MATTHEW ARNOLD'S IDEA OF EDUCATION

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.

MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE

David Giltner

1954

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

MATTHEW ARNOLD'S IDEA OF EDUCATION

presented by

David Giltner

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

Master's degree in English

Elwood P. Lawrence
Major professor

Date March 13, 1954.

MATTHEW ARNOLD'S IDEA OF EDUCATION

By

David Giltner

A THESIS

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of Michigan
State College of Agriculture and Applied Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of English

1954

THESIS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MATTHEW ARNOLD'S IDEA OF EDUCATION

Introduction

Matthew Arnold was not only a poet, essayist, critic and lecturer; he was an Inspector of Schools for the British Government from 1851 to 1886. During his years of service he submitted reports to the Department of Education in which he made statements revealing what he thought about many phases of education in England, France, Germany, Holland, and Switzerland. It is my purpose in writing this essay to show that Matthew Arnold was as articulate an authority in matters of education as he was in matters of poetry, criticism, and culture. If we know what he had to say about schools, instructors, and courses during his long and intimate association with them, we may be better able to understand the man and his literature. This understanding will be more important to the student of Matthew Arnold's writings than will be the incidental information concerning the school systems of some of the European countries between 1851 and 1886. For example, I am not concerned with the fact that elementary education, in England, did not become compulsory until 1880. What is important to me, as a student of English literature, is that Matthew Arnold, the critic and poet, in expressing his studied opinions on the matter of compulsory education, revealed a concern for the state of culture in English society which flowered in the great critical essays that form the portion of his expression which we accept as a part of English literature.

Arnold's permanent claim to honor seems to rest in the fact that he accepted the modern age, with some sadness, it is true, but genuinely and generously. He mastered his regret over what was disappearing and welcomed

the present with courage. How he did this will be seen in his official expressions as well as in his literature. He devoted himself to the preservation of what he thought was the ideal spiritual and intellectual life of the past and became a mediator between the old and the new. He is contrasted with Newman on the one hand, and the followers of art for art's sake on the other. He did not shrink from the apparent anarchy of modern life into seeking spiritual ideals through medieval formulas and standards of truth, nor did he turn to dreams, and a House Beautiful far from the crudities of modern life. Arnold had faith in the instincts that civilized men had developed in common, and he found in the working of these instincts the gradual, continuous realization of the ideal society.

In 1851 Matthew Arnold was appointed as one of three inspectors of schools. For the next thirty-five, and most important, years of his life Arnold held this tedious post. And although his duties and his recommendations as an inspector are often slighted in accounts of his life and importance to the age in which he lived, this experience greatly affected and influenced the substance of his own writings, and his ideas were in some measure incorporated in the Education Acts of 1870, 1902 and 1903.[1]

I do not propose to present a detailed description of the conditions of schools, or the state of education in Victorian England. A part of Matthew Arnold's duties as an inspector of schools was to report from time to time upon their general condition. These voluminous reports, representing thirty years labor, have been published. Though for the most part they are simply routine reporting, they occasionally reveal an opinion or idea of Arnold's

---

1. The Reinterpretation of Victorian Literature, ed. by Joseph E. Baker, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1950, pp. 102-103.

on what a particular phase of education should be. It is my purpose to discover and to present these ideas from his Reports in particular, and also from his critical prose writings which are generally familiar to all students of Victorian literature. It will be necessary, however, to give a chronological summary of the controversies and proposals by various groups and the legislative acts which led to the establishment of the particular school system existing at the time Arnold was appointed as inspector.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century in England an intelligent child of parents whose means were modest, yet who desired that the child should learn his letters and whatever else he could acquire educationally would probably be exposed to one or more of several types of schools then in existence for the instruction of the poor. At Sunday-school he might learn to read after a fashion and he might possibly learn to write if he could stay with it long enough.[2] If the parents wanted him to attend school on weekdays he might be sent to a Dame School, where, if he could stand the close quarters, the foul air, and the discipline of the rod, he could probably, for ½d. a week, learn to read, or in the case of girls, to sew. These were private schools whose single teacher almost always supplemented his income by shopkeeping, sewing, or washing.[3]

The majority of the boys and girls in large cities, however, attended Common Day Schools which were kept by a master or mistress who made his or her living by this work. The charge was higher than that of the Dame Schools, from 6d. to 9d. a week. "Too often the teacher's qualification for his job

---

2. J.L. Hammond and Barbara Hammond, The Age of the Chartists, 1832-1854: A Study of Discontent, London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1930, p. 118.

3. Ibid., p. 169.

was that noted in the case of the old men who kept Dame Schools: unfitness for every other."[4] These schools professed to teach reading, writing and arithmetic. Few of them accomplished this aim; most of them were overcrowded, dirty and disorderly. There was no compulsory attendance in any of these schools except for children working in factories and there the schooling existed chiefly on paper.[5]

Another type of school came into being when, at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries, two men, Dr. Andrew Bell, a Church of England clergyman in Madras, and Joseph Lancaster, a Quaker in London, invented separately new and similar systems of teaching. These systems involved the use of monitors, or pupil-teachers, whereby one schoolmaster might conduct a school of 1,000 children in which he merely presided while scholars taught each other in small groups. Education was thereby greatly cheapened, and the systems became popular in the large towns.[6] Societies were formed among educational enthusiasts, according to their religion mostly, and grouped themselves behind these two men. The Lancastrian Society (1808) afterwards called the British and Foreign School Society (1814), was nonsectarian, and drew its main support from Whigs and Nonconformists. The schools organized by this society were those which Matthew Arnold was called upon to inspect at a later date. In these schools the Bible was taught without comment. The Society which followed Dr. Bell was called "The National

---

4. Ibid., p. 169.

5. Ibid., p. 170.

6. Ibid., p. 177.

Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church," and taught Church doctrines in addition to the Scriptures.[7] It is understandable that the National Society appealed more to the upper classes, who were not very friendly to the education of the poor, but who preferred to see the people educated by the National Church if they must be educated at all. This society, therefore, was subscribed to by wealthier people and became the more prosperous of the two.

In 1833 the new Parliament attempted, without success,, to obtain a census of school children in England to determine the number of children attending private schools as opposed to those attending schools which were partially endowed. Private Statistical Societies in Manchester, Salford, Liverpool, Bury, Bolton, Ashton, Dukinfield, Stalybridge, York, Birmingham and Bristol conducted their own investigations with much better results. It was found that the state of popular education was extremely poor between 1834 and 1837 and that most of the students still attended private schools, yet public interest centered on the work and the rivalries of the two Societies.[8] In 1833 the Government had decided to make a grant in aid to these Societies. This measure was opposed by Cobbett because he thought that mass education would produce a race of idlers, and by "Radicals like Hume, Fielden, Potter, and Brotherton, who wanted a national system, and thought this a harmful substitute."[9] Nevertheless a satisfactory grant was established to be distributed between the two Societies. The National Society received the larger grant because it was larger and more prosperous.

---

7. Ibid., pp. 178-179.

8. Ibid., p. 180.

9. Ibid., p. 182.

In 1839 Lord John Russell proposed a renewal of aid to the Societies and also the establishment of a Normal School for the training of teachers in these schools. A committee of four Cabinet Ministers was appointed to superintend the application of Grants. A Secretary and two Inspectors were appointed to "disseminate a knowledge of improvements among those engaged in education and to keep the Committee informed of progress."[10] Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth was the first Secretary, and England owes as much gratitude to him as to anyone for establishing schools for its children. For several years his proposals for educational reform were hampered by the conflicting interests of the Church of England and the Dissenters, but in 1846 when the Whigs again came into power he pressed his reforms on more tolerant ears.[11]

At this time in England statistics on illiteracy were beginning to alarm politicians. A conservative estimate was that about 40% of the adult population was illiterate, and had remained so for the past ten years even though the number of schools had greatly increased. With this ammunition in hand the Education Committee made elaborate proposals for the reorganization of school-teaching and the improvement of the teachers' position. Monitors were to be replaced by pupil teachers, who were apprenticed for five years. Grants were to be given to them and to the teachers who trained them. After their apprenticeship, further training for pupil teachers was to be encouraged by a system of scholarships and grants. After this training they were to enjoy additions to their salaries and retirement benefits through grants. The establishment of pupil teachers and additions to salaries were to depend upon a favorable report from an inspector, who conducted, each year, the examination

---

10. Ibid., p. 185.

11. Ibid., p. 203.

of the pupil teachers. This marked the first control which the Education Committee was to have over the schools it inspected and subsidized.[12]

These proposals, which were incorporated into the Minutes of 1846, were not an attempt to mould English education into a national scheme. They were designed to improve existing schools without altering the existing basis. National and British schools were equally qualified to claim and obtain the benefits as before.

> But this was not the aspect under which Dissenting circles represented by the Voluntaryist movement saw the proposals. The Church was the enemy. The Church, having more schools and less objection to subsidies, stood to gain by the grants; therefore talk of equality was absurd, and the proposals must be fought.[13]

And so it went that whenever educational reform was proposed, the Dissenters objected on the grounds that half the tax-payers were Nonconformists and yet, the bulk of the school grant went to the Church of England, National schools. The Dissenters also argued that the more State control and aid there was, the stronger the National Church became. On the other hand, the National Church objected to any religious teaching in schools supported by the State which was not the Church of England doctrine. The road to educational reform in England was long and difficult because of these religious interests. The conditions in the schools did not improve. The number of schools increaded, but the instruction was geared to satisfying the inspectors' examinations, and although a child might have answers on the tip of his tongue he probably would not have any notion of the meanings of the words he uttered. It was found that after the average child had finished school he

---

12. Ibid., pp. 203-204.

13. Ibid., pp. 204-205.

was unable to read an unfamiliar passage in any book with even the slightest ease or correctness.

There was one favorable aspect of educational reform even though it was offset by the religious controversy. The humanists who opposed the Industrial Revolution in favor of art, culture, and religion were in accord with the new individual opportunists in the matter of extending and reforming education. It was agreed that the educated man could gain more and contribute more to the well-being of society than the ignorant man. "Men who differed on almost every other question agreed on this."[14]

One of the great tragedies of the age was that the most capable men in the government devoted their energies to other reforms and did not tamper with education for fear of becoming involved in religious controversy. Their attitude kept England behind the leading nations of Europe in educational progress, and even though they repealed the Corn Laws and extended the franchise to the working man, he had grown up in an atmosphere of reform, ill-educated and almost wholly irreligious.[15]

This was the state of popular education in England when, in 1851, Matthew Arnold was appointed as an inspector of certain schools in the British and Foreign School Society. During the course of his career as inspector Arnold reported on one hundred and four of these British schools. They comprised part of the system introduced under the Minutes of 1846-1847 giving grants to these schools. The first chapter of this essay will begin with a presentation of Matthew Arnold's ideas on how to improve the British schools through proper financing, and later, as other ideas are discussed a comparison

---

14. Ibid., p. 214.

15. Ibid., p. 216.

will arise in the minds of those who associate education in England in the nineteenth century with the progressive proposals of Herbert Spencer.

> ... one may see how Arnold's concept of culture infused educational theory with an ideal missing from the great empiricist's proposals. In some measure, it was incorporated in the great Education Act of 1870 constructed by Arnold's brother-in-law, William Forster. Ten years later, in 1880, the Compulsory Education Act definitely legalized the improvements in popular education and made education generally mandatory throughout the realm. The appointment (1894) and the report (1896) of the Bryce Commission with the enactment of the Education Acts of 1902 and 1903 corrected and adjusted provisions of the 1870 act.[16]

16. Reinterpretation, p. 103.

Chapter I

The School System

The Government grants to the British and Foreign School Society made up about half the school operating fund. The other half was called "school pence," which was a fee paid by the pupils' parents. These fees ranged from about 2d to 6d per week according to the parents' incomes. The payments, themselves, excluded the very poor children. The children of the middle and upper-middle classes attended either the National Schools or private schools. The children who attended the British schools were from the lower middle class of society, and consisted mostly of Congregationalists and Wesleyan Methodists whose churches established building grants for these schools. The appropriate religious instruction was given in each, and the Wesleyans, with more strict adherence to their particular religious dogma, began to grow apart from the British system in the maintenance and direction of their schools, even though they received a part of the government grant authorized for the British School Society. Half of the operating fund of all these schools, however, was the fee paid by the parents according to their incomes, and the parents of pupils whose fees were highest expected the teacher to spend more time with their children because they were contributing most to his salary. This situation disordered the instruction in the schools so that the children of the lower middle class were not getting the proper discipline in school and Arnold felt that if these children could not get it there, they would get it nowhere. He thought that the children of the upper and lower classes of society were given more proper educational attention in the home than were those of the lower middle class.[17] Arnold does not say why he believes this

---

17. Matthew Arnold, Reports on Elementary Schools, 1852-1882, ed. by Sir Francis Sandford, London: Macmillan and Company, 1889, pp. 1-8.

to be true; however, one may assume that because of his distaste for the blatant narrow-mindedness of the middle class society in England, he thought that the middle class parents were too busy with more urbane and profitable matters to attend to the cultural discipline of their own children.

Since some of the children were admitted at a lower rate of payment than others, those who paid the least were taught the least. The poorer children were neglected, however bright they might have been. "A plan more calculated to derange and dislocate the instruction of a school it would be difficult to imagine; and the teacher who is responsible for that instruction ought, in my opinion, always to decline to adopt it."[18]

The support of thepopular schools was a problem for which Arnold had no ready solution; however, he did see the immense inequity of the prevailing system and revealed his humanitarian feelings and his advanced sensibility concerning the matter. He suggested that the Government might look to other communities for models. He pointed out that an iron company[19] in Wales supported a school for workers' children through voluntary weekly deductions in pay. This helped to defray the expenses of the school library and the medical attendants. The same deduction was made regardless of the worker's marital state, or the number of children in the family. In this manner all children of the community could be sent to school. Arnold thought that this system should be tried in English industrial towns. He did, however, feel that the Welsh should be taught English in their own schools for the better political and social welfare of the Kingdom, and that, eventually, as in Cornwall, their language should be English.[20]

---

18. Ibid., pp. 8-9.

19. Llynvi Iron Company, Maesteg, South Wales.

20. Reports, pp. 11-15.

Later, in 1867, after he had visited elementary schools on the Continent, he reported that in the compulsory school system of Prussia all children paid an average of a penny per week. The French children had to pay more even than the English, but indigent children could attend school free. The paying parents, however, objected to this system and the French Minister of Education thought that all children should attend the popular schools free of charge, not as paupers, but as the children of taxpayers. Arnold favored the Prussian plan of low, weekly payments by the children's parents.[21]

Little as Arnold does say about the financing of schools we may understand that he did not think the English plan either reasonable or fair and that the systems in France and Prussia were more satisfactory, since the payments which some of the parents in England had to make were becoming altogether too high.

-2-

In commenting on the general living and working conditions in the schools subject to his inspection, Arnold was, in a sense, contributing to the great body of Victorian literature which concerned itself with social reform. He said that the conditions in the London schools were on the average poorer than in the country schools. The facilities for space, desks, ventilating and playgrounds were most inadequate where they were needed most. He regretted that the Minister of Education did not visit the schools more often, as he did the National (Church of England) schools. And he was a firm believer in having the pupil stay at his desk to learn, which could not always be the case in over-crowded schools.[22]

---

21. Ibid., p. 127.

22. Ibid., pp. 41-52.

He thought that it would pay the Government to paint the schools more often. The schools in Paris were much neater and cleaner than those in London. The London schools would not pass inspection by a Parisian.[23]

In 1853 Arnold expressed the English need for many more schools for infants (children under eight years of age). There were crowded classrooms in most of his elementary schools, more so in the British than the Wesleyan schools. He also believed that all elementary schools should mix the sexes in all classes except playground. The Wesleyans adhered more closely to this plan than the British. And Arnold thought that female teachers should be employed exclusively in the teaching of infants.[24] He was constantly complaining that his schools were so much inferior to the National Church schools in both methods and results. The only favorable comparison he could make between the lower middle-class, lower class schools and the middle-class National schools was their mutual freedom from private speculation. He compared two letters written by two students to their parents. One letter was from one of the pupils in his schools and the other was from a pupil in a private middle-class school where instruction and results were much better. The grammar, thought and diction were so much superior in the latter that he remarked in a report of the year 1867; "To those who ask what is the difference between a public and a private school, I answer, it is this."[25]

After his second visit to the Continental schools in 1865, secondary schools this time, Arnold returned to find his schools in worse condition than the first time he returned in 1859. He blamed the Act of 1862 which

---

23. Reports, pp. 84-86.

24. Ibid., pp. 16-17.

25. Ibid., p. 133.

revised the Act of 1846, and reduced the rate of public expenditure on schools. It also reduced the rate of pupil-teachers, whom Arnold considered to be the "sinews of public instruction," from one to every thirty-six scholars in 1861 to one to fifty-four in 1866. And the principal teacher spent less time with the pupil-teacher because the former was now receiving less pay.[26] This situation encouraged a slack attitude throughout the schools, and Arnold not only blamed legislation but also the ignorance and lack of initiative on the part of the school managers and businessmen for this unhappy state of affairs.[27]

In 1859 after touring the primary schools of Holland Arnold remarked in his report that he thought the inspection and the instruction in these schools were the best that he had ever seen. Their examinations were designed to discover "distinguished culture."[28] And the teachers and masters commanded the highest respect in the community and were well paid and happy.[29] The primary schools in Holland were not denominational because there was no dogmatic instruction in the popular educational system, and they were controlled by the Government. The legislation of 1806 provided for the best pupils to stay on for two or three years free if they would consent to become teachers. Arnold thought that it was from this particular Act in Holland that England got the notion of its pupil-teacher system.[30]

One of Arnold's last remarks concerning the well-being of the elementary

---

26. Ibid., pp. 109-112.

27. Ibid., pp. 116-117.

28. Matthew Arnold, The Popular Education of France With Notices of That of Holland and Switzerland, London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1861, p. 203.

29. Ibid., pp. 202-203.

30. Ibid., p. 204.

students was in a report for the year 1882, when he found it remarkable that the New Code, resulting from the legislation of 1870, had relieved much of the strain on the younger children's minds imposed by continual additions to the curricula of the higher grades or forms. Whereas, previously, discounting the fact that each new crop of beginners was always the same age and of the same capacity for learning, there were constantly being added new subjects and programs, the New Code took into account Arnold's suggestion that too many things were being taught the child, and not the best things.[31]

-3-

Before 1880 when elementary education was made compulsory in England Arnold had raised his voice in behalf of the cause time and again. In 1853, speaking of the very poor who could not afford to send their children to school, Arnold remarked, "It is not the high payments alone which deter them; all I say is, as to the general question of the education of the masses, that they deter them in many cases. But it is my firm conviction, that education will never, any more than vaccination, become universal in this country, until it is made compulsory."[32]

By 1867 Arnold found the idea of compulsory education becoming a familiar one in his district. He did not think that a law making elementary education compulsory for all English children would be a hard law to pass. The difficult part would be in making it work. "In Prussia, which is so often quoted, education is not flourishing because it is compulsory, it is compulsory because it is flourishing."[33] There, people prize instruction and culture

---

31. Reports, pp. 255-256.

32. Ibid., pp. 26-27.

33. Ibid., p. 120.

and therefore it is not difficult to impose it. In England people prize "... politics, station, business, money-making, pleasure, and many other things;"[34] Although an impulse may make a law, the English people must cease to prize these other things above culture before the law will work. The friends of instruction must first convince the nation of its value.[35]

Arnold suggested that one step in stimulating the necessary conditions under which compulsory education might flourish would be to make a wider circulation of the yearly volume of minutes and reports issued by the Committee of Council on Education. This would stimulate abstract discussion among teachers and townspeople instead of exclusively within the Government where the school issues could not be settled upon their merits.[36]

We have noted, before, Arnold's admiration for the conditions and the instruction in some of the Continental school systems. What made these schools so much better than the English popular schools? Was it because education was compulsory in these countries? It was not compulsory in Holland and France. "It may be broadly said, that in all the civilized States of Continental Europe education is compulsory except in France and Holland.[37] And yet Arnold recognized the elementary school system of Holland as being one of the best in existence. It could not be said, absolutely, then, that compulsory education was the answer to a good school system. But "... in general, where popular education is most prosperous, there it is also compulsory."[38] In Arnold's belief, compulsory education did not cause a school

---

34. Ibid., p. 120.

35. Ibid., p. 120.

36. Ibid., pp. 149-150.

37. Matthew Arnold, Higher Schools and Universities in Germany, London: Macmillan and Company, 1882, p. x.

38. Ibid., p. xi.

system to be prosperous, but in general he thought that the two went hand in hand.

The idea of compulsory education was such a part of Arnold's general and historical notion of what made a good school system that it is necessary to examine this broad notion in order to understand why, in England, there was such a lack of zeal for this means of bettering the schools. I think that the problem centered around the fact that in England there was a distinction between the National Church schools and the British and Wesleyan schools. Naturally, the Government would be more concerned with the National Church and the upper middle class than it would be with the lower-class Dissenters. There was not this same problem on the Continent where Arnold spent nearly seven months in 1865. He said that, "... on the Continent generally, everywhere except in Holland, the public elementary school is denominational, and its teaching religious as well as secular."[39] Arnold gave this broad, rather startling, explanation of why he thought England lacked the traditional zeal among the people for compulsory education: The Reformation brought the Renaissance, with its Classical learning and better schools, to Germany and Holland. All of the great reformers except Luther were advocates of Classical learning, and they were the greatest intellectuals of their time. But in England the reformers were second-rate men. The great intellects were Anglican, Renaissance men like Shakespeare, Bacon and Spenser who were not reformers or educators in a strict sense. However, Protestantism soon petrified in Germany just as Catholicism had done and the schools decayed. It was not until Friedrich August Wolf in 1783 organized

---

39. Ibid., p. x.

In Germany Arnold was amazed at, and touched by the quality of teaching and the way in which the pupils were being formed by it. In England, he complained, the teaching was so little formative; giving the power to read the newspapers, write a letter, "cast accounts," and "... gives them a certain number of pieces of knowledge, but it does little to touch their nature for good and to mould them."[16] There was no full cultivation of taste and feeling, as in Germany where, for example, religious teaching went right to the Bible and discussed its philosophy. It did not teach Lutheran dogma.[17]

As to the question of whether or not teaching should be concentrated upon preparing the child in the lower-class elementary schools to face some trade or occupation in particular, or life in general, Arnold thought that for the lower class there should be some compromise. The beginnings of a liberal culture should be the same for those who have humanistic aptitudes and those who have aptitudes for studying the laws of nature. They should be exposed to some of both. After this exposure, more freedom of choice could be allowed in the upper grades where the student could pursue some special aptitude.[18]

To teachers in general Arnold said "... every man shall be set to teach that branch which he has thoroughly mastered, and shall not be allowed to teach any that he has not."[19]

-2-

No man can be "set to teach" if he does not have the proper texts at his

---

16. Ibid., p. 14.
17. Ibid., p. 14.
18. Higher Schools, pp. 176-177.
19. Ibid., p. 178.

disposal. In the English elementary, popular schools of 1853 Arnold deplored the lack of standarization, classification and arrangement of school books. There was no authoritative text on any subject. A student was liable to come into contact with several different systemsof presenting grammar, for instance, to his own unfortunate confusion. There was not even standarization of terms, and Arnold believed that the Education Department on Elementary Schools should correct the situation as quickly as possible.[20]

The children who could afford them did, and should buy their books, but there were many who could not afford to buy them. Consequently, some went without. Arnold thought that there should be in all schools a "public stock" of books which should supply those who could not afford them. The teachers and managers could judge who these children were.[21]

After his first tour of Continental schools Arnold observed in 1860 that what France and England needed was a good elementary reading book, or even a course of them. They could get no humanizing instruction from their grammars and scientific fact books, or the "third-rate" literature in their reading books. The reading for English children should be selected from the best English masters. This, he said, was the only way to learn to read, and it would also supply the best instruction for these children.[22]

Reporting on secondary education in Germany in 1865 Arnold noted that the Prussian masters chose the books, which in turn had to be approved by a Provincial Board. And in case the book was being introduced for the first time the Board must refer it to Education Minister and his council. If it

---

20. Reports, pp. 27-28.

21. Ibid., pp. 76-77.

22. Ibid., pp. 86-89.

was approved for one Gymnasium, it could be used by any other Gymnasium or Progymnasium.[23] This criticism of texts was precisely what was needed in England. Half the English texts were rubbish, and every school used its discretion in choosing them. Some schools made a trade of book-dealing. Consequently much of the pupils' time was spent in learning nonsense; and woe to the pupil who transferred from one school to another.[24]

By 1867 the supplying of books was becoming a lucrative business and the books themselves were often compiled by the incompetent. Arnold urged the Education Department to exercise some control over this situation as was being done by the Departments in other countries. He reminded them that the Germans employed experts for all the jobs of supply, selection, and compiling of texts, and in each field of study and administration.[25] And his concern for the poor choice of poetry in the reading books was the concern of a poet and professor of poetry.[26]

In 1871 under the New Code, which superseded the Revised Code, the system of examinations for aid was improved but there was still a need for better texts.[27]

> I showed to a distinguished physiologist the papers in physiology which had been worked under the present schedule; he told me that every one was quite worthless, and that apparently the method and text-books by which the subject had been taught were quite worthless too.[28]

---

23. Higher Schools, p. 112.

24. Ibid., p. 113.

25. Reports, p. 128.

26. Ibid., p. 129.

27. Ibid., p. 157.

28. Ibid., p. 157.

And of this was the text-book situation in a science course how much worse must it have been in the less easily marked-off field of literature where selection was most necessary. Arnold suggested that the Senior Inspectors, like himself, in conjunction with the Department and the school boards, select material for texts.[29]

Writing, this time in an unofficial capacity, in the year 1877 Arnold seemed to synthesize his ideas on text-books:

> "... and my desire in education is to get a few good books universally taught and read. I think twenty is about all I would have, in the direct teaching of the young and to be learnt as text-books. Young people may read for themselves, collaterally, as much as they like.[30]

-3-

Arnold thought that one of the most mis-used instruments of instruction in the English popular school system was the examination; the instrument used to measure the students' knowledge of the subjects which they were supposed to have learned. Arnold discovered, however, that the system of examinations in the schools under his inspection actually measured nothing but a student's capacity for cramming and memorizing subject matter and certain passages in texts which the teacher knew were most likely to be covered on the examinations prepared by the Education Department. This situation existed because, between the years 1862 and 1870, the amount of the government grant to Arnold's schools was based, under the Revised Code of 1862, upon the scores, or grades, of mechanical examinations. Arnold submitted these students' scores

---

29. Ibid., pp. 158-160.

30. Letters, vol. II, p. 164.

with his Reports to the Department of Education. From each school's average the Department determined the amount of aid which the school should receive. The schools with the highest averages received the most aid, and those with the lowest averages received the least aid. It is not difficult to imagine how this examination soon became the be-all and end-all of elementary school instruction.[31]

Arnold was quick to see how this regulation had back-fired:

> The mode of teaching in the primary schools has certainly fallen off in intelligence, spirit, and inventiveness during the four or five years which have elapsed since my last report. It could not well be otherwise. In a country where everyone is prone to rely too much on mechanical processes, and too little on intelligence, a change in the Education Department's regulations, which by making two-thirds of the Government grant depend upon a mechanical examination, inevitably gives a mechanical turn to the school teaching, a mechanical turn to the inspection, is and must be trying to the intellectual life of a school.[32]

The examinations had not achieved their aim. They took up too much of the student's time, and their importance to him was over-emphasized. The children could get through the examinations, to the teachers' pecuniary benefit, without having any knowledge of the subjects. Arnold knew that, in the end, the teachers would win this game of mechanical contrivances. It salved public opinion, but it did not suit the schools.[33]

The English, in general, placed too much emphais on reading merely for examinations, certificates, diplomas, and honors. This practice wasnot in favor with the Germans. The English children memorized certain likely materials in their texts, and, even if they could not read any other portions of the books, they could regurgitate certain passages for examination. This

---

31. Reports, p. 145.

32. Ibid., p. 121.

33. Ibid., p. 124.

system established a certain minimum to be learned. The teacher was forced to concentrate on producing this minimum, which had nothing to do with good and adequate instruction.[34] Arnold could see that the overwhelming preponderance given to examinations had to be reduced, and cited as an alternative method that used in Germany, where, at examination time,

> "a scholar of fair ability and proper diligence may at the end of his school course come to it with a quiet mind, and without a painful preparatory effort tending to relaxation and torpor as soon as the effort is over."[35]

These German examinations consisted of the writing of intelligent compositions and of translation, for which the students could not cram.

The Germans encouraged a love of study and science for their own sakes, not for examinations and posts. About one third of university students in Germany really worked, which was a much higher proportion than in England, or Austria where too many examinations were given and most of them were quite worthless.[36] Arnold quoted the French professor, M. Laboulaye: '"Le pays à examens, l'Autriche, est précisement celui dans lequel on ne travaille pas."'[37] Arnold thought that no matter how many examinations were given, or how much importance was placed upon them, the students' knowledge of the subjects taught could not be determined if the chief motive for the examination was to secure an increase in the grant. According to Arnold, as in other matters of education, the German method of examination set the example for the English school system.

-4-

Matthew Arnold considered the school inspector to be a very important

---

34. Ibid., pp. 145-146.
35. Higher Schools, p. 55.
36. Ibid., p. 148-149.
37. Ibid., p. 149.

organ of instruction, though he knew that a man of much less learning and literary talent than he possessed could perform the routine tasks of inspecting, examining and reporting to the satisfaction of the Education Council. Arnold was not satisfied with merely fulfilling his duties; he thought that he should exercise his critical faculties as well. We have noted some of his criticisms and suggestions on particular phases of elementary education in his reports on the schools in his district. I will conclude this chapter by giving some idea of his itinerary of secondary schools and his prediction of what he thought these schools would do for the middle class. And since Arnold turns, almost in despair, from commenting on his routine as an inspector, we must look to his generalizations on the education of middle class and his effect on others who had different notions about culture. By comparing Arnold's and Whitman's criticisms of one another, for example, and suggesting the differences between the critical methods of Arnold and T.S. Eliot one may obtain an interesting perspective of the idea of culture which Arnold brought to his occupation. Arnold was a literary and an educational critic. He was a critic as inspector of schools; as an instrument of instruction.

Arnold was called upon to inspect certain secondary schools from time to time. These were in much better condition than the elementary schools, and he was particularly pleased with the religioustraining given in these lower middle-class training schools. Some of these with the years in which he visited them were:[38]

1. Wesleyan Training College, Westminster. 1853, 1856, 1868.
2. Training College of the British and Foreign School Society, Borough Road. 1858.
3. Borough Road and Stockwell College for Schoolmistresses. 1861, 1864, 1867.

---

38. See "Extracts from Reports on Training Colleges for Teachers" in Reports On Elementary Schools, pp. 261-298.

4. Training College of the Congregational Board of Education at Homerton, 1868.

The great share of Arnold's time was taken up in inspecting elementary schools, however, and in 1854 he remarked that he was grateful for his territory having been cut down in size. Evidently the Department was displeased by some of his critical reporting, for he states that an inspector should report what he sees regardless of how it will look in the press.[39]

In the same year, while visiting Balliol College at Oxford, thirteen years after he had entered that school, his remarks in a letter to his wife indicate that he is hopeful about some of the products of his Training Colleges:

> But I am much struck with the apathy and poorness of the people here, as they now strike me, and their petty pottering habits compared with the students of Paris, or Germany, or even of London. Animation and interest and the power of work seem so sadly wanting in them. And I think this is so; and the place, in losing Newman and his followers, has lost his religious Movement, which after all kept it from stagnating, and has not yet, so far as I see got anything better. However, we must hope that the coming changes, and perhaps the infusion of Dissenters' sons of that muscular, hard-working, unblasé middle class—for it is this, in spite of its abominable disagreeableness—may brace the flaccid sinews of Oxford a little.[40]

After he had been an inspector of schools for thirteen years he did not sound so hopeful when he wrote in 1864 to Lady de Rothschild:

> I must go back to my charming occupation of hearing students give lessons. Here is my programme for this afternoon: Avalanches—The Steam Engine—The Thames—India Rubber—Bricks—The Battle of Poictiers—Subtraction—The Reindeer—The Gunpowder Plot—The Jordan. Alluring, is it not? Twenty minutes each, and the days of One's life are only three-score years and ten.[41]

---

39. Reports, pp. 32-40.

40. Letters, vol. I, pp. 44-45.

41. Ibid., vol. I, p. 281.

And six years later it seemed as though his duties would finally prevent any further attention to those cultural pursuits which he loved most.

> Yet, after all, it is absurd that all the best of my days should be taken up with matters which thousands of other people could do just as well as I, and that what I have a special turn for doing I should have no time for.[42]

Arnold had a "special turn" for knowing and instructing the middle class. For many years he had entertained the notion of one day being able to witness the sine qua non of the great "muscular" class by visiting the United States. Arnold was a master of generalization, and it seems to me that his opinion of Walt Whitman, for instance, embodied his whole notion of the state of culture and education in a country without a great cultural tradition and dominated by middle class mediocrity. He thought that in England, at least, the aristocracy had set an educational and critical standard for the middle class which could not be appreciated by Americans. On the other hand, it was just this aristocratic quality in Arnold which was objectionable to Whitman.

There were few Americans for whom Arnold had much respect, outside of Emerson, to whom he wrote in 1866:

> As to the general question of Mr. Walt Whitman's poetical achievements, you will think it savours of our decrepit old Europe when I add that while you think it is his highest merit that he is so unlike anyone else, to me this seems to be his demerit; no one can afford in literature to trade merely on his own bottom and to take no account of what other nations have acquired.[43]

It was not known whether or not Whitman was aware of this summary of his poetry, but when he was asked to report to the New York Herald, April 16, 1888, on the death of Matthew Arnold he said that literature was over-weighted with fine gentlemen, purists and scholars, and "I doubt whether America will miss Arnold at all. He was ... one of the dudes of literature."[44]

Arnold had no genius—only a peculiarly clever order of refined

---

42. Ibid., vol. II, p. 50.

43. John Howard Birss, "Whitman on Arnold," MLN, xlvii, (May, 1932), p. 316.

44. Ibid., p. 317.

marshalling the forces of government in order to stimulate the public to an awareness of its cultural needs.

-5-

One of the last duties Arnold performed for the Education Office, before his death in 1888, was to make one final report (1885-1886) on the elementary schools in Continental countries. The report concerned the systems in Switzerland and Germany in particular, and contained few personal comments of Arnold's which might reveal what, at this late date, was the general situation of education in England. This was purely a factual report, highly technical, and containing many figures and statistics which he was able to copy from school records, or obtain from officials. The important thing for us is that the Government of England was interested in pursuing a plan for the improvement of the elementary school system. The particular points with which the Government was concerned, and the ones which he was supposed to cover, were the following:[73]

1. Free education
2. Quality of education
3. Status, training and pensioning of teachers
4. Compulsory attendance and release from school

In reviewing this report it is easy to see that the Government had very definite ideas for a plan of improving the popular schools in particular. Arnold may well, by this time, have begun to see the fruits of suggestions which he made some twenty years earlier, like those in Chapter III of Culture and

---

73. Matthew Arnold, Special Report on Certain Points Connected with Elementary Education in Germany, Switzerland, and France, London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1886, p. 1.

> student's first acquaintance with Bengel's Commentary to the admission of a ray of light when a shutter was opened in a darkened room. The arrival of Matthew Arnold at my lodgings was something like this. He brought with him a complete atmosphere of culture and poetry. He had something to tell of Sainte-Beuve's latest criticism, some new book like Lewes' Life of Goethe to recommend, some new political interest to unfold, and, in short, he carried you away from the routine of everyday life with his enthusiasm and his spirit. He gave me most valuable advice as to the training of pupil teachers. "Open their minds," he would say, "take them into the world of Shakespeare, and try to make them feel that there is no book so full of poetry and beauty as the Bible." He had something to tell me of Stanley and Clough, and it is really difficult to say what a delightful tonic effect his visits produced ... One of his pleasantest characteristics was his perfect readiness to discuss with complete command of temper, views and opinions of his own which he knew I did not share and thought dangerous. All who knew him constantly regretted that a man of such wonderful gifts should have to spend his life in the laborious duties of a School Inspector.[48]

Following Arnold's ideas on how to improve the school system, we have noted that he expressed his opinions on what he thought the proper organs of instruction in this system should be. He was in favor of University-trained teachers who held a certificate showing that they had mastered the subjects to be taught and were thoroughly prepared to teach them. He saw a great need for the improvement, selection, and standardization of texts for the popular schools. He advised the Education Office that the examinations in the schools which he inspected were inadequate, too numerous, and were no true measure of the students' knowledge. In his capacity as an inspector he found the routine of inspection almost unbearable and revealed that his true value to the system of instruction lay in the fact that he was a critic and knew what the middle class needed educationally. We shall see that when he expressed his opinions on what he thought should be taught in the schools his voice began to awaken the English to their educational needs.

---

48. Sir Joshua Fitch, Thomas and Matthew Arnold and Their Influence on English Education, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899, pp. 167-168.

Chapter III

School Subjects

As in other matters of education Arnold's ideas on what he thought should be taught in the English popular school system can be grouped under several headings. I shall discuss his opinions on the subject of religion, science and crafts, grammar and language, and literature. My concluding remarks will be a summary of Arnold's general notion of culture and its humanizing effect upon the students.

The British and National schools were originally founded to provide the children of poorer families with fundamental religious instruction and a know ledge of reading and writing. Religious education remained an important and controversial subjects throughout Arnold's career as an Inspector. In the British schools which he inspected, the instruction in this subject was not uniform, but varied with the sectarian views of the particular Protestant church in each community. Arnold thought that this situation kept the children from learning the great spiritual and social lessons of the Bible, while stressing the importance of sectarian dogma. Actual teaching of the Bible was neglected by the managers of the British elementary schools, and this was one of the main reason for setting up these schools. The religious education was not subject to inspection, but from his own observations Arnold thought that the children in his schools knew next to nothing about the Bible. He reported in 1869 that the Education Council should

> make the main outlines of Bible history, and the getting by heart a selection of the finest Psalms, the most interesting passages from the historical and prophetical books of the Old Testament, and the chief parables, discourses, and exhortations of the New, a part of the regular school work, to be submitted to inspection and to be seen in its strength or weakness like any other.[1]

---

1. Reports, pp. 151-152.

In 1868 Arnold had found that the Congregational school at Homerton, a secondary school, had one of the best plans for religious instruction. Unlike the Church of England schools and the Wesleyan schools it was not merely for Anglicans or for Wesleyans, but for those who held "Evangelical views of religion."[2] They excluded Socinians and Roman Catholics, and in this respect the Congregational school was identical to the Protestant schools of Germany, whose authorities recognized essential differences in religion and effaced the non-essential. German schools were either Protestant or Catholic.[3]

Arnold hoped that the German system of religious education would be adopted in England. In the German Protestant schools religion was taught from an historical rather than a dogmatic viewpoint. It was presented in connection with universal history, which was a very important subject in the German schools. This broad view of religion awakened a student's interest and stimulated him to "active research on definite points."[4] Arnold thought that because the German teaching was more systematic it was also more penetrating and interesting than the more particular and dogmatic religious instruction in England. He recommended as texts for religious instruction in higher education, Bossuet's Universal History for the Roman Catholic view and Weber's Universal History for the Protestant view.

Arnold could think of no more stimulating program than that offered in the secondary, Protestant, German schools as part of the regular course. Briefly, it was this:

---

2. Ibid., p. 289.

3. Ibid., p. 290.

4. Ibid., p. 293.

First year - three hours a week in history of the Hebrews and reading the Old Testament.

Second year - three hours a week with the life of Christ and reading the New Testament.

Third year - three hours a week with the relationship between the Old Testament and the New Testament, and the rise and development of Christianity and Church history. Sometimes this went further into the history of all leading systems of religion and philosophy in the world.[5]

Arnold, like his father before him, believed in the Bible as an instrument of instruction. He thought that for most elementary pupils it was their only contact with good eloquence.[6] So far as popular education was concerned Arnold preferred the German distinction between religions. In Germany the schools were either Protestant, Roman Catholic, or Jewish in their religious instruction and the state recognized them as such. The Protestant schools were not divided into those bodies which believed that a certain scheme of doctrine they had gathered from the Bible, represented the essence of the Bible, and had taken to themselves the denomination of Methodist, Baptist, Evangelical, etc., as was the case in England. Arnold thought that the name "Evangelical" in England aroused a misunderstanding and the claim of this title by that group ought not to be conceded.[7] Evangelisch in Germany meant simply

> ...the man who goes to the New Testament, and to the Old Testament as seen and applied from the point of view under which the New Testament teaches us to see and apply it, for his religion, in contradistinction to the man who goes to any other authority for it—the authority of the Church, of tradition, of the Pope.[8]

---

5. Ibid., pp. 294-295.
6. Ibid., pp. 296-297.
7. Ibid., pp. 297-298.
8. Ibid., p. 297.

Arnold saw this as the only sensible definition of Evangelical and he hoped that those Englishmen who were devoted to the Bible and Christianity could see the value of extracting great lessons from the Bible as the country developed progressively in matters of education.

> Therefore it is that the thorough study and appropriation of the Bible, both in itself and in all the course of its relations with human history, is of so great fruitfulness and importance. In my opinion, they are the best friends of popular education, as well as the best construers of the word Evangelical, who, however attached to their own particular Church or confession, yet can recognize this fruitfulness and importance most fully, and who show the greatest largeness of mind in giving effect of their sense of it.[9]

Arnold did not think that any progress in the correct teaching of the Bible and religion could be made until the churches in England accepted a whole new approach to religion. He, like many other scholars of his day, could see that an inevitable revolution was be-falling the religion in which they had been brought up. Science and the industrial age were dictating that whatever stood must be verifiable, and people were becoming sceptical of the assumptions and the gloss which all churches and sects put upon the Bible and religion.[10] Their quest for reason and authority for the things they had been taught to believe was set down by the clergy as being merely irreligion. Arnold thought that the people of all sects needed a new, sound, reasonable basis for studying the Bible and going to church. His answer, which he keeps repeating in his essays, was culture. The object of religion was conduct, and conduct was three-fourths of life. But neither the clergy nor the layman were able to extract the great lessons of conduct and righteousness from the Bible without "culture, the acquainting ourselves with the best that has

---

9. Ibid., p. 298.

10. Matthew Arnold, Literature and Dogma, New York: Macmillan and Company, 1924, Preface, p. viii.

been known and said in the world, and thus with the history of the human spirit."[11]

In their religious teaching the English popular schools did not take this historical approach as did the German schools. In England the religious instruction was confined to the particular sectarian dogma of each parish. Arnold believed that this method of teaching religion and the Bible would not last in England, and that some day the German approach would be adopted.

-2-

By the year 1876 there were several "extra" subjects being taught in the elementary schools under Arnold's inspection. These subjects could be elected by the students to supplement the regular course in the "three R's." Some of these subjects were animal physiology, physical geography, and botany, all of which Arnold thought too advanced and confusing for elementary students. He thought that there should be a sort of general science course as a part of the regular curriculum in place of these detailed science extras. "I should like to see what the Germans call Naturkunde —knowledge of the facts and laws of nature—added as a class subject to Grammar, Geography, and English History for all students above the Third Standard."[12]

Arnold could see that though the children were taught what made night and day and the seasons, for example, they were not taught the related phenomena of weather conditions. He thought that they needed a simple instruction in the laws and facts of nature and that a good text should be drawn up

---

11. Ibid., p. xi.

12. Reports, p. 191.

on the subject by a man of science who could write clearly and orderly. This would give the children an elementary knowledge of nature instead of presenting the existing hodge-podge of science courses which had no relative or combined general meaning.[13]

Always, in reporting on the subjects which were being taught in his schools, Arnold stressed the importance of simplicity and clarity of meaning, so that the students could relate their knowledge to other subjects and to their lives and environment. Even in the matter of working sums he said,

> Our system of weights and measures is indeed such an absurdity, that one is disposed to say reform it altogether, rather than to suggest means for working sums in it with more facility. But I am assured, and I believe it, that if the scholar had actually before his eyes the weights and measures with which his sums deal—an ounce, a pound, a pint, a quart, a foot, a yard—he could work his sums in weights and measures more intelligently and more successfully.[14]

Paradoxical as it may seem to those who associate Arnold's significance to his age with the broad notion of culture, some of his comments in his reports have a remarkably practical aim. In one of his first reports, 1853, he stressed the economic importance of teaching needlework to girls after noting that one family in his district, receiving parochial relief, had quite a bill with the town dressmaker.[15] He also thought that a child with a particular talent for drawing should be encouraged, but reading and writing should come first.[16] The foundation for the acquisition of culture should not be sacrificed to any emphasis on arts and crafts. These subjects, Arnold thought, should be incidental to reading and writing.

---

13. Ibid., pp. 206-207.

14. Ibid., pp. 202-203.

15. Ibid., p. 28.

16. Ibid., p. 31.

While inspecting the course work in a training college in the year 1861, Arnold noticed that

> music and chemistry had the power of awakening students in class, of striking the electric chain in them, in a way in which no other part of their instruction can. No doubt it is because of this capacity that the civilizing power of music has always been famed so highly; for instruction civilises a raw nature only so far as it delights and enkindles it. Perhaps it will be found that physical science h has, for such natures, something of s similar power, and that we may well make more use of both agents than we do at present. Undoubtedly no refining influence is more powerful than that of literary culture; but this influence seems to need in the recipient a certain refinement of nature at the outset in order to make itself felt; and with this previous refinement music and physical science appear able to dispense.17

He saw the value of subjects which interested and delighted the student and in recommending music and physical sciences for the secondary instruction of the lower classes of society he showed an understanding and sympathy toward the problems of educators at this level. The things which Arnold insisted upon most doggedly, however, were the proper teaching of grammar and literature.

-3-

Arnold considered the subject of grammar as a valuable exercise having a definite humanizing effect on the minds of elementary students. On the subject of grammar he had something to say about Latin as being an aid to the study of English grammar, and about spelling, recitation, paraphrasing, and parsing sentences.

Arnold would liked to have seen Latin used more and more as a special

---

17. Ibid., p. 279.

subject, and eventually as a part of the regular instruction in the elementary schools under his inspection. "Latin is the foundation of so much in the written and spoken language of modern Europe, that is is the best language to take as a second language."[18] He thought that it was an object of reference and comparison, having a stimulating and instructing effect upon the students. It was the best language for learning grammar. The teachers in his schools should not, however, as was done in the classical schools, go too deeply into grammatical framework, and they should by all means stay away from classical Latin. "A second language, and a language coming very largely into the vocabulary of modern nations, is what Latin should stand for to the teacher of an elementary school."[19] The best reading book for these students would be the Latin Vulgate Bible.

> A chapter or two from the story of Joseph, a chapter or two from Deuteronomy, and the first two chapters of St. Luke's Gospel would be the sort of delectus we want; add to them a vocabulary and a simple grammar of the main forms of the Latin language, and you have a perfectly compact and cheap schoolbook, and yet all that you need.[20]

Arnold did not recommend classical Latin for elementary students because it was in a foreign idiom and not more than one out of five thousand of his pupils would go on to Virgil and Cicero in secondary schools. He thought that the value of Latin for elementary students was in giving them grammatical exercise and a vocabulary which was at the bottom of much of modern life and language.

Arnold thought that the spelling of English words should conform closely to their derivation, and he was disturbed by proposals for reforming spelling. He recognized the difficulty which foreigners had in learning English

---

18. Ibid., pp. 164-165.

19. Ibid., p. 165.

20. Ibid., pp. 165-166.

spelling due to its irregularities. However, he thought that it should not be difficult for the English child if he were taught spelling correctly: "—the English nation will not be induced, in the hope of making it easier, to take to writing Leed uz not intu temtaishon."[21] The teachers should have pointed out the blunders of printers who liked symmetry. For instance, "we find almost universally connection, reflection, instead of connexion, reflexion. This the printers give us from the analogy of words like affection, collection, and for the sake of symmetry."[22] Arnold, in his reports, gave examples of the Latin roots of these words which proved that the printers' usage was irrational. He thought that there should be a permanent Royal Commission for watching the language, taking care that it be rational and not stereotyped.[23]

Of all the special subjects which were being taught in the elementary schools Arnold thought that recitation was producing the most good. For this subject the student was required to learn a passage of literature to be recited before the class. After the recital he was questioned on the meaning of the passage and supposedly on its significance to the elementary student. This was not always done to Arnold's satisfaction. He said that at best, an elementary education gave the child "the mechanical possession of the instrument of knowledge, but does nothing to form him, to put him in a way of making the best possible use of them."[24] For recitation he said that a familiarity with a limited number of masterpieces, each one standing singly, would do the

---

21. Ibid., p. 196.

22. Ibid., p. 197.

23. Ibid., p. 198.

24. Ibid., p. 163.

most toward "forming" the younger children. For the advanced students the masterpieces should be arranged in some well planned order. Recitation should, in the absence of literary study, increase the students' power of p perception.[25] For increasing the general intelligence of the students Arnold thought that recitation was the best method. However, the passages were merely learned by heart in some cases, with no attention to their meaning, and they did not represent the best literature. There should have been a better text, with passages from the classics instead of from the rubbish which was currently used for these texts.[26] Arnold believed that learning by heart extracts from good authors was the best elementary exercise for the improvement of paraphrasing. He found in his schools that passages were talked about too much and not learned enough. If there had been good discipline in the learning of these passages, in the right nature a sense of appreciation for the meaning and the beauty of literature would follow.[27]

In 1874 Arnold expressed his consciousness of the relationship between a good foundation in grammar and the study of literature. "The animation of mind, the multiplying of ideas, the promptness to connect, in the thoughts, one thing with another, are what we wanted; just what letters, as they are called, are supposed to communicate."[28] With this thought in mind Arnold watched the grammar portion of the examinations of candidates for admission to training schools.

> The grammar paper, then, is eminently a test of mental activity and resource, and hence its importance. To work successfully a

---

25. Ibid., p. 163.

26. Ibid., pp. 182-183.

27. Ibid., pp. 94-95.

28. Ibid., p. 175.

> sum in stocks requires, comparatively, but a narrow diversion of the whole extent of our faculties to be called into play; to work a grammar or literature paper successfully requires a much larger one ... Altogether, the paper is one which tests his information, judgments, and taste more thoroughly than any other of his papers tests them.[29]

Arnold found the results of these tests deplorable, and there had been no improvement in them for the past twenty years. The paraphrasing portion of the examination, which tested the range of ideas and the quickness of apprehension on the part of the student, was particularly bad. The quotations for paraphrasing were, in themselves, not well chosen by the Education Department.[30]

Arnold regarded grammar as a course in elementary logic. To those who belittled its importance and complained of its simplicity, he pointed out a simple examination question which was commonly misinterpreted by his elementary students:

> Yes is it so insignificant a mental exercise to distinguish between the use of shelter in the two phrases: "to shelter under an umbrella," and "to take shelter under an umbrella"?[31]

In 1880 Arnold thought that parsing was one of the best disciplines of grammar if it were taught judiciously. The English language had an analytic character, and it should be taught by the analytic method of parsing, instead of with the machinery borrowed from the grammar of synthetic languages.[32] The analytic method saved children from puzzled minds, and made them understand more readily the use of case, mood, and tense, and teachers should

---

29. Ibid., p. 176.

30. Ibid., p. 176.

31. Ibid., p. 216.

32. Ibid., p. 240.

"beget in them an interest in what is one of the most naturally interesting of things - language. And at the same time they are teaching English grammar in the true philosophical way."[33]

The importance which Arnold placed on the study of grammar by elementary students cannot be underestimated. And he was extremely anxious that this subject be presented to them clearly and in an interesting manner.

> Grammar is an exercise of the children's wits; all the rest of their work is in general but an exercise of their memory. But, after learning the definition of a noun, to recognize nouns when one meets them, and to refer them to their definition, that is an exercise of intelligence. I observe that it animates the children, even amuses them. Indeed, all that relates to language, that familiar but wonderful phenomenon, is naturally interesting if it is not spoiled by being treated pedantically. In teaching grammar, not to attempt too much, and to be thoroughly simple, orderly, and clear, is most important.[34]

These remarks of Arnold's on the subject of grammar showed that he thought the subject to be extremely important for the beginning student as a foundation for learning to read the best that had been written. If we understand Arnold's ideas on the subject of grammar, we may more readily understand his ideas on the subject of the study of literature in the English popular school system.

-4-

It can be well imagined the importance which Arnold placed upon literature as a class subject for school-children. As a poet, professor of poetry, critic and inspector of schools he was especially well qualified to pass judgment upon the quality of the instruction and the reading matter in this course.

---

33. Ibid., p. 241.

34. Ibid., pp. 189-190.

From the comments in his reports we shall see that he had little admiration for the effect which the existing literature courses were producing on his students. He could not accept the fact that in England the instruction in this subject was so much less formative than in the popular schools of other countries he visited. In 1863 he had an opportunity to observe, unofficially, the instruction in several Scottish schools. He was immediately reminded of the instability of some English students to read well and to understand what they had read, and also of the inferior quality of the material which they were asked to reproduce on examinations. The Scotch students, as a body

> ——certainly have more culture. I attribute this to the effect insensibly produced on all classes in the country by the long establishment of education for all, as a matter of public institution and national importance, in Scotland.[35]

Arnold's statement revealed the connection in his mind between culture and complusory education. He thought that if English educational authorities had the respect for culture which the authorities in other European countries had, the English schools would be turning out a much better educated product. The schoolmasters and pupil-teachers under Arnold's inspection simply did not have the proper training and sense of culture necessary to teach a satisfactory course in reading.

> The culture both of the pupil-teacher and of the elementary schoolmaster with us seems to me to resist the efforts made to improve it and to remain unprogressive, more than that of the corresponding class on the Continent. Ignorance is nothing; such a blunder as this of an English student, 'Pope lived a little prior to the Christian era,' a French or Swiss student might also commit; but the hopeless want of tact and apprehensiveness shown by such a sentence as this, 'I should consider Newton as a great author: firstly, on account of the style and value of his works; secondly, on account of his most valuable and wonderful discoveries, coupled with the pains he took to diffuse his self-acquired knowledge among the people,' no French or Swiss student who had read the books and heard the lectures which the English student who wrote that sentence had

---

35. Ibid., p. 108.

> heard and read, would in my opinion ever equal. It is true that if you take the bulk of the scholars, even in schools for the richer classes, the rate of culture is very low; but then it is to be remembered that our pupil-teachers and students are a select body, not the bulk of a class, and have gone through a careful training and schooling.[36]

Arnold must have been continually criticized by the Education Office for his relentless insistence upon the importance of reading, literature, and of compulsory education. At times his remarks on these topics were extremely bitter. He could not refrain from hammering at the value of literature as being the best cultural subject for elementary students.

> What is comprised under the word literature is in itself the greatest power available in education; of this power it is not too much to say that in our elementary schools at present no use is made at all. The reading books and the absence of plan being what they are, the whole use that the Government makes of the mighty engine of literature in the education of the working classes, amounts to little more, even when most successful, than the giving them the power to read the newspapers.[37]

Good poetry, especially, was extremely valuable in the teaching of elementary students. Arnold could see that memorizing passages of poetry was helpful in teaching the pupils to read with ease and understanding. While accomplishing this it also moulded their natures and civilized them.

> But good poetry is formative; it has, too, the precious power of acting by itself and in a way managed by nature, not through the instrumentality of that somewhat terrible character, the scientific educator. I believe that even the rhythm and diction of good poetry are capable of exercising some formative effect, even though the sense be imperfectly understood. But of course the good of poetry is not really got unless the sense of the words is known.[38]

Arnold also thought that poetry enlarged the students' vocabulary and circle of ideas. He observed that their lack of vocabulary was their greatest defect, but by 1880 he was pleased to notice that the study and memorization

---

36. Ibid., pp. 106-107.

37. Ibid., p. 157.

38. Ibid., p. 210.

And of this was the text-book situation in a science course how much worse must it have been in the less easily marked-off field of literature where selection was most necessary. Arnold suggested that the Senior Inspectors, like himself, in conjunction with the Department and the school boards, select material for texts.[29]

Writing, this time in an unofficial capacity, in the year 1877 Arnold seemed to synthesize his ideas on text-books:

> "... and my desire in education is to get a few good books universally taught and read. I think twenty is about all I would have, in the direct teaching of the young and to be learnt as text-books. Young people may read for themselves, collaterally, as much as they like.[30]

-3-

Arnold thought that one of the most mis-used instruments of instruction in the English popular school system was the examination; the instrument used to measure the students' knowledge of the subjects which they were supposed to have learned. Arnold discovered, however, that the system of examinations in the schools under his inspection actually measured nothing but a student's capacity for cramming and memorizing subject matter and certain passages in texts which the teacher knew were most likely to be covered on the examinations prepared by the Education Department. This situation existed because, between the years 1862 and 1870, the amount of the government grant to Arnold's schools was based, under the Revised Code of 1862, upon the scores, or grades, of mechanical examinations. Arnold submitted these students' scores

---

29. Ibid., pp. 158-160.

30. Letters, vol. II, p. 164.

beauty and interest should occur within the limits of the passage learnt.[42]

He thought that some of the best selections for elementary students would be short poems by Mrs. Hemans like "The Graves of a Household," "The Homes of England" or "The Better Land." If selections from Shakespeare or Scott were to be used they must be kept short and contain a center of interest.[43]

No matter what was offered in the English schools in 1880, however, the fact still remained to plague Arnold that throughout England during the nineteenth century the quality of instruction in the schools in general had lagged pitifully behind that of the French and German schools, Arnold thought that this deficiency manifested itself in the quality and style of English letters, and even in governmental jargon. The Government had not planned, organized, and directed the instruction of the populace, but had allowed religious factions to hamper and compromise its efforts. In England there was no strong state supervision of schools and no academy to keep the language commonly intelligible.

In 1859, while inspecting schools in France, Arnold compared the Code Napoleon as an example of rational, direct, lucid diction with the garble that passed for legislative style in England. He said that the English official diction had a medieval quality, unintelligible to all but a few Englishmen. However, he had heard French peasants quoting the Code Napoleon. The rational, intellible speech of their laws had a great effect on the general reason and intelligence of the French people. In their country the state was the organ of reason.[44]

---

42. Ibid., p. 228.

43. Ibid., p. 228.

44. Popular Education, pp. 159-160.

In the study of his mother-tongue the French schoolboy had an advantage over the English pupil. The French student learned something of his country's language and literature, whereas the English pupil did not. Arnold considered French grammar and literature to be better instruments of instruction, more suitable for secondary schoolboys than were their English counterparts.[45] He said that there were five or six secondary schools in England, like Eton, which gave a better education than the secondary schools of France, but they were extremely expensive and for the upper classes only. He thought that England needed more secondary schools like the French Toulouse Lyceum, or Sorèze College.[46] England should be able to offer the same instruction as that of Eton to the middle-class student for £25 to £50 per year instead of £120 to £200 which the upper classes were paying at Eton in 1864.[47] Arnold lamented the fact that in England there were no governmental provisions for the "securities of supervision and publicity" for the secondary schools such as there were in France.[48] In England the only recourse for the middle-class student who desired a secondary education was a trade school or a teachers' training college. Because of great expense of attending them, the classical schools were not available to the middle-class students.

In Germany a student who successfully passed from the primary school could go on to the secondary school to learn, among other things, something of the great literature of his country. German students could then obtain a superior idea of the meaning of literature and culture. Arnold noticed

---

45. A French Eton, p. 435.

46. Ibid., pp. 447-448.

47. Ibid., p. 454.

48. Ibid., p. 461.

organ of instruction, though he knew that a man of much less learning and literary talent than he possessed could perform the routine tasks of inspecting, examining and reporting to the satisfaction of the Education Council. Arnold was not satisfied with merely fulfilling his duties; he thought that he should exercise his critical faculties as well. We have noted some of his criticisms and suggestions on particular phases of elementary education in his reports on the schools in his district. I will conclude this chapter by giving some idea of his itinerary of secondary schools and his prediction of what he thought these schools would do for the middle class. And since Arnold turns, almost in despair, from commenting on his routine as an inspector, we must look to his generalizations on the education of middle class and his effect on others who had different notions about culture. By comparing Arnold's and Whitman's criticisms of one another, for example, and suggesting the differences between the critical methods of Arnold and T.S. Eliot one may obtain an interesting perspective of the idea of culture which Arnold brought to his occupation. Arnold was a literary and an educational critic. He was a critic as inspector of schools; as an instrument of instruction.

Arnold was called upon to inspect certain secondary schools from time to time. These were in much better condition than the elementary schools, and he was particularly pleased with the religioustraining given in these lower middle-class training schools. Some of these with the years in which he visited them were:[38]

1. Wesleyan Training College, Westminster. 1853, 1856, 1868.
2. Training College of the British and Foreign School Society, Borough Road. 1858.
3. Borough Road and Stockwell College for Schoolmistresses. 1861, 1864, 1867.

---

38. See "Extracts from Reports on Training Colleges for Teachers" in Reports On Elementary Schools, pp. 261-298.

classes the teacher questioned the children on a ballad by Goethe. They compared it with a ballad by Schiller, noted the differences, pointed out wherein lay their particular charm and the interest of the Middle Ages and Chivalry for them, etc. In short, this was an active and intelligent class performance which would have been good in a much higher class in England.[52] The point which Arnold wanted to make here, as in most of his statements concerning literature as a subject which should be taught in the English popular schools, was that good literature should be taught and discussed in such a manner that all the students could get an historical notion of its importance and place in their own lives. It should be taught in such a manner that the great lessons which it contained would form their character and civilize them as no other subject could do. In the twentieth century we, in America, have failed to recognize this power which literature has for the elementary student.[53] Matthew Arnold has taught us that

> culture is the study of perfection and that no man can attain perfection unless he carry others along with him in seeking this goal, unless he seek 'to make reason and the of God prevail among mankind.'[54]

-5-

The last topic which I shall discuss concerning Matthew Arnold's idea of education isthat idea which became the very motive for his existence—culture. Why he prescribed a cultural, or liberal education for the middle

---

52. Special Report, p. 15.

53. Florence L. Ingram, "Matthew Arnold, The Educator," Education, LXIV, (September, 1923-June, 1924), p. 206.

54. Ibid., p. 207.

class society of England, in particular, as opposed to a practical or scientific education, is a question which will take us into the best of Matthew Arnold's writings. Arnold was, throughout his life, appalled at the self-satisfaction and narrow-mindedness of the great, busy middle class in England. This class was satisfied with itself, but he was not satisfied with it, and he asked of them, perfection, since they had inherited the government of England from the aristocracy. Some men, like Professor Huxley and Herbert Spencer, thought that science and technology were what this ascendant class needed for assuming the direction of the new industrial state. Arnold thought that, more than ever, the middle class needed culture. How culture would make the middle class fit to rule will be shown in this last section.

Arnold saw in the American Civil War the case of a middle class not being satisfied to remain as it was, and though there were many things which he did not like about America, he did think that this was a healthy sign.[55] He thought that in England the stoggy old middle class would have been content with the status quo, nay, they would have considered it perfection. The English middle class which Arnold referred to as the Philistines, reminded him of the crusade of Peter the Hermit. In answer to Arnold's admonitions the middle class spokesmen were continually saying to him 'is this not Jerusalem? Is this not perfection which we now have?' And Arnold would say to them, "God keeps tossing back to the human race its failures, and commanding it to try again."[56] This is not perfection. Keep striving toward perfection, Jerusalem is not yet.

The English middle class was Arnold's great adversary. This was the class which resisted his efforts to bring religious compromise and culture to

---

55. A French Eton, p. 499.

56. Ibid., p. 499.

itself and to the lower classes. In 1859, after making a report on the French popular school system and recommending certain reforms suggested by the superior quality and disposition of education among the lower classes in France, Arnold was criticized by certain middle-class English periodicals whose names he does not mention. They claimed that the lower classes in France were discontented with their lot because of the extension of educational opportunities, and they gave this as a good reason for suppressing compulsory education in England. Arnold remarked that,

> It is sufficient to say to those who hold it, that it is vain for them to expect that the lower classes will be kind enough to remain ignorant and unbettered merely for the sake of saving them inconvenience.[57]

Arnold gave ancient Athens as an example of a community which recognized the value of culture; of a classical education for the lower and middle classes. He said that culture and character were united in Athens; for the government recognized that one was bad, or dangerous, without the other. Tradesmen and shopkeepers were the speakers in the works of Plato and Xenophon. They had a respect for ideas, they were refined, they were critics, they would not accept any but the best art and architecture.[58] Arnold thought that there could be no high standard of achievement in England, either in government or the arts, unless the lower and middle classes could obtain culture.

What was this middle class in England that Arnold attacked so bitterly on the one hand and desired to salvage through education on the other? We must answer this question before we summarize and establish a definition of his idea of culture and education.

> We in England have come to that point when the continued advance and greatness of our nation is threatened by one cause, and one

---

57. Popular Education, pp. 166-167.

58. Ibid., p. xliii.

> cause above all. Far more than by the helplessness of an aristocracy whose day is fast coming to an end, far more than by the rawness of a lower class whose day is only just beginning, we are imperilled by what I call the 'Philistinism' of our middle class. On the side of beauty and taste, vulgarity; on the side of morals and feelings, coarseness; on the side of mind and spirit, unintelligence,—this is Philistinism.[59]

However, I think that the thing which bothered Arnold the most about the middle class was not its vulgarity, coarseness, and unintelligence, but its resistance to improvement. They had now governmental control over a good share of the world's population, and therefore thought themselves perfect. Arnold admired the English for their strength and morality, (however coarse) but he feared for their future. He insisted that England could not go on as the leading 'world power' if its governing class were to remain self-satisfied.

> But nothing has really a right to be satisfied with itself, to be and remain itself, except that which has reached perfection; and nothing has the right to impose itself on the rest of the world as a conquering force, except that which is of higher perfection than the rest of the world. And such is the fundamental constitution of human affairs, that the measure of right proves also, in the end, the measure of power.[60]

The road toward this ultimate perfection of the middle class was a two-way traffic problem for the great educators of Victorian England. Arnold seemed to be the spokesman for those who would guide the "Philistines" on the way of culture, and men like Spencer and Huxley were directing the middle class along a practical, scientific path to perfection. Spencer said that in the English Classical schools, as in the schools of ancient Greece, music, poetry, rhetoric, and philosophy had little bearing upon action, or the "arts of life."[61]

---

59. On the Study of Celtic Literature and On Translating Homer, Introduction, p. xi. See also, pp. 136-137.

60. A French Eton, p. 495.

61. Herbert Spencer, Education: Intellectual, Moral and Physical, New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1881, p. 22.

> If we inquire what is the real motive for giving boys a classical education, we find it to be simply conformity to public opinion. Men dress their children's minds as they do their bodies, in the prevailing fashion.[62]

Spencer saw a classical education as merely an ornamental discomfort for the sake of conformity. For life, health, livelihood, parenthood, national life, art, discipline, and religion the proper study was science.[63] Much the same as John Dewey in the twentieth century, Spencer called for an education which was practical, and would fit a child for action. Let the child think and act, he said, don't inhibit him, or be dogmatic; don't drill knowledge into him, lead it out of him.

In answer to this, and other demands that natural science replace literature in the curricula of the popular school system in particular, Arnold wrote to the Education Council in 1876:

> The problem to be solved is a great deal more complicated than many of the friends of natural science suppose. They see clearly enough, for instance, how the working classes are, in their ignorance, constantly violating the laws of health, and suffering accordingly; and they look to a spread of sound natural science as the remedy. What they do not see is that to know the laws of health ever so exactly, as a mere piece of positive knowledge, will carry a man in general no great way. To have the power of using, which is the thing wished, these data of natural science, a man must, in general, have first been in some measure moralised; and for moralising him it will be found not easy, I think, to dispense with those old agents, letters, poetry, religion. So let not our teachers be led to imagine, whatever they may hear and see of the call for natural science, that their literary cultivation is unimportant. The fruitful use of natural science itself depends, in a very great degree, on having effected in the whole man, by means of letters, a rise in what the political economists call the standard of life.[64]

His argument with Professor Huxley, Herbert Spencer and the many others, especially in America, that great industrial nation where the majority must

---

62. Ibid., p. 23.

63. Ibid., pp. 93-94.

64. Reports, p. 200.

do plain and dusty work, was akin to Plato's philosophy that the soul must get sobriety, righteousness and wisdom no matter what the occupation.

> ——in our culture, the aim being to know ourselves and the world, we have as the means to this end, to know the best which has been thought and said in the world.[65]

This is the key phrase which all students of Matthew Arnold's prose know by heart. As we have seen before, Arnold was not opposed to the teaching of science courses in any schools. He felt that knowing the most powerful manifestations of the human spirit's activity, through literature, greatly fed and quickened our own activity, but know the world itself, through the study of science, was also vital and formative. He admitted that the laws which governed nature and man as part of nature, were also a part of the circle of knowledge.[66] Armold thought that the amount of science in each student's curriculum depended upon the individual student's appitudes. Arnold's objection to the proponents of science was that they cut the circle of knowledge in two. This was their big mistake. Arnold thought that those who had been subjected to a classical education, if separated from the students of science, would have the upper hand in government and human affairs.

> The study of letters isthe study of the operation of human freedom and activity; the study of nature is the study of the operation of non-human forces, of human limitation and passivity.[67]

The one heightens the force of human activity, the other checks it.

As an example of a basic subject for a course which would humanize students, Arnold proposed a thorough knowledge of Latin grammar whose classical power was character, which could be learned and taught, rather than

---

65. Matthew Arnold, Discourses in America, New York: Macmillan Company, 1924, Chapter II, "Literature and Science", p. 82.

66. Higher Education, p. 156.

67. Ibid., pp. 158-159.

Greek whose power was beauty, which could not be taught.[68] The need for nine out of ten pupils was to get Latin as literature, to get the ideas, and let the exceptional student master the philosophy also. Arnold did not believe in teaching elementary and secondary students to speak foreign languages. This was the commercial theory of shallow thinkers. He noticed that most of his students in 1865 never got more than a wrestling with Latin grammar and never felt the force of the literature.[69] He was disturbed by the fact that the upper-class schools were exposing the children to the force of literature and the schools under his inspection were not. He thought that the most important thing for the lower classes was a feeling for the humanities and he wrote to the Education Council in 1880:

> Not that the ideal which we should propose to ourselves for the school-course in these schools is not a high or a large one. It is the ideal admirably fixed long ago by Comenius, an early and wise school reformer, who is now too much forgotten. 'The aim is,' says Comenius, 'to train generally all who are born men to all which is human.' Without pedantry and without platitudes, we should all seek to reach this aim in the most practical manner.[70]

This is the aim of the humanities, of culture, as Arnold called it. The true value of culture for Arnold was that the spirit of the human race found its ideal in making endless additions to itself, in the endless expansion of its powers and in the endless growth in wisdom and beauty. To reach this end culture was an indispensable aid.[71]

Those men who advocated a scientific education as being the most practical course for the new masses of English school children did not, for the

---

68. Ibid., p. 168.

69. Ibid., p. 172.

70. Reports, pp. 233-234.

71. A French Eton, p. 196.

most part, understand what Arnold meant by culture. Arnold meant by the phrase "knowing the best which had been thought and said in the world," not merely belles lettres, as the scientists thought, but also the results of all the best learning, Copernicus, Calileo, Newton and Darwin included.

> 'I call all teaching scientific,' says Wolf, the critic of Homer, 'which is systematically laid out and followed up to its original sources. For example: a knowledge of classical antiquity is scientific when the remains of classical antiquity are correctly studied in the original languages.'[72]

We have seen before that Arnold recommended a course like the German Naturkunde, or general science, as a regular subject in his schools. He also recommended certain other courses in crafts and sciences if they were presented with a combined, general meaning toward a fit end.

All knowledge was interesting to Arnold, but the scientists would have their processes emphasized as much as, or more than the humanities, letters or literature. They said that even for a general education science was more important. Here Arnold parted with them, for he claimed that they left out of account the "constitution of human nature." The powers which went toward the building up of human life were conduct, intellect and knowledge, beauty, social life and manners. These powers were not isolated, but related in all men.[73] Having acquired certain pieces of knowledge we desire to relate these to our conduct and sense for beauty, and here is where letters have their hold upon us.[74] Science, howsoever more accurate and factual in its concept of the universe, had not and could not replace the integrating power which religious teaching had provided in medieval universities. Humane letters, the Bible

---

72. Discourses in America, p. 87.

73. Ibid., pp. 100-102.

74. Ibid., p. 103.

included, could. Great literature related and satisfied man's sense and desire to relate his knowledge to his conduct and sense for beauty. Especially would the literature of ancient Greece do this. In comparing the glorious beauty of the Acropolis at Athens with the meanness of the Strand in London Arnold pointed out that "Fit details strictly combined, in view of a large general result nobly conceived; this is the symmetria prisca of the Greeks and is just where the English fail in art."[75] Arnold was certain that the English would recognize their failure and that the majority of them would always require humane letters, even though science had its day.[76]

In 1882, almost at the end of his career as inspector of schools, Matthew Arnold included in a report to the education council, his comments on a sermon by Bishop Butler in 1745, which Arnold thought could have been given, quite appropriately, to a congregation of middle-class exponents of a practical education in late nineteenth-century England.

> Every point is taken in it which most needs to be taken: the change in the world which makes 'knowledges' of universal necessity now which were not so formerly, the hardship of exclusion from them, the absurdity and selfishness of those who are 'so extremely apprehensive of the danger that poor persons will make a perverse use of even the least advantage, whilst they do not appear at all apprehensive of the like danger for themselves or their own children, in respect of riches or power, how much soever; though the danger of perverting these advantages is surely as great, and the perversion itself of much greater and worse consequence.' But there is perhaps no sentence in the sermon which more deserves to be pondered by us than this: 'Of education,' says Butler, 'information itself is really the least part.'[77]

Before concluding this essay on Matthew Arnold's idea of education, in

---

75. Ibid., p. 133.

76. Ibid., p. 137.

77. Reports, p. 259.

all fairness to the subject, I think that it is necessary to give a brief appraisal of Matthew Arnold's critical aims and methods and a summarizing statement of what he thought England needed educationaly. Arnold possessed a critical faculty whose validity still applies, even though his ideas on education are not presently so much discussed as are his literary criticisms, and since the main theme of his remarks on education concern the spread of literature and culture throughout the "Populace" and "Philistines," I think that the comparison between his critical faculties and those of a great modern critic will show that his ideas on education are still provocative. "But for his end, which was not culture, but the propagation of culture, and was not literature, but the procuring of literature, he is, as I said, not only right, but justified by success."[78] T.S. Eliot, a modern critic, and Arnold both appreciated tradition, but their methods of working were opposed in principle. "Matthew Arnold found generalization easy and effective because he was satisfied to build on the religious and cultural background he possessed."[79] Eliot rents his house "from the Anglicans, Classicists, and Royalists. But into this house he moves all of his outlandish furniture of Symbolism."[80] But a good generalization is needed, not various and complex results. Arnold intensified criticism.[81] His willingness to "speak responsibly" was a great thing. Arnold thought that the critic was essentially a winnower, separating the wheat from the chaff. Modern critics say that selecting is an impoverishment, and that criticism is a sensitive, sympathetic interpretation.[82] Arnold did, however, give credit where it was due and he would select even the minute

---

78. T.S. Eliot on Matthew Arnold, p. 488.

79. Ibid., p. 488.

80. Ibid., p. 488.

81. John Holloway, "Matthew Arnold and the Modern Dilemma," Essays in Criticism, I, (January, 1951), p.1.

82. Ibid., p. 15.

good from a piece of literature. He always gave a hierarchy from bad to good literature and demanded a quality of high seriousness as essential to great poetry.[83] He insisted that poetry must be illuminating and afford a central insight.[84]

If what Matthew Arnold had to say about great literature as compared to what modern critics have to say about it, is meaningful and enlightening to present day scholars, Arnold's ideas on education should be of some interest to them also. This thought has inspired the present work and I believe that all of the important statements which Arnold made concerning this subject have been analyzed here. Although Matthew Arnold's direct contact with education in England was for the most part with those popular elementary schools of the dissenting British and Foreign School Society, he had something to say about almost all the phases of European education in the neneteenth century. He was called upon to inspect schools at all levels of education in Continental countries as well as in England, and it may be safely said, that he favored the Prussian plan of compulsory education with absolute, organized, and intelligent control by the State to such an extent that he would have liked to see the Prussian system adopted in England. For the lower classes Arnold prescribed an introduction to culture. For the middle class, "the Philistines," those in control of the government, he advocated culture as the only answer to their relief from dogmatic religious differences, and their crudity and self-satisfaction. Given the absolute State control of education, and all of the decent and adequate schools and teachers and texts and curricula, Arnold believed that a respect for culture in preference to any other preoccupation would be engendered in the English people to the great benefit of

---

83. Ibid., p. 9.

84. Ibid., p. 10.

that country which held such an important place among the nations of the world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS USED IN THIS ESSAY

Arnold, Matthew, Culture and Anarchy and Friendship's Garland, New York: Macmillan Company, 1924.

——— Discourses in America, New York: Macmillan Company, 1924.

——— "A French Eton; Or, Middle-class Education and the State" in Essays In Criticism, New York: Macmillan and Company, 1880, pp. 425-506.

——— Higher Schools and Universities In Germany, London: Macmillan and Company, 1882.

——— Letters of Matthew Arnold, 1848-1888, collected and arranged by George W.E. Russell, Vols. I & II, New York: Macmillan and Company, 1896.

——— Literature and Dogma, New York: Macmillan and Company, 1924.

——— On the Study of Celtic Literature and On Translating Homer, New York: Macmillan and Company, 1924.

——— The Popular Education of France With Notices of That of Holland and Switzerland, London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1861.

——— Reports On Elementary Schools 1852-1882, ed. by Sir Francis Sandford, London: Macmillan and Company, 1889.

——— Special Report On Certain Points Connected With Elementary Education in Germany, Switzerland, and France, London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1886.

Birss, John Howard, "Whitman on Arnold," Modern Language Notes, XLVII (May, 1932), 316-317.

Fitch, Sir Joshua, Thomas and Matthew Arnold and Their Influence on English Education, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

Hammond, J.L. and Barbara, The Age of the Chartists 1832-1854: A Study of Discontent, London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1930.

Holloway, John, "Matthew Arnold and the Modern Dilemma," Essays In Criticism, I (January, 1951), 1-16.

Ingram, Florence L., "Matthew Arnold, The Educator," Education, XLIV (September, 1923-June, 1924), 197-207.

Loring, M.L.S., "T.S. Eliot on Matthew Arnold," Sewanee Review, XLIII (October-December, 1935), 479-488.

The Reinterpretation of Victorian Literature, ed. by Joseph E. Baker, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1950.

Spencer, Herbert, Education: Intellectual, Moral and Physical, New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1881.

Trilling, Lionel, Matthew Arnold, New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1939.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES OF MATTHEW ARNOLD

Brown, G.A., "Matthew Arnold," Cambridge History of English Literature, XIII, 537-540.

Ehrsam, T.G., Deily, R.H., and Smith, R.M., Bibliographies of Twelve Victorian Authors, New York: 1936, pp. 13-45.

Motter, Thomas H.V., "Check List of Matthew Arnold's Letters," Studies in Philology, XXXI (1934), 600-605.

Smart, Thomas B., The Bibliography of Matthew Arnold, London: 1892. (Rev. and enl. in Arnold's Works, XV, [1904]; omits the critical items, chronologically arranged, included in 1892.)

Arnold's Works, ed. deluxe, 15 vols., London: 1903-1904; and Works "Complete uniform" ed. 12 vols., New York: 1924. Neither ed. is complete.