

true intent of her "dear brother" Edward. And well she might so recognize them, for they were used in the training of Edward, and probably were developed out of the experience of his schoolmasters. Because of her own connection with Edward and his teachers, Elizabeth would have been trained to sympathy with these ideas. Among these schoolmasters, it is now apparent that we must award the chief praise or blame for these changes in the curriculum to Richard Cox. He had been master at Eton, sending about 1530 a copy of that curriculum to Saffron Walden. As Leach shows, Cox won at Eton the distinction of being "the best schole master of our time" but also "the greatest beater."⁴⁹ We hear that he was on the commission which prepared the authorized grammar to serve as a basis for essential uniformity in the grammar schools. He was one of three members to shape the cathedrals, and consequently the curricula of their grammar schools, on the new foundation. It should therefore be no matter of surprise that these schools receive the Eton curriculum as their own. Cox was in 1544 put in charge of the education of Prince Edward, and in that education we have seen the Eton curriculum used as a basis, and are now seeing some of the resultant modifications appearing in the curricula of Edward's reign. We shall see that these modifications were also inserted in the curricula at Winchester, Eton, and regularly elsewhere. They were the official idea of the proper procedure. Cox, Cheke, Cheke's pupil Ascham, and his pupil Grindal, had trained Edward and Elizabeth; and Edward and Elizabeth had been convinced that the system which had produced such satisfactory results upon themselves was likewise the best for the grammar schools.

So the curriculum is now in the reign of Edward fully formed. Mary could not completely undo what had been done, and Elizabeth returned to the system of Edward. We shall see that for the remainder of the sixteenth century and beyond, this is basically the approved curriculum.

⁴⁹ V. C. H., *Buckingham*, Vol. II, p. 181.