pédagogie et d'instruction*

In conjunction with the reform of teacher training through the *Écoles Normales* and the formation of a school supervisory authority, the publication of a monthly pedagogical periodical was a core element in the “système général de l’instruction primaire”, conceptualised by Guizot.⁷

After the adoption of the Primary School Act of 1843, the Board of Education in Luxembourg viewed the publication of a pedagogical periodical as a real opportunity to complete their ambitious education policy reform program and create a ‘system’ of education similar to that being established in France or Prussia. The first known reference to plans to establish a so-called *Mémorial des Instituteurs* dates back to the summer of 1844. In a move to try and finance the publication, for which no provision had been made in the budget, the Board of Education attempted to persuade teachers and school inspectors to forgo reimbursement for expenses incurred by travelling to regional school conferences. Having received the green light from teachers and school inspectors, the Permanent Committee (*Comité permanent*) of the Board of Education lodged an application with the Luxembourg parliament for the publication of a periodical under the title *Luxemburger Schulbote*.⁸ As the originally intended title, *Mémorial des instituteurs*, would have placed a strong emphasis on the official nature of the new periodical by aligning its content with that of similarly titled official press organs – such as the *Mémorial législatif et administratif du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg/Verordnungs- und Verwaltungsblatt des Großherzogtums Luxemburg* – the choice of the alternative title, *Schulbote*, can be seen as a deliberate shift away from any official connotations. The new title was obviously intended to symbolize the journalistic freedom of the new publication.

Written permission for publication of the *Schulbote* was received from the Government Council on 24 September 1844 on the condition that all laws, decisions, regulations and announcements pertaining to the primary school system be published in both official languages of the Grand Duchy, i.e. German and French.⁹ In setting these conditions, the Council emphasised that Luxembourg would remain a bilingual entity despite the loss of its French-speaking region to the Kingdom of Belgium in 1839 and that this decision would be reflected in the primary school system. The first edition of

primaire, ed. Ferdinand Buisson (Paris: Hachette, 1911), <http://inrp.fr/edition-electronique/lodel/dictionnaire-ferdinand-buisson> (accessed, January 16, 2012).

7 Brigitte Dancel, ‘La mise en place d’un ‘système général de l’instruction primaire’’, in *Une histoire de l’école*, ed. Jacquet-Francillon, 505.

8 Archives nationales du Luxembourg (ANLux), IP-729: Commission de l’instruction publique: Comité permanent: Procès-verbaux (1844–1857), Séance du 10.08.1844.

9 ‘Le conseil de gouvernement approuve cette publication mais à condition que toutes les dispositions législatives et les autres décisions, ainsi que les Règlements et instructions concernant l’Instruction primaire y devront chaque fois figurer dans les deux langues.’ Ibid., Séance du 28.09.1844.

the new *Luxemburger Schulbote Eine Zeitschrift zunächst für die Schullehrer des Großherzogthums Luxemburg bestimmt/Le Courrier des Ecoles dans le Grand-Duché de Luxembourg*¹⁰ finally went to press at the Joseph Lamort publishing house in Luxembourg in 1844.

The Luxembourg publication was probably named after its German equivalent, the *Deutscher Schulbote*¹¹ edited by Georg Floßmann und Martin Heißler and first published in Augsburg in 1842. According to an article on the *Deutscher Schulbote* in the *Schweizerische Kirchenzeitung* of 1844: “The first year of this upstanding Catholic pedagogical publication has been remarkably well received in all quarters because there has been a real need for a good Catholic, school periodical of this kind for years.”¹² It is no coincidence that the Luxembourg school periodical was named after a publication that had already contained “numerous articles [...] by nationally and internationally renowned Catholic pedagogical experts.”¹³ After all, in adopting the education act of 1843, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg had itself only recently ordered the creation of an unequivocally Catholic primary school system.¹⁴ Numerous articles that had appeared in the *Deutscher Schulbote* were also later reprinted in the *Luxemburger Schulbote*.¹⁵

10 The introduction to the first edition is dated October 5, 1844, implying that the publication date was probably around mid-October 1844.

11 *Der deutsche Schulbote. Eine katholisch-pädagogische Zeitschrift für Schulmänner geistlichen und weltlichen Standes, dann aber auch für alle katholischen Familien und Jugendfreunde.* Im Vereine mit mehreren Schulmännern und Schulfreunden herausgegeben von G. Floßmann, Pfarrer zu St. Zeno, und M. Heißler, Schullehrer in Piding (Augsburg: Rieger, 1842 – 1865).

12 *Schweizerische Kirchenzeitung.* Herausgegeben von einem katholischen Vereine (Luzern: Räber, 13. Jahrgang 1844), 454.

13 Ibid.

14 In contrast to the *Luxemburger Schulbote*, the *Deutscher Schulbote* did not publish any laws, regulations, or other official announcements. Rather, the focus was on: (1) Pedagogical essays on all elements of lessons and education; (2) Obituaries of deserving School men and School friends; (3) Brief reviews and advertisements for newly published school and youth publications; And (4) General school news, miscellaneous items, poetry and songs. *Schweizerische Kirchenzeitung*, 13 (1844), 454.

15 For example, an article by Joseph Geiges, ‘Wie kann das Temperament an den Kindern erforscht, und wie soll jedes Kind seinem Naturelle gemäß behandelt werden?’, in *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 2 (1845), 269–73, first published in *Der Deutsche Schulbote* 3 (1844), 359.

**Der Luxemburger
Schulbote.**

LE COURRIER DES ÉCOLES

DANS

LE GRAND-DUCHÉ DE LUXEMBOURG.

Eine Zeitschrift

zunächst für die Schullehrer des Großherzogthums
Luxemburg bestimmt.

Dritter Jahrgang. — TROISIÈME ANNÉE.

Nr. 1.

Luxemburg,

Druck von J. Lamort, auf dem Paradeplatze.

1846.

Figure 1: *Schulbote_3-1846_Cover*

From 1852, its 9th year of publication, until its discontinuation in 1942, the periodical ceased to use its French title.¹⁶ Moreover, in 1868 and 1871, the German title and subtitle were simplified, respectively, and the Journal became simply *Luxemburger Schulbote. Zeitschrift zunächst für die Lehrer des Großherzogtums Luxemburg* and it continued to be published under this title until 1940. During the Second World War, the nature of the *Schulbote* changed entirely. The primary objective of the publication became to re-educate the population of occupied Luxembourg to become good German citizens in accordance with the ideologies of National Socialism.¹⁷ The 99-year history of the *Luxemburger Schulbote* drew to a close in 1942.

The periodical was re-established after German occupation in 1944 under the title *Le Courrier des écoles du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg*, which changed to *Courrier de l'Éducation nationale*, in 1952, when the Ministère de l'éducation nationale et de la formation professionnelle took over the publishing responsibility.

Having remained in print for 99 years (1844–1942), the *Luxemburger Schulbote* outlasted most comparable publications in neighbouring countries.¹⁸ Although it was the longest running official school publication in the Grand Duchy, it did not surpass the *Manuel général de l'instruction primaire* or the *Journal général de l'instruction publique* in France.¹⁹

The vision and the reality of the *Luxemburger Schulbote*

The *Luxemburger Schulbote* was edited by the 18-strong *Commission Royale Grand-Ducale d'Instruction* (Board of Education of the Grand Duchy), which was ultimately responsible for the administration of the Luxembourg primary school system. As the board only convened twice a year, the actual administration of the periodical was the responsibility of the Comité permanent (Permanent Committee), whose four members were recruited from within the board of education. The committee met twice a month while the committee secretary took care of day-to-day matters.

16 The German subtitle, *Eine Zeitschrift zunächst für die Schullehrer des Großherzogtums Luxemburg bestimmt*, did not appear on the front cover of the journal.

17 Hans Schiffels, 'Die luxemburgische Mundart, eine deutsche Mundart', *Luxemburger Schulbote* 99 (1942), 2–55; Martin Ferres, 'Luxemburgs Geschichte als Teil der deutschen Geschichte', *Ibid.*, 56–77.

18 It outlasted, for example: *Deutscher Schulbote*, see footnote 13; *Süddeutscher Schulbote. Eine Zeitschrift für das deutsche Schulwesen* (Stuttgart Steinkopf, vol. 1, 1836 – vol. 55, 1891); *Schulbote für Hessen* (Darmstadt, vol. 1, 1860 – vol. 74, 1933); *Österreichischer Schulbote* (Wien: Pichler, vol. 1, 1851 – vol. 65, 1915); *Centralblatt für die gesamte Unterrichtsverwaltung in Preußen* (Berlin: Weidmann, vol. 1, 1859 – vol. 76, 1934).

19 However, the two French publications were not entirely official in character.

In conjunction with administrative and judicial procedures, the intention of the monthly periodical, which was published practically unaltered from 1844 to 1942, was to monitor and control primary school teachers. As noted in its subtitle, the publication was directed principally at the primary school teachers of Luxembourg. In its editorial role, the Board of Education set out the purpose of the bilingual publication in the foreword to the first edition of October 1844, according to which the primary objective was to inform the schoolteachers of the Grand Duchy about the regulations and mandates of the school system. To this end, the first edition of the *Schulbote* published the education act of 1843 because, nearly a year on from its adoption, many teachers were apparently still unfamiliar with the legislation. At the same time, the periodical also set itself the pedagogical – or as described by the editors “literary” – objective of publishing “original articles on the school system” as well as reprinting “respectable and appropriate excerpts from reliable school publications and other pedagogical works published in neighbouring countries,”²⁰ because, “it is essential in this day and age that every school teacher should hear something about teaching methods and the achievements of the school system.”²¹ Thirdly, the Board pledged in its opening remarks to “make every effort to direct readers to important publications which were indispensable for school teachers”; in other words, to publish reviews and recommendations of important pedagogical works. “In this way,” according to the editors, “it is hoped that unity can be fostered and life can be breathed into the new school system we are in the process of establishing.”²²

It is therefore clear that the *Schulbote* was intended as both an official bulletin and a teacher-training tool, the basic goal of which was to establish a homogenous group of teaching professionals. This uniformity was in fact an express provision of the Primary School Education Act of 1843, which applied to every school in the country.²³ It was envisaged that the ‘life breath’ of the publication would be provided by pedagogical stimulation from abroad, although these foreign articles were to be supplemented as soon as possible through contributions from Luxembourg. In keeping with this final goal, the foreword closed, therefore, with a call for “essays on the school system [...] to

20 *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 1 (1844), 2.

21 *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 3 (1846), 3.

22 *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 1 (1844), 2.

23 For the ‘Loi du 26 juillet 1843 sur l’instruction primaire’ see: Albert Calmes, *Histoire contemporaine du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg. Volume IV: La création d’un Etat 1841–1847* (Luxembourg: Saint-Paul, 1983); Vic Diederich, ‘Notre enseignement primaire – essai historique’, in *Mémorial 1989: La société luxembourgeoise de 1839 à 1989*, ed. Martin Gerges (Luxembourg: Editions Mosellanes, 1989), 337–68.

be submitted to the permanent committee of the Board of Education,” where they would be “gratefully received.”²⁴

However, the processes of circulating and gaining acceptance for the publication among teachers proved difficult in three main respects. Firstly, teachers were very slow to recognise the purpose of the publication. In effect, they were reluctant to embrace a publication for which they were expected to pay, as they perceived it as not only a source of information but also as a means of control and supervision. Ultimately, this reluctance led to the second problem, that of financing the publication. The subscription policy of the education board proved untenable and, as a result, the first ten to twelve years of the publication were shrouded in financial insecurity. The third problem lay in persuading the teachers of Luxembourg to submit essays for publication in the pedagogical section of the *Schulbote*, which turned out to be an extremely laborious process. In fact, this strategy, like the subscription policy, can also be considered a failure.

Although the subscription price was announced, the *Schulbote* would appear to have remained free for teachers until the end of 1845. Because the expenses for attending regional conferences, which teachers had foregone two years earlier to provide start-up funds for the *Schulbote*, now had to be paid out, the teachers were asked to contribute an annual subscription fee of 3 Francs to the publication’s coffers. The Board of Education had, by its own estimation, endeavoured to keep the price “as low as possible so that all teachers can afford to subscribe.”²⁵ Readers who did not wish to renew their subscription on these terms were required to contact the Board, i.e. their highest administrative authority, by January 10, 1846, to cancel their subscription – a step very few teachers are likely to have been willing to take.²⁶

In a newly developing school system, with a high turnover in teaching staff, the main problem prior to the introduction of paid subscription had been delivering the publication to the addressees. This was particularly problematic when it came to the teaching staff of Luxembourg’s approximately 100 winter schools that ceased to operate in the summer season.²⁷ The enforcement of the 3 Franc subscription fee brought with it a further complication—namely ensuring that recipients made their annual payments. On the whole, it would appear that the payment record of the teachers of Lux-

24 *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 1 (1844), 2. In the first half of the 19th century, this was a common approach in Swiss school periodicals, too. See for example, *Der freimüthige und unpartheiische Schweizer Schulbote* 1 (1832); Anne Bosche, ‘171 Zeitschriften’, 163.

25 *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 2 (1845), 280.

26 *Ibid.* This process was actually quite common. In France, the Education Minister, threatened in 1858 to force teachers to subscribe to the *Journal des instituteurs* unless they had expressly requested not to. Jacquet-Francillon, *Une histoire de l’école*, 54.

27 *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 2 (1845), 56.

embourg left much to be desired when it came to the *Schulbote*, despite the implementation of a range of measures designed to remedy delivery and payment difficulties. For example, although the Board of Education made constant appeals to teachers to inform authorities of any change of address and to pay outstanding fees, they fell on deaf ears. In addition, in 1847, the subscription fee was reduced from 3 Francs to 2 Francs, but the policy had to be reversed just one year later due to the “ever increasing financial strain” on the *Schulbote*. Another strategy was to change payment terms to quarterly instalments in advance, which also failed to make any significant inroads.²⁸ An alteration in the mode of collection was also attempted. Fees were collected in stages by teachers in regional capitols, school inspectors and a further 13 teachers in cantons, who were also given the responsibility of delivering the money to the board of education. This scheme was also unsuccessful. Even threats to discipline teachers who failed to pay subscription fees by reading out their names at regional conferences proved ineffective.²⁹ Ultimately, the Board of Education failed to get the problem under control and was consequently unable to cover the printing costs from subscription receipts.³⁰

On January 1st, 1856, with the *Schulbote* entering its 13th year of publication, the periodical was finally provided with a sound financial foundation.³¹ From that year on, the state budget allocated funds for the journal, allowing it to be provided free of charge again. However, the publication was “no longer the property of the teachers, but instead the property of their respective schools” and had to be archived in school buildings. The local authorities were responsible for binding the publication and the teachers were responsible for the completeness of the collection in their respective schools from 1856.³² Nevertheless, it was still not uncommon for teachers changing position to “inadvertently take copies of the *Schulbote* with them,” which gave rise to fresh complaints.³³ It was not until after 1860, with the periodical entering its 18th year of publication, that complaints about missing issues or even the disappearance of entire collections gradually abated.

28 *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 3 (1846), 272, 323 and 349; 5 (1848), 19.

29 *Loi du 28 novembre 1855, concernant le budget des dépenses de l'administration*: XI. C. Öffentlicher Unterricht, Wissenschaft und Kunst, 2. Primär-Unterricht, 5. [...] *Schulbote*, und unvorhergesehene Ausgaben, in: *Mémorial législatif et administratif du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg* 29 (15 décembre 1855); *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 4 (1847), 231; 5 (1848), 19; 10 (1855), 45.

30 The printing costs filed by Joseph Lamort, *imprimeur*, for the period 1844–45 amounted to 400 fl. ANLux, IP-729: Commission de l'Instruction publique, Séance du 23.09.1845 and Séance du 04.10.1845.

31 *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 12 (1855), 309.

32 *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 12 (1855), 309; 14 (1857), 25.

33 *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 14 (1857), 25.

Quantitative expansion and decline

Regarding the length of the publication, the monthly periodical already achieved a considerable volume in its early years of publication, reaching more than 400 pages in 1847 – level it would not achieve again until 1897. Apart from a few exceptional years, the page count declined continually after the initial take-off phase (1844–1847), averaging only around 250 from 1880 to 1887. The period from 1890 to 1918 saw a return to an increased volume of up to 400 pages. A maximum of 590 pages was reached in 1912, which can be attributed to the numerous entries relating to the Primary Education Act of that year. After the First World War, however, the average volume fell to consistently below 200 pages, with the final edition of 1942 containing a mere 78 pages.

A similar trend can be seen in both the number and variety of articles published. In the early years, the *Schulbote* achieved its best results, publishing up to 123 articles in 1854.³⁴ The volume of articles contributed never approached this level again over the subsequent 87 years of publication. From an average of 50 to 70 articles (1856–1870), the number declined to under 50 articles published annually (1871–1884), ultimately reaching around 30 per year (1885–1897). In the period from 1898 to 1916, the volume rose again to an average of around 50 articles, but returned to less than 30 per year from 1917.

Although exact circulation figures are not available, since the publication was directed primarily at elementary school teachers in the Grand Duchy, the increase in circulation would have been roughly equivalent to the increases in the teaching personnel, rising from around 500 in the late 1840s to over a thousand copies towards the end of the 19th century.

Although in 1846 the editors had already split the publication into a ‘generally official section’ and an essay section “containing nothing of an official nature,” the entries were not clearly split into ‘official’ and ‘non-official’ sections until 1859. From 1868 onwards, the *Schulbote* moved from two to three sections. The non-official section continued under the title “Pedagogical Essays”, until 1870, when it was renamed “Education” and a new section entitled “School Chronicle” was added. Initially, the new section contained a wide range of miscellaneous articles. However, from the mid 1870s, it was used primarily to report on the biannual assembly of the Board of Education, candidates enrolling at the teacher training college, changes in teaching staff and schools, as well as the questions for written exams required for attaining teaching qualifications at the *École normale*. The separation into three sections – “Official”, “Education” and “School Chronicle” – was retained until

34 This figure refers to the absolute number of contributions listed in the contents pages of the publications in respective years, regardless of whether the entries were legal texts, lengthy pedagogical essays or brief, for example news items, adverts for new books etc.

1918. From this point on, the *Schulbote* rarely published pedagogical essays and an “Education” section was abolished. The distinction between official notices and chronicle was, however, kept until the late 1930s, thus continuing almost until the discontinuation of the *Schulbote*.

Although the Board of Education viewed the *Schulbote* as both an official publication and as a periodical for teachers, it increasingly lost sight of the second of these objectives over time. After the adoption of the education act of 1843, with the primary school system of Luxembourg in a state of reform and reconstruction, the publication of official notices, such as laws, announcements and regulations, took up a great deal of space. After modest beginnings (pedagogical articles accounted for a maximum of one quarter of the publication from 1844 to 1850), the Pedagogical Essays section enjoyed its real heyday from 1850 to 1870, during which time the number of non-official articles drew roughly level with the number of official notices; around 30 official entries per year were published alongside approximately the same count of articles in the “Education” section.

However, the beginning of the 1870s signalled a dramatic fall in the number of pedagogical articles published. Apart from one or two exceptions, the number of pedagogical entries published each year remained in single figures. In the years where major educational reforms were enacted, for example in 1881 and 1912, the waning pedagogical aspirations of the editors fizzled out completely. In its 38th year of publication, in 1881, the entire “Education” section of the *Schulbote* comprised of a single article, and even that was just a piece on the Board of Education, about which an annual report is published anyway.³⁵ In the 1912 edition, with 590 pages, was the longest ever published, there were a total of 27 official notices and 6 entries under the rubric “School Chronicle” but not a single primarily pedagogical article.

Although the *Schulbote* had set out in 1844 with the dual purpose of publishing “regulations and mandates” and also of fulfilling a “literary objective” in the sense of providing pedagogical and methodological insight, the second aspect was almost entirely neglected in the three decades from 1870 to 1900. Despite an increase in the number of pedagogical articles published between 1900 and 1914, the “Education” section never regained the volumes experienced in its heyday from 1844–1870.

35 ‘Observations générales de la commission chargée d’inspecter les écoles primaires supérieures à la fin de l’année scolaire 1879–1880’, *Luxemburger Schulbote* 38 (1881), 46–56.

General-Bericht

über den Zustand des Primär-Schulwesens im Großherzogthum Luxemburg während des Schuljahrs 1844—45, erstattet an das Regierungs-Collegium in Gemäßheit des Art. 81 des Gesetzes vom 26. Juli 1843 über den Primär-Unterricht.

Luxemburg, am 17. Februar 1846.

Meine Herrn,

In Gemäßheit des Art. 81 des Gesetzes über den Primär-Unterricht faßt die Unterrichts-Commission einmal jährlich die in den Berichten der Schulinspectoren enthaltenen Nachweisungen in einer allgemeinen Darstellung zusammen, und schickt diese Arbeit mit ihren Bemerkungen an das Regierungs-Collegium ein, welches sie dem König Großherzog und den Landständen vorlegt; und nach Artikel 16 des Reglements, nach welchem die Primär-Unterrichts-Commission ihre Funktionen ausübt, muß dieselbe sich in ihrer ordentlichen Versammlung des zweiten Dienstags im Monat October mit dieser Arbeit befassen.

Diese Arbeit aber, sollte sie vollständig werden, und eine treue Darstellung des wahrhaftigen Zustandes der Dinge darbieten, erforderte eine Mühe, welche die Commission bei ihrer Versammlung des Monats October nicht hatte, indem zu zahlreiche und zu wichtige Beschäftigungen ihre ganze Zeit in Anspruch nahmen.

Die Commission hat daher geglaubt sich darauf beschränken zu können, daß sie die Grundlage und die Elemente zu dieser Arbeit feststellte, die fernere Ausarbeitung dem ständigen Ausschusse überlassend.

Indem wir uns des Auftrags erledigen, den uns die Plenar-Versammlung hinterlassen hat, empfinden wir eine

RAPPORT GÉNÉRAL

sur la situation des écoles primaires dans le Grand-Duché de Luxembourg, pendant l'année scolaire 1844—45, présenté au Conseil de Gouvernement en exécution de l'art. 81 de la loi du 26 juillet 1843 sur l'instruction primaire.

Luxembourg, le 17 février 1846.

MESSEURS,

Au vœu de l'art. 81 de la loi du 26 juillet 1843 sur l'instruction primaire, la Commission d'Instruction réunit une fois par an, en un seul travail général, les renseignements consignés dans les rapports des Inspecteurs, et adresse ce résumé, avec ses observations, au Conseil de Gouvernement, qui le soumet au Roi Grand-Duc et aux États, et conformément à l'art. 16 du règlement d'après lequel la Commission d'Instruction exerce ses fonctions, elle doit se livrer à ce travail dans sa réunion ordinaire du deuxième mardi du mois d'octobre.

Cependant ce travail, pour être exact, et pour offrir un exposé fidèle du véritable état des choses, exigeait des loisirs que n'avait pas la Commission d'Instruction lors de sa réunion du mois d'octobre, de trop nombreux travaux, et des travaux trop importants ayant réclamé alors tout son temps.

La commission a donc cru pouvoir se borner à arrêter les bases et les éléments de ce travail, en en abandonnant la rédaction à son Comité permanent.

En nous acquittant du mandat que l'assemblée générale nous a confié, nous éprouvons une véritable satisfaction de pouvoir

Figure 2: Schulbote_3-1846_Rapport

In summary, the take-off period in the early years of publication was followed by a “double decline” in terms of pedagogical content, which was characterised by an initial fall in both the scope and the number of articles that started in 1870 and culminated in an almost complete collapse in pedagogical content and the virtual closing down of the pedagogical section of the publication. For more than half of the nearly 100-year history of the *Schulbote*, there was therefore practically no expressly pedagogical content at all.

As for the bilingualism of the publication, this related mainly to the title, and, as decreed by the government of Luxembourg in 1844, to the publication of legislative texts and official announcements. Therefore, it was actually by no means the case that every single entry in the *Schulbote* was published in both German and French. In fact, it was only during the first three years of publication (1844–1846) that both German and French versions of articles appeared. However, this related exclusively to the publication of official content, such as the education act of 1843 or the annual “General Report on the State of the Primary School System of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg”. The predominant language of the *Schulbote* was German, which was also the language mainly used in the primary schools of Luxembourg. Texts submitted by French authors were generally also printed in French, although, even here, the editors occasionally chose to fall back on German translations. Overall, the significance of the French language in the publication evidently declined over time. There was one notable exception to this rule, however, with the “General Report” being published exclusively in French under the title “Rapport général” from 1851 onwards.

The official section: a ‘tool’ for education policy

The official section of the *Schulbote* published the important laws and provisions pertaining to the bodies and institutions of the Luxembourg school system: the Education Act of 1843, regulations governing the *École normale* and legal regulations on school governance, the operation of the Board of Education and the instruction of school inspectors.

Reports on the *École normale*, the pride and joy of the Board of Education, took up considerable space in the official section of the *Schulbote*. This included detailed accounts of the annual opening and closing ceremonies of the *École normale* along with the curriculum, the timetable and the names of both the professors and the candidates.

Subjects covered in the teacher training exams, exam dates, the names of successful candidates and available teaching positions were also published regularly. Based on the extensive lists of names of teachers summoned away from their posts to sit exams to attain higher teaching qualifications (*Brevet*), it can be concluded that the Board of Education was following a very proactive

training policy. In fact, teachers who ignored invitations to take part in these Brevet exams or in summer courses at the teacher training college risked being suspended from duty. The names of dissenters were also published in the *Schulbote* in an attempt to deter potential offenders.³⁶ The official section also published various other entries, from a glossary of approved school books right through to obituaries for teaching staff, whereby an annually updated directory of teachers and the general report on the school system were the other core elements. One stated objective of the *Schulbote* was to form a professional corps of teachers who viewed themselves as such and who could be recognised as such by others. To this end, from 1845 to 1939, a complete directory of the teaching body of the Grand Duchy was published annually in the *Schulbote*. Organised in numbered listings according to school district, including full name, place of work and level of teaching qualification (*Brevet*), the directory read like a ‘Who’s who’ of Luxembourg educators. Through these means, the *Schulbote* constructed a national professional teaching corps open to scrutiny both from the public as well as from within its own ranks. The annual directory charted the career progression of every single teacher in the country.

As the periodical was primarily directed at the primary school teachers of the Grand Duchy, the annual teacher directory also served as an address list. Those included were at least morally bound to read the *Schulbote* and to take on board the guidelines about schools and lessons.

The Board of Education let it be known that it was ‘not amused’ by any failure to fulfil these obligations. As an instrument of official education policy, the *Schulbote* also had a disciplinary function: misdemeanours were regularly documented in the publication, subjecting offenders to public pillory. Until the 1860s, the authorities were not satisfied with simply warning, admonishing or dismissing teachers who broke the behavioural codes of their profession, they also published the corresponding subpoenas in the *Schulbote*, obviously with the intention of warning about the potential consequences of such actions. Initially, these entries were anonymous, but from 1853 onward they included the full name of the offender. For example, teachers Kingten, Heintzen and May were dismissed from their positions, for non-attendance at a summer course at the *École Normale*.³⁷ Suspensions due to the “shameful burden” of drunkenness were also commonplace.³⁸

36 See: *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 2 (1845), 193.

37 *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 2 (1845), 193.

38 See: Victor Kalmes, ‘Lob und Tadel, Verurteilung und Anerkennung’, in *Ibid.*, *Vom Tagelöhnerkittel zum Gehrock*, 170–8; Daniel Tröhler, ‘Menschen, Bürger und Nationen. Kulturen der Organisation von Lernen in den modernen Schulsystemen im Westeuropa des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts’ (paper presented at the conference ‘Europa als Bildungsraum und Wissensgesellschaft’, Luxembourg, March 22–23, 2012).

Allgemeines Verzeichniß
der Personen, welche im Großherzogthum Luxemburg das Schullehrer-Amt ausüben.

Schuljahr 1845 — 46.

LISTE GÉNÉRALE
des Personnes qui exercent dans le Grand-Duché de Luxembourg les fonctions d'Instituteur.

Année scolaire 1845 — 46.

Ord- nungs- Nummer	Namen, Vornamen und Orte wo sie ihr Amt ausüben.	Rang des Brevets.
N ^o d'ordre.	NOMS, PRÉNOMS ET LIEUX OU ILS EXERCENT LEURS FONCTIONS.	Rang du Brevet.

Schulinspektion Capellen.

Inspection d'écoles de C A P E L L E N.

Inspecteur M^r ERSCHEN.

1	Bartz, Jean, à Hobscheid.	4 ^o
2	Bemtien, Pierre, à Bettange.	4 ^o
3	Bois, Nicolas, à Holzem. — Autoris. provis.	»
4	Bonifas, Charles, à Dippach.	4 ^o
5	Bourkel, Jean-Nicolas, à Mamer.	5 ^o
6	Eiffes, Michel, à Garnich.	4 ^o
7	Gaasch, Martin, à Goetzingen. — Autor. pr.	»
8	Gloodt, Nicolas, à Steinfort.	4 ^o
9	Heimes, Pierre, à Nospelt.	5 ^o
10	Heymes, Michel, à Gœblange. — Autor. pr.	»
11	Jaans, Pierre, à Kopstal.	5 ^o
12	Kettenhoven, Pierre, à Schouweiler.	4 ^o
13	Kneip, Jean, à Eyschen.	5 ^o
14	Kraft, Romain, à Septfontaines.	4 ^o

Figure 3: Schulbote_3-1846_Liste

The topic “education”: primarily an imported issue

Even though official notices took up most of the space during the first few years of publication, the editors of the *Schulbote* did also seek to fulfil their other pledge to publish pedagogical essays. This consisted almost exclusively of reprints from German and French handbooks, monographs, lexica and journals.³⁹ Three articles by the foreign authors, Raimund Hermannz, Jaques Matter and Lorenz Kellner, reprinted in the first year of publication of the new periodical as a kind of pedagogical “Trias”, determined the future strategy and direction of the publication.⁴⁰ Alongside these articles, the editors also reprinted works by other authors, including Matthias Cornelius Münch, Emil Ferdinand Vogel, Carl August Zeller and Jeremias Gotthelf, as well as extracts from *Naturlehre* by Charles Rollins edited by François Guizot, *Naturgeschichte* by Beudants, works by Charles-Auguste Salmon – a magistrate in the French Département Moselle, Chateaubriand, Augustin Théry and from the French *Inspecteur général de l'instruction primaire* Eugène Rendu.⁴¹ The sources chosen originated predominantly from Catholic regions of Germany, although publications from Catholic Silesia and from Austria could also be found in

39 The information on the authors and the original place of publication are generally incomplete and can often only be deduced with great difficulty. For one article, for example, published under the title ‘Was hat der Lehrer zu thun, damit in seiner Schule die nöthige Ruhe herrsche’, the text is recorded in the contents as having been reprinted from a ‘publication on education and upbringing’, which could possibly refer to the *Katholische Zeitschrift für Erziehung und Bildung* (Neuss, 1845–1848). See: *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 6 (1849), 109.

40 ‘Die Zucht in der Volksschule von Hermannz’, *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 1 (1844): 134. Raimund Hermannz, *Die Zucht in der Volksschule* (Freiburg: Herder, 1843); ‘Considérations empruntées à l’instituteur primaire de Matter’, *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 1 (1844): 138. Jacques Matter, *L’instituteur primaire* (Paris: Hachette, 1832); ‘Methodik des höhern Leseunterrichts’, *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 1 (1844): 150; Lorenz Kellner, *Praktischer Lehrgang für den gesamten deutschen Sprachunterricht: Ein Hand- und Hülfsbuch für Lehrer an Volksschulen und Seminaristen* (Erfurt: Otto, 1837)

41 Matthias Cornelius Münch, *Universal-Lexikon der Erziehungs- und Unterrichtslehre* (Augsburg: Schlosser, 1840–42); Emil Ferdinand Vogel, *Praktische Handbibliothek gemeinnütziger Kenntnisse für den Volksunterricht* (Leipzig: Brauns, 1845); Carl August Zeller, *Die Schulmeisterschule: Oder Anleitung für Schullehrer zur geschicktern Verwaltung ihres Amtes* (Königsberg: Degen, 1810); Jeremias Gotthelf, *Leiden und Freuden eines Schulmeisters* (1838/39); François Guizot, ed., *Oeuvres complètes de Rollin* (Paris: Lequien, 1821–26); François Beudant, Henri Milne-Edwards, and Adrien de Jussieu, *Populäre Naturgeschichte der drei Reiche: Vollständig in einem Bande mit mehr als 1000 getreuen Abbildungen* (Stuttgart: Scheible, Rieger & Sattler, 1845); Charles-Auguste Salmon, *Conférences sur les devoirs des instituteurs primaires* (Paris: Hachette, 1844); François-René de Chateaubriand, *Génie du christianisme* (1802); Augustin Théry, *Lettres sur la profession d’instituteur* (Paris: Dezobry, 1853); Eugène Rendu, *Pédagogie générale* (1869).

the *Schulbote*.⁴² Although outnumbered, reprints from French journals did also appear, in particular from the *Manuel général de l'instruction primaire*, the *Messenger de la Moselle*⁴³ and the *Revue de l'instruction* from France or from the *Guide des écoles primaires*, which originated in the town of Arlon in Belgium. The foremost pedagogical authority for the *Schulbote* was, however, the German Catholic pedagogue Lorenz Kellner “the famous educationalist [...] and great friend of teachers,” who was the chief school inspector and a cabinet minister in Trier from 1855 to 1886, thus working pretty much on the doorstep of the Grand Duchy.

The *Luxemburger Schulbote* had already published extensively a selection of works Kellner had written prior to his time in Trier. In fact, Kellner’s articles effectively provided the pedagogical framework for the periodical.⁴⁴ His move from Marienwerder in Brandenburg to Trier further increased his importance in the eyes of the editors of the *Schulbote*. The *Schulfreund* (successor to *Eifeler Schulfreund*), which Kellner co-edited with Johann Heinrich Schmitz, was also a guiding light for the editors in Luxembourg. Indeed, along with the *Magazin für Pädagogik*, published in the Catholic diocese of Rottenburg in Württemberg, the *Schulfreund* was one of the two most important pedagogical sources for the *Schulbote*.⁴⁵

42 There are, for example, articles taken from: *Monatsblatt für katholisches Unterrichts- und Erziehungswesen* (Münster), *Zeitschrift für Erziehung und Unterricht im Geiste der katholischen Kirche/Katholische Zeitschrift für Erziehung und Unterricht* (Köln), *Eifeler Schulfreund/Der Schulfreund* (Prüm/Trier), *Magazin für Pädagogik* (Rottenburg/Spaichingen), *Die Volksschule* (Stuttgart), *Württembergisches Schulwochenblatt* (Stuttgart), *Der Deutsche Schulbote* (Augsburg), *Quartalschrift für praktisches Schulwesen* (Augsburg), *Organ des Vereins katholischer Schullehrer in Bayern* (Augsburg), *Repertorium der pädagogischen Journalistik und Literatur* (München), *Sächsische Schulzeitung* (Dresden/Leipzig), *Der katholische Jugendbildner* (Breslau), *Katholisches Schulblatt* (Breslau), and *Österreichischer Schulbote* (Wien).

43 *Messenger de la Moselle: Journal d'instruction populaire* (Metz: Gerson-Lévy et Alcan, vol. 1, 1842 – vol. 13, 1853); see: *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 5 (1848) : 35.

44 Lorenz Kellner, *Praktischer Lehrgang für den gesamten deutschen Sprachunterricht* (Erfurt: Otto, 1837); *Ibid.*, *Die Pädagogik der Volksschule in Aphorismen: Ein Beitrag zur Belebung der Lehrerkonferenzen und der Berufsliebe* (Essen: Bädeker, 1850); *Ibid.*, *Pädagogische Mitteilungen aus dem Gebiete der Schule und des Lebens: Mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Bildung und Fortbildung der Volksschullehrer, für diese, ihre Leiter und Freunde* (Essen: Bädeker, 1853); *Ibid.*, *Volksschulkunde: Ein Hand- und Hilfsbuch für katholische Seminare, Lehrer und Schulaufseher* (Essen: Bädeker, 1855). See also: *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 1 (1844): 150–68; 10 (1853): 87–92; 11 (1854): 88–95; 13 (1856): 21–9; 20 (1863): 319–20; 22 (1865): 283–4.

45 *Der Schulfreund: Monatsschrift zur Förderung des Elementarschulwesens und der Jugendziehung*, im Vereine mit Schulmännern und Jugendfreunden hrsg. von J. H. Schmitz (and L. Kellner) (Prüm/Trier: F. A. Gall, Hamm: Breer & Thiemann, 1846–1922). See also: *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 2 (1845): 137–9; 15 (1858): 41–63 and 244–69; 16 (1859): 35–41 and 78–83; 17 (1860): 28–44; 18 (1861): 84–90, 140–51 and 202–8;

The selected foreign articles dealt with more generic topics, such as didactics and general teaching methods, as well as with questions of literacy in the German and French languages. A great deal of time and effort was dedicated to literacy in French in particular as French language turned out to be a problem subject in the Luxembourg primary school system. Furthermore, there were also pieces on mathematics and, to a lesser extent, on the natural sciences, schooling, school discipline and civic education.⁴⁶

The majority of know-how imported from abroad dealt with the execution of the teaching profession (both inside and outside school), teacher training, the advancement of children with special needs or education and school policy in general.⁴⁷

Reprinted articles were generally relatively recent, appearing in the *Schulbote* within only one or two years of original publication, enabling readers to gain an overview of the current state of the art in Catholic-oriented

19 (1862): 24–52, 82–109, 128–50 and 197–220; 27 (1870): 66–75. *Magazin für Pädagogik: Monatsschrift für christliche Erziehung und Bildung*, hrsg. vom Kath. Schul- und Bildungsverein der Diözese Rottenburg (Spaichingen: Verlag des Kath. Schul- und Bildungsvereins der Diözese Rottenburg, 1846–1938). See: *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 9 (1852): 298–327; 21 (1864): 226–45; 25 (1868): 291–314; 26 (1869): 64–8.

46 ‘Die Grundformen des Unterrichts’, *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 13 (1856): 114–20; ‘Pädagogische Winke’, *Ibid.* 12 (1855): 64–7; ‘Methodik des höhern Leseunterrichts’, *Ibid.* 1, (1844): 150–68; ‘Leitfaden zum praktischen Sprachunterricht’, *Ibid.* 2 (1845): 106–30; ‘Logisches und anspruchsvolles Lesen’, *Ibid.* 2 (1845): 140–3; ‘Praktischer Weg, die Schüler in den Geist und den Gebrauch der Sprache einzuführen’, *Ibid.* 9 (1852): 155–66; ‘Unterricht in der französischen Sprache’, *Ibid.* 3 (1846): 142–9; ‘Französische Grammatik’, *Ibid.* 5 (1848): 41–2; ‘De quelques problèmes de prononciation’, *Ibid.* 9 (1852): 89–90; ‘Dictées grammaticales sur les participes des verbes pronominaux’, *Ibid.* 9 (1852): 167–70; ‘Notions d’algèbre’, *Ibid.* 10 (1853): 146–52; ‘Die Giftstoffe in den drei Reichen der Natur’, *Ibid.* 4 (1847): 33–8; ‘Physique des enfants’, *Ibid.* 3 (1846): 317–23 and 328–33, and *Ibid.* 4 (1847): 33–8, 62–9, 89–99, 113–32, 149–53, 237–46, and 329–34; ‘Wie kann der Lehrer zu einem regelmäßigen Schulbesuch beitragen?’, *Ibid.* 16 (1859): 225–31; ‘Die Zucht in der Volksschule’, *Ibid.* 1 (1844): 134–8; ‘Quelle est l’influence que l’instituteur peut et doit en général exercer sur l’éducation des écoliers qui lui sont confiés, et de quelle manière peut-il de bonne heure leur inspirer le respect dû aux autorités et aux lois?’, *Ibid.* 9 (1852): 170–5.

47 ‘Conférences sur les devoirs des instituteurs primaires’, *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 4 (1847): 100–8; ‘Bild eines musterhaften Schullehrers, in der dreifachen Rücksicht, 1. In der Schule, 2. In der Kirche, 3. Im gesellschaftlichen Leben’, *Ibid.* 4 (1847): 141–5; ‘Die Würde des Lehrers innerhalb der Grenzen von vier Kardinaltugenden’, *Ibid.* 9 (1852): 340–8; ‘Bild einer guten Schule’, *Ibid.* 13 (1856), 21–29; ‘Nebenbeschäftigungen junger Landschullehrer’, *Ibid.* 3 (1846): 342–5; ‘Gartenbau als Nebenbeschäftigung des Lehrers’, *Ibid.* 12 (1855): 104–8; ‘Fortbildung des Schullehrers für sein Amt’, *Ibid.* 10 (1853): 57–9; ‘Über die Behandlung der schwachbegabten Schüler’, *Ibid.* 21 (1864): 226–45; ‘Abbé de l’Épée, Vater der Taubstummen-Bildung’, *Ibid.* 14 (1857): 47–54; ‘Die Elementarschule muss von unten gehoben werden’, *Ibid.* 11 (1854): 50–2.

pedagogical research into primary school education. Overall, the majority of sources were published in German, which is possibly, because there was a comparatively greater selection of resolutely Catholic authors and periodicals to choose from in German speaking areas than there was in France.⁴⁸ Even though articles by authors who were not overtly Catholics did occasionally appear in the *Schulbote*, there were definitely distinctly Roman Catholic overtones. The publication was geared to the Catholic primary school model. The strict alignment of the *Luxemburger Schulbote*, and thus the entire primary school system of the Grand Duchy, with the Roman Catholic dogma was underlined in 1865 when an anonymous article, probably penned by a member of the Board of Education, warmly recommended a reading list of 10 fundamentally Catholic books and journals on education.⁴⁹ The majority of these publications, from which the editors themselves took many articles for the *Schulbote*, are directly attributable to Rhineland Catholicism. The article treated as self-evident the fact that any Catholic – and as such any Luxembourg – teacher should only be permitted to call upon Catholic pedagogical literature in his quest to develop professionally. With the such a reference library to hand, the primary school teacher, supported in his pedagogical method and strengthened in his beliefs, could dedicate himself “with a light heart” to the difficult task of educating society.

The inclusion in the *Schulbote* of articles on biblical history and religious education is a further indication of the publication’s Catholic inclination. There are even prayers and poems of praise, such as that written by Westpha-

48 The article ‘Die Zucht in der Volksschule’, which opened the series of pedagogical publications in the *Schulboten* in the third issue of the first year of publication (1844), was penned by Raimund Hermannz’, director of the ‘Großherzoglich-Badisch Katholisches Schullehrer-Seminar’, a teacher training institution in Ettlingen near Karlsruhe; See: *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 1 (1844): 134–8.

49 ‘Der Lehrer als Erzieher. Pädagogische Kenntnisse des Lehrers’, *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 22 (1865): 255–62, and 23 (1866): 76–93. Alongside the afore mentioned works by Kellner and Münch the following publications are also named: Aloys Karl Ohler, *Lehrbuch der Erziehung und des Unterrichtes: Eine systematische Darstellung des gesammten katholischen Volksschulwesens für Geistliche und Lehrer* (Mainz: Kirchheim, 1861); Georg Martin Dursch, *Pädagogik, oder Wissenschaft der christlichen Erziehung auf dem Standpunkte des katholischen Glaubens* (Tübingen: Laupp & Siebeck, 1851); Hermann Rolfus and Adolph Pfister, *Real-Encyclopädie des Erziehungs- und Unterrichtswesens nach katholischen Principien* (Mainz: Kupferberg, 1863). Alongside the *Schulfreund* and the *Deutscher Schulbote*, also mentioned above, there are also: *Trier’sches Schulblatt* (Trier, 1849–1877), *Zeitschrift für Erziehung und Unterricht im Geiste der katholischen Kirche/Katholische Zeitschrift für Erziehung und Unterricht* (Düsseldorf, 1851–1919) and *Katholisches Schulblatt. Monatsschrift für Lehrerbildung und Schulerziehung in religiös-sittlichem und vaterländischem Geiste* (Breslau, 1855–1921).

lian theologian and educationalist Bernard Overberg,⁵⁰ as well as a great many Marian and Church hymns, which gradually took the place of secular songs such as “Freut euch der Schule” (17 verses) calling on pupils and teachers to rejoice in school or an ode to exam days entitled: “Sei mir gegrüßt, du Prüfungstag!”⁵¹

One particularly noteworthy example in this regard is the “Litanei von der Mutter Gottes”, which was published in the *Schulbote* in the spring of 1861 in the form of an intricately designed, separate fold-out insert. This Latin Marian hymn composed by Heinrich Oberhoffer, a Professor at the *École Normale*, for four children’s voices and a four-part male-voice choir, in its own way symbolised the intellectual and spiritual communion between the pupils and teachers of the Grand Duchy.⁵²

Although some of the religious pedagogical texts were written by authors from Luxembourg, the “articles from local teachers about the school system” that were heralded in the first edition of the *Schulbote* in 1844 never actually materialised. In the early editions of the periodical, the few local articles that did appear were confined to semi-official commentaries, reprinted forewords to Luxembourg schoolbooks or normative reports on teaching materials and curricula. Moreover, these articles were not written by primary school teachers as intended, but either by professors at the *École Normale* or by school inspectors.⁵³

In the spring of 1852, the Board of Education launched a campaign “to urge teachers to assist with the publication of the periodical.” Senior teacher, Antoine Godart, together with a group of experienced colleagues, was given the task of drafting proposals. During “negotiations about the future editing of the *Luxemburger Schulbote*” – a report on which was published in the periodical – the panel of teachers emphasised the unique nature of the pedagogical challenge they faced in educating the society of the Grand Duchy. In particular, they pointed out the very young “internal national life” of the newly formed nation as well as “the peculiar attitude” of the small country toward its neighbours. In order to face this challenge, teachers had to be equipped, with the assistance of the *Schulbote*, with a minimum of “academic

50 For further information on Overberg, see also: *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 21 (1864): 245. Some of the hymns were taken from the Luxembourg hymnal: *Himmelsharfe: Katholisches Kirchenliederbuch auch zum häuslichen Gebrauch* (Luxemburg: Bück, 1846).

51 *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 4 (1847): 42–6 and 270–1.

52 *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 18 (1861): 76.

53 J(ean) P(ierre) M(ichaelis), ‘Erklärung des metrischen Maß- und Gewichtssystems, zum Gebrauch unserer Primärschulen’, *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 2 (1845): 26–43; Ibid., ‘Brüche von Brüchen’, Ibid. 182–7; Ibid., ‘Anzeige, die Arithmetik des Herrn J.-N. Noël, übersetzt von Herrn Maeyß, betreffend’, Ibid. 267–8; Joseph Paquet, ‘Über den Unterricht in der vaterländischen Geschichte in unsern Primärschulen’, *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 5 (1848): 29–34.

training” and a sense of “uniformity” in what was still perceived to be heterogeneous education system.⁵⁴

This key text shows the importance people attached to the role of the school system, and thus to the role of teachers, in the process of nation building. As in other nations, the newly founded state of Luxembourg set itself the objective of establishing a national school system that was both genuinely original and, at the same time uniform. While it was perfectly acceptable to look to the school systems of its neighbouring states – France, Belgium, Prussia and Germany – for inspiration, the primary school system of Luxembourg still had to be clearly distinguishable from those of its neighbours. With the sense of loss associated with the separation of the territory in 1839 still keen and the limited sense of an “internal national life” in the newly formed state, the starting position for such a project in Luxembourg was understandably complex. By raising the issues of “special circumstances” and the “peculiar attitude [...] toward neighbouring countries” in their discussions, the editors of the *Schulbote* and the teacher panel were clearly making reference to the unusual language situation in Luxembourg. The retention of both official languages, German and French, after 1839 and the introduction through the Education Act of 1843 of French as the second language of the newly formed primary school system were both clearly politically motivated acts that, in view of the almost homogeneously German-speaking population, however, were not strictly necessary.⁵⁵ Post 1843, being a citizen of Luxembourg or indeed the process of becoming one, involved acquiring a perfect written and spoken command of both German and French.⁵⁶ This prerequisite of perfection in both languages is reiterated in practically all texts dedicated to language lessons in the *Schulbote*. Despite all the linguistic advantages associated with bilingualism, this stipulation was a heavy burden for the pupils and teachers of the Grand Duchy to bear.

It was in this context, under the guidance of the Board of Education, that the panel of teachers formed around Antoine Godart developed a 14-point plan to “elevate the *Schulbote*” by motivating teachers to submit articles on such varied topics as raising school attendance, improving pupils’ handwriting, dictation and memorisation exercises in both languages, the awakening

54 ‘Verhandlung über die fernere Zukunft unseres Luxemburger Schulboten’, *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 9 (1852): 99–100.

55 Siggy Koenig, ‘Luxemburg’, in *Die Bildungssysteme Europas*, ed. Hans Döbert, W. Hörner, B. von Kopp, and L.R. Reuter (Baltmannsweiler: Schneider Verlag Hohengehren, 2010), 428–41.

56 Luxembourgish had at that point not yet been recognised as an independent language. See: Fernand Fehlen, ‘Letzeburger Deutsch: Aus der Vorgeschichte der Luxemburger Sprache (1815–1830)’, in *Du Luxembourg à l’Europe: Hommages à Gilbert Trausch à l’occasion de son 80e anniversaire* (Luxembourg: Editions Saint-Paul, 2011), 571–91.

of the religious senses of teachers, improvements in the cleanliness of schools, airing of classrooms and combating the burden of drunkenness. This was a catalogue focussing on the “negative aspects of our education system” and therefore of its front-line representatives, the primary school teachers. The bleak picture these topics painted served only to increase still further the inhibitions of potential authors. In effect, rather than being asked to report on successes and examples of best practice, teachers were being called upon to write articles on how to correct the defects of the school system. In an attempt to counterbalance the huge volume of German language articles and attain the desired linguistic parity in the *Schulbote*, teachers considering a submission were also requested to address one or the other of these issues in French if at all possible. It was hoped that the resulting submissions would go a long way toward fulfilling the *Schulbote*’s obligation to act as a source of “academic training” for teachers. Teachers were also encouraged to form three-man Cantonal editorial committees, an imitative that met with only limited success until 1854.⁵⁷

With the Luxembourg school system lagging behind its neighbours in its development due to the catastrophic effects of the Belgian revolution (1830–1839), these great demands were being made of a teaching profession in a state of regeneration. In fact, in the Board of Education’s own estimation, with the exception of certain long-serving luminaries singled out for particular praise in the *Schulbote*, the teaching corps was characterised by a woeful level of education and training, as well as precarious working and living conditions. Had teachers adhered to the Board of Education’s plan, it would have entailed writing articles on disciplinary issues within their own ranks. It is therefore hardly surprising that this strategy also met with little success.

It is also no wonder that this overly ambitious reform program could only be partially realized. Although a variety of articles were either written by teachers or can be attributed to certain teachers from 1853 onwards (in particular Antoine Godart, Joseph Baldauff, Damian Kintgen, Jean Joris and Jean Tautges) the majority of these entries were reading passages, solutions to mathematical exercises or sample translations of French texts.⁵⁸ Actual pedagogical articles by Luxembourg teachers that venture beyond the direct transfer of expert subject knowledge were still nowhere to be found. This shortage of real pedagogical essays cannot be blamed on the inability of the authors because Joris, Tautges and colleagues went on to prove themselves successful as critical publishers and editors of newspapers and teacher journals. The real truth of the matter is that the editors regularly rejected articles submitted by teachers either on political grounds or because of excessive stylistic demands,

57 *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 9 (1852): 99–103; 11 (1854): 18.

58 See Jean Tautges, ‘Constructions ou rédactions d’après modèles’, *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 19 (1862): 241.

often doing so in a downright patronising tone. In 1854, the editors explained why several articles submitted by teachers had been deemed unfit for publication. The anonymous author of a manuscript entitled “Aufruf an die Lehrer des Luxemburger Landes” whose submission had already been rejected once in the spring of 1854 due to “coarse language,” also failed to garner favour with a redraft a few months later. A text dealing with the purpose of primary schooling under the title “Zweck der Volksschule”, submitted by a teacher from the relatively less developed northern region of the Grand Duchy, was classified as displaying “linguistic deficiencies.” The editors also felt that the report was aimed more at the parents of pupils than at the teachers and was therefore not suitable for publication in the *Schulbote*. Another submission was rejected because, according to the editors, it “had absolutely nothing new to add.”⁵⁹ The editors were clearly intent on ensuring that the *Schulbote* did not develop into a forum where teachers could ‘unburden’ themselves by writing and responding freely. Despite being aware of the trade-off it was entering into by taking up this position, the Board of Education still chose to run the calculated risk of discouraging prospective authors and nipping in the bud attempts by teachers to write literary articles on professional issues.

During the period from 1844 to 1930, Michel Molitor managed to marshal just 27 teachers to write for the *Schulbote*, contributing a total of 100 entries, most of which were either obituaries or articles on grammar, spelling and calligraphy. The majority of these authors were senior teaching staff with advanced teaching qualifications, who thus met with the approval of the Board of Education. Antoine Godart alone was responsible for 20 pieces, 13 of which were acceptance speeches for awards from the primary schools of the city of Luxembourg.⁶⁰ One article on teacher training written by Damian Kingten in 1865 represented the absolute exception in this regard.⁶¹ Contributions by Luxemburg primary school teachers ceased almost completely around 1870. As a result, the *Schulbote* quite simply had no authors to make meaningful contributions to the “Education” section. Despite ongoing appeals from the Board of Education, fewer and fewer teachers were willing to submit articles deemed suitable for the official publication.⁶²

59 See, for example: *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 11 (1854): 100, 132–3, 167 and 254–6.

60 Michel Molitor, *Der luxemburgische Lehrer in seiner schriftstellerischen Betätigung von 1815 – 1930* (Luxemburg: Bourg-Bourger, 1930).

61 Damian Kintgen, ‘Art und Weise wie ein Lehrer sich fortbilden soll’, *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 22 (1865): 52.

62 *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 1 (1844): 1–2.

Official publications and historical research

The teachers and editors were also placed under often considerable pressure by the Catholic Church. In particular, during the reestablishment of the school system that commenced in the beginning of the 1840s, the determination of the editors of the *Schulbote* to breathe “life” into the primary school system of the Grand Duchy proved to be more resilient than at first expected. At the beginning of 1846, the Board of Education was again forced to reiterate the entire purpose of the *Schulbote* because some school masters were apparently under “misapprehensions.”⁶³ The trigger for this explanation was a complaint by the Apostolic Vicar, himself a member of the Board, against an article published in the periodical. The article in question was an excerpt from *Der Schullehrer in seiner Vollkommenheit* (1837) by Heinrich Gotthard Stamm, which the editors had published in the autumn of 1845 with the express intention of raising issues for discussion at future teacher conferences and in the hope of maybe even providing some readers with the impetus to contribute their own pedagogical articles for publication in the *Schulbote*.⁶⁴ Bishop Laurent, however, objected to the piece. He felt that it could be interpreted as encouraging rash responses lacking due deliberation and reflection and was thus unsuitable for circulation to the primary school teachers of Luxembourg on religious grounds.⁶⁵ Going to great lengths to avoid any reference to the party actually responsible, the editors published a somewhat awkward syllibine correction, restating the nature of the publication, and warning against imprudent interpretations of the “in no way official” essay section “Education” as an invitation to independent thought. The editors went on to sensor themselves further, pledging that the *Schulbote* would in future only publish articles that were “commendable in every respect, not only from a pedagogical but also from a moral and religious standpoint and the circulation of which could be seen as truly beneficial.”⁶⁶ This left next to no scope for pedagogical innovation.

The establishment of an independent teacher press

This restrictive practice, which showed little understanding for the concerns and needs of the teachers on the ground, was ultimately the catalyst for the

63 *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 3 (1846): 3–4.

64 *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 2 (1845): 246–9. Heinrich Gotthard Stamm, *Der Schullehrer in seiner Vollkommenheit, oder Anleitung zur Fortbildung der Schullehrer im Amte und Berufsleben, nebst Aufgaben und Winken für Lehrervereine zu einer allseitigen Vervollkommnung des Schullehrerstandes* (Mainz: Kupferberg, 1837).

65 ANLux, IP-729: Commission de l’instruction publique. Comité permanent. Procès-verbaux (1844–1857): Séance du 26 décembre 1845.

66 *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 3 (1846): 3–4.

teachers' decision to create an independent teaching press that dealt with the spectrum of topics relating to "Education" far more extensively than the official school periodical. Significantly, these publications were founded by teachers who had previously written numerous articles for the *Schulbote*. Jean Tautges, who published the *Luxemburger Schulblatt* from 1863, had been a longstanding contributor to the *Schulbote* and would go on to be published in the periodical again in later years. Effectively, therefore, the official publication served as a training ground for particularly committed and motivated teachers, for whom, however, the limited journalistic freedom afforded to them at the *Schulbote* was ultimately too restrictive in the long run.

The *Luxemburger Schulblatt* identified itself as a "Lehrerbote" and as such, consciously set itself up as a direct alternative to the official *Luxemburger Schulbote*. Although pedagogical articles did appear in this new publication, it was the stated intention of the *Schulblatt* neither to become an "exclusively pedagogical publication" nor, in contrast to the *Schulbote*, to primarily publish scholarly essays from abroad. A further distinction between the *Schulblatt* and the official periodical was that it understood its role as that of both a "Lehrerzeitung" and a "Correspondenzblatt" – in other words, as both a newspaper for teachers and as a medium through which teachers could "enter intellectual dialogue with one another" and freely exchange their "thoughts and experiences." The intention was to make a contribution to "teacher training" based on the principles of collegiality and mutual support.⁶⁷ This represented a departure, as the *Schulbote* was certainly not a "Correspondenzblatt", having never sought to act as an open forum for intellectual discourse between teachers. With the exception of the issue of literacy in German and French, which would never be far from the surface of topical discussions in the context of Luxembourg, the *Schulbote* steered clear of debates on truly fundamental pedagogical or school policy issues.⁶⁸

The *Luxemburger Schulblatt* remained in print only briefly, until 1864. Its successor, *Fortschritt*, first published in 1870, would suffer a similar fate, existing for just two years.⁶⁹ In fact, it was not until the foundation of the *Luxemburger Schulfreund* (1872–1939) and the *Pädagogischer Sprechsaal*

67 *Luxemburger Schulblatt*. Herausgegeben von mehrern Schullehrern des Großherzogthums, Nr. 1, 15. Januar 1863, 1–3 and Nr. 5, 15. März 1863, 65. On the phenomenon of knowledge exchange between teachers, see: Heidemarie Kemnitz, 'Lehrerverein und Berufsidentifikation in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts', in *Professionalisierung pädagogischer Berufe im historischen Prozess*, ed. Hans-Jürgen Apel, K.-P. Horn, P. Lundgreen, and U. Sandfuchs (Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt, 1999), 111–23.

68 See 'Die beiden Sprachen in der Primärschule', in *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 26 (1869): 56–61, and 'Die gewöhnlichsten Fehler der Luxemburger gegen die deutsche Sprachlehre und Stylistik', *Ibid.* 24 (1867): 86–131.

69 Joseph Kanivé, 'Revues pédagogiques 1839–1939', *Luxemburger Lehrerzeitung* 34 (1939): 236–44.

(1884–1901) that the free teaching press truly gained a foothold in Luxembourg.⁷⁰ Nevertheless *Schulblatt* and *Fortschritt* represented the first attempt by the teachers of Luxembourg to institute a form of “permanent communication.”⁷¹ In so doing, both publications were laying claim to a new form of public arena.

The official *Schulbote*, for the most part, opted to ignore these new publications. Internally, however, the board of education was keeping a very close eye on developments in the new free teaching press. One indication of this effort is a complaint registered by the Board of Education with the *Directeur général de la Justice* in 1864 against an article by former primary school teacher, Jean Joris, in the *L'Union* newspaper, who claimed that many teachers looked forward to *Schulbote* “with the same sense of dread as they would a Russian order of deportation to Siberia” because it only ever expressed “the viewpoint and will of the higher echelons of the school authorities.”⁷² In the same year, Jean-Pierre Michaelis, Secretary of the Permanent Committee, wrote an article in the *Schulbote* defending himself against the *Luxemburger Schulblatt*’s “sharp criticism” of the pension legislation of 1863.⁷³

These examples clearly demonstrate not only the apparent unpopularity of the *Schulbote* amongst its readership, but also the growing self-confidence of the Luxembourg teaching corps, which was increasingly intent on freeing itself from the oppressive paternalism of the official publication. There are, therefore, several indications that the period of crisis suffered by the *Schulbote* from 1870 to 1900 outlined above can be directly attributed to the inception of a free teaching press. Attempting to serve both as an official publication and a periodical for teachers was akin to attempting to put a square peg into a round hole – it was simply bound to come to a head eventually. In effect, one and the same publication was acting as the mouthpiece for the authoritarian Board of Education, which was not afraid to lecture or sanc-

70 *Luxemburger Schulfreund*, since 1909: *Luxemburger Schulfreund. Bulletin de l'Union catholique des instituteurs et institutrices du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg* (Luxembourg: UCIL, vol. 1, 1872 – vol. 68, 1939); *Pädagogischer Sprechsaal. Organ der Luxemburger Volksschule und ihrer Lehrer*. Hrsg. von mehreren Schulmännern (Luxembourg: Bück, vol. 1, 1884 – vol. 18, 1901). See: Edouard Kirsch, ed., *La loi Braun de 1912: La libération de l'instituteur. Recueil de mémoires publiées à l'occasion du 75e anniversaire de la loi scolaire de 1912* (Luxembourg: Editions de la FGIL, 1987), 45–58.

71 Hans-Erich Bödeker, ‘Die bürgerliche Literatur- und Mediengesellschaft’, in *Handbuch der deutschen Bildungsgeschichte, Bd. II: Vom späten 17. Jahrhundert bis zur Neuordnung Deutschlands um 1800*, ed. Notker Hammerstein and Ulrich Herrmann (München: C. H. Beck, 2005), 516.

72 ANLux, H-478: Commission d’instruction et inspecteurs d’écoles – composition, personnel (1857–1880), 13.08.1864.

73 ‘Über das Pensionsgesetz vom 11. Dezember 1863’, in *Der Luxemburger Schulbote* 21 (1864): 74–81.

tion, while at the same time claiming to be a well-meaning friend to teachers. Although attempts were made to broaden the editorial scope of the *Schulbote* and to persuade teachers to get involved, in the end the editors proved unwilling or perhaps simply unable to truly take the newly articulated interests of Luxembourg primary teachers into account and – figuratively speaking – to let go of the *Schulbote*, i.e. to allow it to pass into the hands of the teachers. The *Schulbote* therefore remained a ‘top-down’ publication, through which information was passed from the highest echelons of the school authorities above to the teachers below. During the 1860s, this one-dimensional press apparatus was augmented by new publications written by teachers for their colleagues, facilitating multidimensional public communication about matters concerning education and teaching.

The irony here lies in the fact that it was actually the re-establishment of the primary school system from 1843 onwards that effectively equipped the teachers of Luxembourg for emancipation. Through the introduction and implementation of professional standards in both teacher training and the execution of the teaching profession, the Education Act of 1843 created a professional corps of teachers. In other words, the Board of Education was itself responsible for the creation of teaching as a profession. Published on a regular basis and addressed to the teachers of the Grand Duchy, the *Schulbote* played an essential role in this development. In a process spanning several decades, the teachers of the Grand Duchy acquired not only academic training but also an educational, professional and political awareness, which enabled them to pursue new avenues that would ultimately take them beyond the *Schulbote* and on to the establishment of their own publications.

The plan Michel-Nicolas Müller had envisioned in 1829 was realized in 1844. For nigh on a hundred years, the Grand Duchy possessed its own school periodical that was both Catholic and published in French and German. The publication could certainly have been more inspirational and dynamic. It may even have been possible for the *Schulbote* to become “l’organe vivant de la pédagogie luxembourgeoise.”⁷⁴ Due to the setup of this official publication, however, there was very little room for manoeuvre in this respect. In reality, therefore, the *Schulbote* could just as easily have borne its originally intended title, *Mémorial des instituteurs*, after all. The indisputable legacy of the periodical, however, is its contribution to the dissemination of pedagogical expertise in Luxembourg. Another crucial role of the *Schulbote* was that of a pioneer, laying the foundations for a teaching press in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg.

74 Kanivé, ‘Revue pédagogique’, 238.