



Tho^s Phillips, R.A.

B. Holl

Ever very affect^{ly} yours,
T. Phillips.

THE UNIVERSITY OF HULL

ASPECTS OF THE LIFE OF DR THOMAS ARNOLD (1795-1842)

IN THE LIGHT OF THE UNPUBLISHED CORRESPONDENCE

being a Thesis submitted for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in the University of Hull

by

Anthony James Hutchinson Reeve, B.A.

September 1988

Summary of Thesis submitted for Ph.D. degree

by

Anthony James Hutchinson Reeve, B.A.

on

Aspects of the Life of Dr Thomas Arnold (1795-1842)

in the Light of the Unpublished Correspondence

The subject of this thesis is the application of the unpublished correspondence of Dr Thomas Arnold (1795-1842) to particular aspects of his life. Hitherto, the 341 letters published by A.P. Stanley in his biography of Arnold have been regarded as the main source of his correspondence. In addition to these, however, another 630 letters have now been located, most of which are unpublished. This study establishes a chronological index of all the correspondence; shows how the unpublished letters affect the received biographical accounts of Arnold's pre-Rugby years; and uses them to develop selected themes from his career at Rugby School.

The General Introduction examines the sources of the correspondence and discusses the form in which it has been displayed within the thesis.

Part One applies the correspondence critically to the standard biographical accounts of Arnold's pre-Rugby life.

Part Two is a commentary on selected themes from his Rugby School career. The topics chosen are: incidents of indiscipline at the School; Arnold's relations with his Trustees; and the Chancery Court Case of 1839.

The General Conclusion surveys the results of the study and indicates areas for future development.

Appendix One is a chronological analysis of all the correspondence, including the form in which it survives and its location.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a great pleasure to be able to express my general thanks to all those people who have assisted me over so many years in my quest for Dr Arnold's correspondence. Foremost among these is my supervisor, Mr J.C. G. Strachan, for his invaluable advice and criticism.

There are too many to name individually, but among the large number of Librarians and Archivists I should like to acknowledge especially the help given by, Mrs Molly Barratt, sometime Senior Assistant Librarian at the Bodleian Library; Mr E.G.W. Bill, Librarian of Lambeth Palace Library; Mrs G. Chedzoy, Assistant Librarian at Pusey House; Mr R. Custance, the Archivist of Winchester College; Mr M.W. Farr, County Archivist at the Warwickshire County Record Office; the late Mr R.S. Hope, Governor and Honorary Archivist of Warminster School; the late Mr N.C. Kittermaster, Librarian of Rugby School; Mrs J. MacRory, the present Librarian of Rugby School; Mrs R. MacDonald, Assistant Librarian, Oriel College; Dr P. Mussett, Dept. of Palaeography and Diplomatic, University of Durham; Dr W.E. Parry, Librarian of Oriel College; Mr V. Quinn, former Keeper of Special Collections, Balliol College; Mrs J.E. Robinson, Librarian, Keble College; Mr C.D.W. Sheppard, Sub-Librarian, the Brotherton Library, Leeds; and Dr I. Wojtke, of the Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.

Of all those individuals who have, in their private capacities, aided my research, I am particularly grateful to, Mrs M. Barnett; Mr B.J. Cahalin (for help in locating American sources); Sir W. Dugdale; Mrs A.E. Gell; Mr A.D.J. Grenfell; Mr R.W. Lamb; Mr J. Moberly; Mrs M. Moorman; Colonel G.W. Odey; Sir M. Pasley; Major J. Shirley; and

Mr A. Whitridge.

For suggestions and criticisms in the writing of this work, I should like to thank the following members or former members of the University of Hull: Professor J.A.V. Chapple of the Department of English; the Rev I.P. Ellis of the Department of Theology; Dr T.T.B. Ryder, Dr S. Ireland, and the late Dr C.W. Chilton of the Department of Classics; Mr R. Smeaton of the Institute of Education Library; and to the Scholarships Committee of the University for awarding me a grant from the Lord Cohen Bursary.

And last, but by no means least, I owe thanks to the late Mr S. Wake, and to my mother for her encouragement and for typing the manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
PART ONE : A COMMENTARY ON THE PERIOD 1795 TO 1827	25
PART TWO : A COMMENTARY ON SELECTED THEMES FROM THE PERIOD 1828 TO 1842	205
GENERAL CONCLUSION	440
APPENDIX ONE : A CHRONOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE CORRESPONDENCE .	460
BIBLIOGRAPHY	491

--oo0oo--

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

"Lives of Arnold have been continuously put out for over a century and the flow has not ceased, but much of the water has been used like the fountain's - over and over again."¹

The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D. (hereafter called The Life), written by A.P. Stanley and first published in 1844,² has ever been the prime source for the study of Thomas Arnold's life and opinions. This celebrated and much reprinted book is based upon the reproduction, in whole or in part, of some 341 of Arnold's letters.

However, many years of investigating public and private sources both in this country and abroad have revealed the existence of nearly 1000 letters written by Thomas Arnold. Specifically, this means that another 630 letters have so far been found in addition to the 341 printed in The Life. Although a few of these have appeared in print, usually in the form of detached quotations, the letters have not been systematically collected and related to the biographical record before this study. Most of the extant correspondence is in Arnold's handwriting, the vast majority is unpublished, and it represents a significant addition to the previously known corpus of original material. Moreover, these letters provide an independent source of comparison for the text of 163 of the letters printed in The Life. The existence of so much new material, however, presented a major problem of selection and organisation.

Arnold had many interests: theology, history ancient and modern, politics, social affairs, school and educational matters are just some of the regular topics in his letters, which are usually lengthy. Given the wealth of unpublished material, therefore, much of it new factual information which frequently added to or questioned the received biographical accounts of his life, the difficulty was how best to display this great variety of subject-matter given the criteria for a Ph.D. thesis - especially the restrictions on length.

A particular problem lies in the sheer amount and diverse nature of the information available in the unpublished letters, whose range is such that it allows selections to be made which can be developed into studies in their own right. For example, the unpublished letters from Arnold's early years provide much new information and often radically alter parts of the accepted biographical interpretation of the period. The abundance of detailed information on all aspects of his Head-mastership at Rugby casts new light on many topics, such as disorders at the school, the incidence of flogging, curriculum matters, Arnold's relations with his Trustees, the Chancery Court Case of 1839 etc. . There is new information on his literary activities, and fresh insights into the religious crisis which first assailed him just before his ordination as Deacon. These are just a few of the themes which could be valuably developed from the unpublished letters. And in addition to these, there is new material which adds to or qualifies specific, though in comparison minor, details in the biographical record. Moreover, the ability to compare the texts of letters published in The Life with source documents, and the discovery of two of Stanley's working notebooks³ (hereafter called Notebooks), made a thesis on Stanley's editorial methodology a feasible proposition in itself.

Initially it was decided that because the contents of the letters were likely to be of interest to several disciplines, and were certainly capable of being developed in a variety of ways, that a systematic description of the extant correspondence should form the basis of the thesis, and from this, selections of significant material should be critically developed.

A comprehensive analysis of the correspondence was undertaken which resulted in the creation of a summary of the contents of each of the letters not published by Stanley. This study also included the critical evidence for the attribution of recipients' names and letter dates, established an index of recipients, and led to the identification of many detached, previously unattributed quotations from the correspondence which were present in The Life. This was followed by a textual study of those letters published in the numbered series in The Life for which an independent source had been discovered. Particularly significant results were produced by this exercise. Not only was the nature of the acknowledged omissions in those letters revealed, but also the hitherto unsuspected existence of many unacknowledged omissions, alterations, and inconsistencies in the published versions. Moreover it was proved conclusively that the source of many of the printed texts was not the original MS but a transcription, itself often partial. The results of these investigations were then used to produce a study of Stanley's treatment of the correspondence, a consideration of his editorial aims and techniques. Yet despite their undoubted value, these studies could not, unfortunately, be included in the thesis since the scale of the information involved would have meant the sacrifice of equally valuable material in those sections which showed how the unpublished correspondence affected the biographical

record. However, the results of these preliminary investigations are noticed in the General Conclusion, and the studies themselves are separately available from the Department of Classics.

The decision was taken, therefore, to limit the thesis to the critical application of the new material to the standard biographical accounts of Arnold's life, though even here, the amount of significant new information was such that this had to be done selectively if the prescribed limits of the work were not to be exceeded. From these considerations, the following framework emerged, the individual parts of which will be described in detail later, which allowed aspects of Arnold's life to be examined in the light of the unpublished correspondence.

In Part One of the thesis will be found a commentary on the period 1795 to 1827, Arnold's pre-Rugby days. Part Two provides a commentary on selected themes from the period 1828 to 1842, Arnold's Rugby years. These two Parts are followed by Appendix One, which is a chronological listing of the entire correspondence.

Before discussing the contents of each portion of the thesis in detail, some explanation of the nature and provenance of the evidence which forms the basis of them must be given.

THE EXTANT CORRESPONDENCE

Arnold's letters exist in one of three forms: either the original, manuscript letter, a manuscript copy by another hand, or a printed/typed copy. The majority of them are the manuscripts of the original letters.

The largest collections of letters are those held by the Bodleian Library, Rugby School, and the Brotherton Library at Leeds. The Bodleian has the biggest single collection of Arnold's correspondence and contains significant groups of letters written to his friends, particularly J.T. Coleridge and F.C. Blackstone, and also to one of his publishers, Joseph Parker. The Rugby School collection is miscellaneous and includes, among other MS material, the two previously mentioned Notebooks used by Stanley in preparing The Life. The letters held by the Brotherton Library are chiefly those written by Arnold to members of his family, and his friend George Cornish.

The discovery of the correspondence has been the result of writing numerous letters, over a ten year period, to public institutions and private individuals at home and abroad. All the County Record Offices in this country were circularised, and all the Oxford and Cambridge college libraries contacted to ascertain whether they held any of Arnold's letters. Similar approaches were also made to selected museums, libraries, and civic archives. In all these categories, personal visits were made to copy material if photocopies of the original manuscripts could not be provided. In addition to Arnold's own family, and descendants of his known correspondents, a systematic attempt was made to trace the families of all those boys who had been either members of the School House at Rugby under Arnold, or who had

been taught by him in the Sixth Form. Similar attempts were made to trace descendants of the school's Governors and Arnold's Assistant Masters. This was no light task; and even when such descendants were located, the search for letters usually proved fruitless. Happily, there were exceptions: the discovery of the Pasley letters was particularly notable, and it was gratifying, after a long search across Europe, to locate in Poland a batch of letters (unfortunately of slight interest) which had been looted during the Second World War. This is not to suggest that no more letters will be found. Even in the case of those public institutions which were contacted, it is possible that other letters written by Arnold have since been, or will be, discovered; and, of course, such institutions regularly acquire fresh material. Nor is the recording of existing manuscript holdings always comprehensive. To give one example: the Librarian of Oriel College informed the writer that by no means all the college libraries in Oxford had their manuscript collections fully catalogued. If there is always the possibility that more letters may survive in the public sector, there is even less doubt when the private sector is considered. The inherent difficulty in tracing the private source is exacerbated by the fact that Arnold's letters are collectable, and therefore sought by commercial dealers in autographs and manuscripts. The writer has systematically examined the catalogues of many major British and American dealers in such material to locate correspondence which has passed through their hands. These catalogues should be considered essential reading for all researchers into autograph material. They are valuable not only for discovering the mere existence of letters, but also for the fact that they frequently quote from the letter itself. This latter point is particularly important

when it is remembered that many of the letters which appear in their catalogues may subsequently have been sold to non-institutional sources and therefore become no longer available to the scholar. It will be seen from Appendix One that the writer has often used these catalogues as source documents. Unfortunately, commercial dealers are, with occasional exceptions, unwilling to allow copies or transcriptions to be made of letters in their possession, or to effect an introduction between researcher and purchaser. While it is true that some of the letters they hold are eventually bought by public institutions, it is equally true that many are sold privately and effectively taken out of the scholar's reach. This is unfortunate, because although the necessity for confidentiality has to be maintained, it has been the uniform experience of this writer that members of the public are more than willing to assist the legitimate researcher. In conclusion, therefore, although several hundred original letters have been found, there is no doubt that more remain to be located.

As well as the original manuscripts, some of Arnold's letters have survived in the form of transcripts, usually contemporary. The most significant source which exists in this form is the transcriptions of selected letters and extracts from them made by Arnold's wife throughout the period 1826 to 1841. Eight notebooks containing these and related matters were, at the time of writing, held on loan by Yale University, from whom the writer obtained photo-copies for the purposes of this study.

The volumes are called "Mrs Arnold's Records of Dr Arnold's Correspondence, 1825 to 1841", and they are referred to hereafter as The Records. Unfortunately, many pages of The Records are missing, and the pagination is frequently incomplete; but since the letters are

generally transcribed in chronological order, they can be traced by references to the volume number. They are a valuable source because they provide transcriptions or partial transcriptions of many letters the originals of which have not been discovered and which may, indeed, be no longer extant. The letters and extracts which Mrs Arnold selected for transcription are quite arbitrary, and formed part of a record she was compiling for her family of what was characteristic of their father, so that they might have a tangible reminder of him in later years. In fact, the selections are often interspersed with records of his conversation and remarks on various topics, and in addition, she occasionally copied letters her husband had received into these volumes. It is probable that most of the letters were transcribed by her on the day on which they were posted, so that errors of transcription could be expected to occur, a factor which has to be kept in mind when The Records provide the only extant source. Of course, in those cases where the original letter has survived, it can be compared with the transcription and any such errors detected and any omitted portions revealed.

The third and final form in which Arnold's letters have survived is the printed or typed copy. The principal items included in this category are those letters published in The Life for which no other independent source has so far been found, and similar letters which have been published from time to time, usually in biographies and reminiscences of Arnold's pupils.

A chronological analysis of all the extant letters, which includes a key to their location and the form in which they survive, is given in Appendix One, which has a separate introduction. It should be noted that throughout the thesis, references are made to the letters by the number they have been given in this Appendix.

It is convenient to conclude this section with some observations on Arnold's method of writing. In broad terms it can be said that his letters are neatly written, usually lengthy, contain a variety of subject-matter, and tend to be factual rather than speculative. The analysis of his style and methodology given by T.W. Bamford in his Thomas Arnold on Education⁴ is a reliable general survey of Arnold's technique; although the examination of so many original letters enables a few qualifications to be made to this account.

Firstly, the reason why some of the early letters have the same surface covered twice, that is the main text has writing at right angles across it thus producing a lattice effect, is not mere idiosyncrasy. It simply reflects that the postage on a letter was in part determined by the number of sheets used. Secondly, although Bamford correctly identifies neatness as a characteristic of Arnold's handwriting, he qualifies this by saying only "... until the last few years, when the first signs of untidiness and disturbance begin to appear."⁵ This view is repeated by J.R. de S. Honey, who sees a "... great change in Arnold's handwriting in the letters of those last years - the meticulous and precise hand had become careless and headlong ...";⁶ and he cites the letters in the Brotherton Library. An examination of all the extant letters, however, provides examples of occasional handwriting changes throughout Arnold's career⁷ and significantly, often at times of great stress. Moreover the uniform change in his handwriting in the last years ("careless" is too strong a word) might simply be explained by the haste engendered by an ever-increasing work-load, and the sheer number of letters he chose to write. One other point in Bamford's account which requires a comment is the fact that Arnold often,

"... seemed compelled to go on reproducing the

same arguments time and time again to
different correspondents, even to the use
of the same phrases."⁸

This practice does not necessarily have to be interpreted in terms of a psychological desire to keep satisfying himself on particular points. A simpler explanation is that such a habit was a natural consequence of his practice of writing regular, very long letters to his intimate friends acquainting them with all his doings since his last letter to them.⁹

An outline of the various parts of the thesis has already been given. The way in which the contents of the letters are displayed in each of these can now be described in detail.

THE CONTENTS OF THE THESIS

Part One of the thesis uses the correspondence to provide a commentary on the treatment by various biographers of the years 1795 to 1827. There are two reasons why this particular period has been selected. The first is that most biographical emphasis has been placed on the years 1828 to 1842, the years Arnold spent as Headmaster of Rugby School. Until this century comparatively little attention had been given to the earlier period of his life. For example, the first letter which Stanley reproduces in The Life is dated May 1817, when Arnold was twenty-one years old and a Fellow of Oriel College; and indeed for this entire period, the first thirty-two years of Arnold's life, Stanley only gives twenty-four letters in total. This "top-heavy" aspect is a typical feature of biographies in the nineteenth century and usually reflects a lack of documentary evidence for the subject's early years.¹⁰ In Arnold's case, however, much information does exist. It can be seen from Appendix One that 237 letters have been traced for these years. The second reason is that these letters are largely unpublished, and not only reveal much new information but also the existence of many errors of fact and interpretation in the biographical treatment of the period. By applying the information provided by the letters to the biographical record, the imbalance is redressed, new material displayed, and errors of fact and interpretation are corrected.

The guiding principle in the selection of material from the correspondence has been to ask whether it added to our knowledge of

Arnold's life and character. It must be emphasised that the aim has not been to produce a comprehensive biographical study of the years 1795 to 1827, but rather to show how the extant letters affect particular aspects of the received accounts of Arnold's life for this period; especially to expose the number of factual errors which are present. This means that specific points have been critically examined and developed, either because they shed new light on Arnold, or because the accepted interpretation of particular events has been significantly affected by the application of unpublished material. In the case of Arnold's schooldays, the commentary also shows how the biographical use of the correspondence has often led to a distortion of aspects of his character. The results of the investigation of the letters, therefore, are displayed in the form of a commentary on selected biographies and studies of Arnold. The criteria for selecting these can now be given.

Although so many lives and studies of Arnold have been written since the publication of Stanley's biography, as well as monographs on particular aspects of his career, most of the material on which they have been based has, as the quotation from Alicia Percival at the head of this introduction says, been used over and over again. Since so much of what has been written derives from The Life, or Arnold's own publications, it is not surprising that in addition to these works the modern sources

which are most frequently quoted are those books written by authors who had access to previously unpublished material. The three writers who have made most use of material not published by Stanley are Arnold Whitridge,¹¹ Norman Wymer,¹² and T.W. Bamford.¹³ It is because this information frequently enabled them to shed new light on Arnold's life that they, in addition to Stanley, are the authors whose accounts have been selected for detailed examination against the extant correspondence.

The principal biographical source for Arnold's letters is, of course, The Life; though the fact that only seven per cent of the letters published there relate to his pre-Rugby days, and that these plus Stanley's biographical commentary on the period only occupy seventy-five pages out of 718, does not make the work of prime importance for this period of Arnold's life. Nevertheless, despite the comparative lack of attention Stanley gave to these years, he did pass some judgements upon them, particularly on Arnold's character as a boy and young man. Since the evidence in the correspondence is often at variance with these judgements, and as selections from Arnold's letters do form the basis of his study, it is necessary to include a critical discussion of Stanley's account along with the others dealt with in Part One.

After Stanley, the first writer to make significant¹⁴ use of the unpublished letters was Arnold Whitridge, a descendant of Thomas Arnold. In his study of Arnold, he reproduced several unpublished letters, either in full or in extract. His book was designed to supplement The Life by concentrating on aspects of Arnold's personality and teaching,¹⁵ and he went some way to giving a more lively picture of Arnold, particularly as a boy, than had previously appeared. Though his account of the pre-Rugby years is brief, it is balanced and reliable.

Twenty-five years later, in 1953, Norman Wymer wrote a popular biography which has made far more use of unpublished materials¹⁶ than any other. The unpublished correspondence is the source of most of the new material he published, which derived mainly from The Records and the family letters which had been preserved by Mrs Arnold at Fox How after her husband's death. From these he quoted extensively, though always in extracts, which are often merely a few words. Wymer produced what he believed was:

"... the first complete portrait of Thomas Arnold from birth to death; a portrait in which he is seen not only as the headmaster ... but as schoolboy, bachelor and family man,"¹⁷

and the claim was made that his book, "will assuredly be the definitive biography."¹⁸ and indeed, it is frequently quoted as a source because of its previously unpublished material. The biography contains the most detailed account yet published of Arnold's pre-Rugby years; but, as will be shown, it has serious defects.

Finally, there is the work of the educationalist, T.W. Bamford. He produced a study of Arnold in 1960 in which he sought to reassess the traditional view of his subject, which he believed had "all the substance of mere legend."¹⁹ Although his book does not quote directly from the unpublished letters, he did use some of them²⁰ as well as other new sources of information (though his annotation is frustratingly sparse). Because Bamford's study is the latest and the most radical interpretation of Arnold's character, and a work which is frequently cited, its inclusion is essential.

These are the writers whose accounts of Arnold's life have been selected for detailed comparison against the extant correspondence.

For the sake of convenience, they are often referred to collectively as "the biographers". This is not to say that previously unpublished letters occur only in the works of these men - though only a handful have appeared elsewhere, and then usually in extract²¹ - and other works are discussed in the commentary when relevant. It is simply that their studies are the most significant sources by virtue of the material to which they had access.

The results of the examination of the letters from Arnold's pre-Rugby years have been displayed in three chronologically distinct periods: his schooldays, his Oxford career, and his life at Laleham. For the sake of clarity the commentary on these periods, extensively illustrated by quotation from the unpublished correspondence, has been embodied in a generally biographical format.

Part Two of the thesis gives a commentary, based on the correspondence, on selected themes from the period 1828 to 1842, Arnold's Rugby years. In this section, although the principles underlying the investigation of the correspondence and its relation to the biographical accounts are the same as those in Part One, the scope is narrower in that the range of topics examined is not so wide, and their presentation is slightly different.

Apart from limitations of space, there were three main factors which led to the decision to concentrate here on specific topics from the letters rather than, as had been the case in Part One, to range more generally throughout the correspondence and to reveal the new material in a narrative which was essentially biographical in its presentation. Firstly, a larger number of letters survives from this later period and there is a correspondingly greater diversity of subject-matter. To present the variety of material which occurs in

the correspondence for the Rugby years in the same form as the earlier period, would, necessarily, have produced a commentary which was unduly fragmentary, and one in which the relative importance of the disparate parts would not easily be perceived. This situation would also be aggravated by the fact that many of the topics discussed would draw upon letters written throughout the fifteen year period, thereby disrupting the chronological exposition of the narrative. Secondly, for the later period, far more of Arnold's letters have been published, either in full or in part, in The Life. And finally, there is the fact that his life at Rugby has been the subject of much more attention, and there is therefore, not the same level of general biographical error and misinterpretation which has been discovered in the earlier period. Nevertheless, the unpublished correspondence does reveal a number of areas in which the biographical treatment of the Rugby period can be both modified and expanded. It is from these that particular topics, the choice of which is discussed in the introduction to Part Two, have been selected for critical development.

Appendix One is a chronological analysis of all the correspondence which has so far been traced. It gives each letter's List Number (L.), date, name of recipient, the form in which the source exists, and its location.

The General Conclusion summarises the results which have emerged from the study of those aspects of Arnold's life which were selected for examination, and includes a discussion of Stanley's use of the letters and the general nature of the correspondence. The extent to which the letters have affected the biographical judgements passed upon Arnold during his pre-Rugby years is shown, and consideration given to those particular incidents from his Headmastership of Rugby School whose

received interpretation has been questioned by the application of new evidence. An assessment of the degree to which the unpublished material changes the accepted picture of Arnold is made, and an indication given of the areas in which future research might be undertaken based on the unpublished letters.

NOTES

1. Alicia C. Percival, Very Superior Men (London, 1973), p.109.
2. A.P. Stanley, The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D., 2 vols. (London, 1844).

All references in this thesis are to the sixth edition (one volume) of 1846.

Among the various editions of The Life, twelve were published in Stanley's own lifetime, many differences can be found. For example, more letters were published in some than in others; the numbering of letters differs among the editions, as does the identification of recipients. The sixth edition, on which this thesis is based, contains all the letters which Stanley ever published. Readers using this thesis in conjunction with other editions should rely upon the date of a letter rather than the number it bears in their edition of The Life. Appendix One of this thesis should be consulted, for it provides the most authoritative guide to the entire correspondence, published and unpublished, and arranges the letters in chronological order (see the description of Appendix One in the General Introduction).

3. In the Rugby School archives are two unpaginated notebooks which Stanley used for recording material relating to The Life. Many pages contain lists of letters he had seen. These are usually given chronologically with the surname of the recipient and a very brief note on their subject-matter. The lists are

incomplete; they run from 1817 to 1820, and from 1827 to 1842, although the former period has very few letters recorded.

They are certainly not a complete index of all the letters Stanley saw, because many letters which appear in The Life are not recorded in the lists. Nor must it be thought that an entry in these lists necessarily means that Stanley examined the original letter, since several of the entries have the reference "B.B." against them - which I take to mean "Brown Books" - and these correspond with letters or extracts which appear in Mrs Arnold's Records of Dr Arnold's Correspondence 1825 to 1841, a work which is described in the General Introduction. They are rough, working-notebooks and presumably only a part of Stanley's papers. However, the lists have often proved a useful source for establishing dates and recipients of letters which would not otherwise have been known.

4. T.W. Bamford, Thomas Arnold on Education (C.U.P., 1970), pp.37-40. Throughout the thesis reference to this work is always made by its title. See note 13 below.
5. ibid., p.37.
6. J.R. de S. Honey, Tom Brown's Universe (London, 1977), p.2.
7. See L.303 (September, 1829) and L.473 (May, 1834), for example.
8. Bamford, Thomas Arnold on Education, p.40.

9. This is a particularly striking feature of many letters in the Coleridge/Blackstone/Cornish correspondence.
10. A.O.J. Cockshut, Truth to Life (London, 1974), pp.16-20.
11. Arnold Whitridge, Dr Arnold of Rugby (London, 1928).
12. Norman Wymer, Dr Arnold of Rugby (London, 1953).
13. T.W. Bamford, Thomas Arnold (London, 1960). Throughout the thesis, "Bamford, op.cit.," refers to this work. See note 4 above.
14. The writers of two Victorian studies: Emma Jane Worboise, The Life of Thomas Arnold, D.D. (London, 1859) and Rose E. Selfe, Dr Arnold of Rugby (London, 1889) were given access to the family papers used by Stanley in compiling The Life. But their studies are uncritical works, largely derived from The Life, and with very few quotations from unpublished letters: they add little to the biographical record.
15. Whitridge, op.cit., preface.
16. His chief source was the Arnold family papers, most of which are now in the Brotherton Library at Leeds. Within this source, he placed most reliance on the unpublished letters Arnold had written, mainly to his family or his friend, George Cornish. It is from these that very many of the quotations he

makes derive: but since his biography is not annotated, this discovery can only be made by reading the entire correspondence. The other MS sources he mentions in his bibliography have all been consulted.

17. Wymer, op.cit., p.7.
18. Publisher's blurb on the dust-jacket.
19. Bamford, op.cit., p.212.
20. See ibid., p.126, for example. See also his Thomas Arnold on Education, p.168, p.176.
21. See note 14 above and, for example: J.R. de S. Honey, op.cit.; Frances J. Woodward, The Doctor's Disciples (London, 1954); P. Honan, Matthew Arnold. A Life (London, 1981).

NOTE

Throughout the thesis, quotations from the correspondence preserve Arnold's manuscript text, or the text of the source document, with the following minor exceptions.

- a. Stanley's practice of reducing many of Arnold's nouns to the lower case has frequently been adopted to facilitate the letters' appreciation by the modern reader.
- b. Writing across the text, at right angles to it, has not been separately noticed.
- c. Arnold's idiosyncratic use of the dash after marks of punctuation has been ignored.
- d. Any brackets which appear in the thesis are the writer's own unless separately noticed. For their use in Appendix One, see the introduction to that part.
- e. References to the letters throughout the thesis are based on the List Number given to each letter in Appendix One (e.g. L.123), to which reference should be made.
- f. The following three abbreviations should be noted:
 - i. The Life = A.P. Stanley, The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D. 6th. edition

(London, 1846). In all the Notes,
"Stanley, op.cit." refers to this work.

- ii. The Records = Mrs Arnold's Records of Dr Arnold's Correspondence, 1825 to 1841. (Held at Yale University.)

- iii. Notebooks = The two volumes of A.P. Stanley's Working Notebooks. (Held at Rugby School.)

PART ONE

A COMMENTARY ON THE PERIOD 1795 - 1827

BASED ON THE EXTANT CORRESPONDENCE



INTRODUCTION

When the extant correspondence for the period 1795-1827, the years before Arnold went to Rugby School, is examined, it becomes apparent that very few of the letters have been published. For example, the first of the numbered letters which Stanley reproduces in The Life is dated 28 May 1817, at which time Arnold was a Fellow of Oriel College. In Appendix One, this letter is numbered L.74. Indeed for the entire period 1795-1827 only twenty-four letters were published in The Life, whereas two hundred and thirty seven are extant. Because these letters reveal not only new biographical information but also the existence of many errors of fact and interpretation in the principal biographies, the results of the examination of the correspondence have been presented in the form of a commentary on Arnold's pre-Rugby years. This commentary concentrates selectively on those aspects of Arnold's life on which the correspondence sheds new light. It does not pretend to be a complete biographical study of the period. The commentary itself is divided into three distinct periods: Arnold's schooldays; his university career; and his life as a private schoolmaster at Laleham. The extant correspondence has been compared with the principal biographical accounts of these years and the results of this examination have generally been displayed chronologically.

ARNOLD AT WARMINSTER SCHOOL AND WINCHESTER COLLEGE

The Correspondence: 1803-1810 (L.1-L.34)

The simple biographical facts of Thomas Arnold's life for this period are well established. He was born on 13 June 1795 at West Cowes in the Isle of Wight, the seventh child of William and Martha Arnold. His father held a number of official posts on the island, principally those of Collector of Customs and Postmaster, to which latter position his wife succeeded on her husband's sudden death in 1801. Thomas's early education was entrusted to his aunt Susan Delafield until 1803 when he followed his brother Matthew to Warminster School in Wiltshire where he remained for four years. In 1807 he entered Winchester College where he spent a similar period until his entry as a scholar of Corpus Christi College, Oxford in 1811. He achieved a first-class in Literæ Humaniores in 1814 and was elected as a Fellow of Oriel College the following year. He remained at Oxford, where he was ordained Deacon in 1818, reading privately and taking pupils until 1819 when he began a partnership with his brother-in-law, John Buckland, in a small, private school they established at Laleham. In 1824 this partnership was dissolved, although both men continued to teach at Laleham until Arnold was appointed Headmaster of Rugby School. He entered on his duties there in 1828.

The extant letters from Dr Arnold's schooldays are thirty-four in number and cover the period 1803 to 1810.¹ The only publication of any of them in their entirety was in 1932 when E.G.Selwyn, then Dean of Winchester and a descendant of Dr Arnold, reproduced eight letters in the journal Theology.² In the same year, P.& G.Wells Ltd., the Winchester College booksellers, produced a booklet which purported to be a reprint of the letters which had appeared in Theology but which actually contained

five additional letters.³

Of the biographers who certainly examined the manuscript letters: Stanley, apart from one brief extract and a few indirect allusions, did not use them⁴; Whitridge reprinted four extracts and drew on the contents of some of the others, although not by direct quotation⁵; while Wymer made most use of them, but again in extract, often giving no more than a few words.⁶

It is necessary to remember that the extant correspondence represents virtually the only source of evidence for Arnold's character as a schoolboy. Without the letters we should know almost nothing about his early life apart from whatever oral reminiscences Stanley had preserved in his brief narrative in The Life. They are unquestionably the prime source for Arnold's schoolboy career.

The principal biographers generally have very little to say about the formative years of Arnold's schooldays, and the attention which has been given to this period has been confined chiefly to his education at Winchester College. Nevertheless, biographical judgements have been made about Arnold's first school, Warminster, and his character during his years there.

Wymer paid most attention to the school, depicting it as a rustic academy:

"... intended primarily for the local farmers' sons, perhaps twenty or so, who went ambling there on their palfreys each morning then galloped home again in the evening; ... (with) so little arranged in the way of a programme (that) tea - drinking and eating appear to have provided a major occupation."

He believes Thomas outgrew the school and had to be moved "to be saved from becoming a prig."⁷ Bamford, who generally follows Wymer for this period,⁸ concludes that:

"Thomas ... developed into an oddity if not an eccentric. The masters found him difficult to handle, ... the school would benefit greatly by his absence. ... it was just possible that a larger establishment would bring a more normal outlook."⁹

Whitridge, on the other hand, states that "his letters home show him to have been a perfectly normal little boy."¹⁰ Given such diverse estimates of his character, it is worthwhile examining these biographical judgements in the light of the unpublished correspondence and other information to see how definitive we can be about the young Arnold and Warminster School.

Firstly, how accurate is Wymer's portrayal of Warminster as a rather inefficient day-school "intended primarily for the local farmers' sons,"? The obvious question is if it were such an institution, why were the Arnolds prepared to send their sons there, and at such a distance from home? Warminster possessed no scholarships for the universities, and financial considerations were an important factor, for the Arnold household suffered more than an emotional shock when William Arnold died suddenly in 1801.¹¹ The family had made fair progress into the ranks of middle-class society, but they had little money to spare.¹² In fact, they had always been hard-pressed, and for Martha Arnold the immediate prospects had looked bleak.¹³ However, she was, quite unexpectedly, appointed Postmistress for the Isle of Wight, and then her income was further supplemented by her son William, who began to remit part of his salary to her.¹⁴ Therefore, the very real prospect of slipping down the social scale had been avoided, but the family had to be careful, and any

unnecessary expenses would be avoided. There was an apparently adequate grammar school in Newport, Isle of Wight, which regularly sent its scholars to Eton and Winchester, and whose fees were substantially less than Warminster's;¹⁵ indeed, Matthew had commenced his education there. While it is true that the Headmaster and Second Master at Warminster were friends of the Arnold family, the determining factor seems to have been the quality of the education the Arnolds believed their sons would receive. Matthew, for example, had remained there for four years and successfully matriculated at Merton College, Oxford. Educationally or financially, therefore, it would have made little sense for the Arnolds to have sent Thomas to Warminster had it been the kind of school depicted by Wymer.

Although their archives do not reveal the number of boys at the school, sufficient evidence can be adduced which suggests that Warminster School was flourishing at this time. Indeed, the whole emphasis of the establishment was probably on its boarding side, for in 1801 it became necessary to build a new dormitory block to provide accommodation for another twenty boys. In fact, the Headmasters of the school had a vested interest in increasing the number of boarders. Under the terms of the foundation deed, twenty local boys were supposed to be taught Latin and Religious Knowledge (and no more), and for this the Headmaster was paid £30 p.a. However, he was allowed to take in his own pupils as boarders, at his own expense. Any other subjects taught in the school were "extras"¹⁶ and had to be paid for separately as the Headmaster had to engage and pay his own staff. Likewise, any additional buildings which were required on account of the school's expansion had to be erected and paid for by him. Clearly Latin would be of little use to the "farmers' sons" or even sons of local tradesmen, and while Religious Knowledge was not irrelevant,

subjects such as reading, writing and arithmetic would be of more practical use to them; but as these were all chargeable extras, the dayboys who were there were probably a mere handful, sons of tradesmen or local gentry who could afford to pay.¹⁷ The Headmaster, Dr Griffith, obviously judged that the expenditure of his personal capital on an extension to the school's boarding accommodation was a sound commercial investment, and the little evidence there is reveals that the school attracted boarders from well outside Wiltshire.¹⁸ Among them was a member of the Bowdler family and it says much for the moral reputation of the school that it satisfied the exacting standards of that household.¹⁹ Given these facts it may be considered that Wymer's depiction of Warminster as primarily a day-school for the local farmers' sons is inaccurate to say the least.

There is also evidence which suggests that the academic standing of the school was high and its system anything but desultory. For Dr Griffith's immediate predecessor as Headmaster was the Rev H.D. Gabell, a strict disciplinarian, and a man who has been described as "pre-eminent as a teacher"; certainly not the sort of man who would waste his time tutoring rustics.²⁰ And on his own appointment, Dr Griffith publicly advertised that he would be:

"... pursuing the same plan of education, and the same line of conduct ... so successfully pursued by ... the Rev G.I. Huntingford and Mr Gabell, ... to keep up the character the school has long had, of being one of the first private schools in England."²¹

Dr Griffith's own views on education were by no means narrow. Prior to his appointment at Warminster he had opened his own academy near Frome where, in addition to the Classics, he offered tuition in Arithmetic, Geography, French, Music, and Astronomy.²² It is not known if all these subjects were available at Warminster, but the Arnold correspondence does

mention Arithmetic, Geography, and Dancing, as well as the Classics and Religious Knowledge it is known the school was required to teach. Such gibes as Wymer's, "with so little arranged in the way of a programme tea-drinking and eating appear to have provided a major occupation", and, "when nothing definite had been arranged - which was more often than not", are confuted by the evidence.²³ For example, in L.18, there is a list of Thomas's classical reading for the half year: three books of Homer's Iliad, one book each of Horace's Odes and Epistles, five books of Virgil, parts of Sallust, Polyænus, Aelian, Xenophon, "and others". While there may have been some fluidity in the required reading among the regular subjects, all this, combined with his other studies, hardly supports the view that there was very little formal work for the boys to do. If, therefore, the school was not, as previously thought, a rather inefficient, rustic academy, how did it affect the young Arnold? It is convenient to consider this question by asking to what extent the letters support the differing estimates of his character; especially the notion that he was:

"an eccentric rebellious boy, difficult to handle,"

"as far above his fellows in matters that adults argue about and children ignore as he was below them in the subjects ... the more rightful concern of youth."?²⁴

His private reading does not seem to have been particularly abnormal. L.1 reveals a small boy's passion for lurid fiction, as exemplified by Lewis's Tales of Terror and Wonder, and his obvious relish in describing his own juvenile attempt at composition as "a very bloody tragedy you may be sure.". Certainly it would be a mistake to believe that his later views on the deleterious effects of light fiction upon schoolboys were reflected in his own youthful tastes. Yet the temptation to accept the

idea that the child is father of the man has frequently proved irresistible to his commentators, although they have not been helped by misleading quotations from his correspondence. For example, in the penultimate sentence of L.11²⁵ occurs the word "ludicrous":

"I have lately read Roderick Random, which I think of all the novels I ever read is in the ludicrous style inferior only to two, namely Don Quixote, and Peregrine Pickle."

Wymer, erroneously assuming that Arnold has used it in a pejorative sense,²⁶ reproduces this one word to prove that the embryo Dr Arnold "preferred deeper works", and thereby misleads E.L. Williamson into stating that Arnold "discounted (novels) as merely ludicrous".²⁷ Once the word is read in context, we realise that, on the contrary, Arnold rather enjoyed them.

Of course, young Thomas read "serious" books. The non-classical authors he mentions in the letters are Milton, Shenstone, Pope (Odyssey), Ferguson, Mavor, Priestley, Prideaux, and Junius. With the exception of Ferguson, Shenstone, Mavor, and Junius, all these names have been recorded in the biographies; but do they show that his reading was unusually deep? David Newsome's observations on the atmosphere of early nineteenth century middle-class family life enable the reader of the letters to place examples of apparent precociousness in perspective.²⁸ As Newsome shows, Arnold conformed to the pattern, so that for a boy of that period from such a background, who liked poetry, the names of Milton, Shenstone, and Pope are not particularly surprising, while Ferguson and Priestley²⁹ merely confirm that the interest in history, which his father had stimulated, had continued to develop at Warminster.³⁰ However, the main emphasis in the letters is not on literary criticism and once these names are seen, not only in the context of the letter in which they occur, but also in

relation to the schoolboy correspondence as a whole, it surely becomes hazardous to invest them with undue significance. For example, Williamson has this to say of the nine year old Arnold's interest in Prideaux's "enormous and erudite work":

"(it) may well have been aroused by Prideaux's attempt to show how the prophecies of the Book of Daniel were fulfilled by the decay of the Roman Empire."

Such remarks seem more than a little overstrained when the reference is seen in context.³¹ It occurs in a letter Arnold wrote to his aunt (L.9), and this shows clearly that Thomas was browsing among many books after a particularly satisfying tea, the delights of which he seems rather more concerned about recording than any new light he has received on the subject of the literal fulfilment of prophecy:

"(I) was stuffed as full as I could hold with Cake Tea and Plumb Pudding for supper besides what I liked better than all books of all sorts among which I discovered one that I thought you would like it was Prideaux's connection of the Old and new Testament. I am sure if Patty had been there I should not have eat half as much as I did." (L.9, sic).

If the letters do not suggest that in his private reading he was so "far above his fellows", we can say that by temperament and upbringing he liked "books of all sorts", history books in particular, and we know also that the school library, such as it was,³² enabled him to indulge his inclinations; but it would be wrong to overemphasise the effect they had upon him, or the part they played in his life at this time.

If his private reading can be explained without depicting him as a prodigy, do the letters suggest that he was below his fellows "in subjects ... the more rightful concern of youth"? Did the boys at Warminster

consider him the oddity some of his biographers think him to have been?³³
 There is some evidence among the letters which suggests an answer to these questions.

Certainly he was not a complete stranger to the school and its customs when he arrived, for in addition to the strong Isle of Wight connection which it is known existed, some of his brother's friends still remained among the senior boys, and no doubt this made his initial entrance less traumatic than it might have been.³⁴ The letters show that he made friends (and doubtless enemies too), but the scattered references to his fellows do not indicate that young Thomas was a boy apart. For example, he cuts short his letter of 3 March 1806 because, "I am just going out to play"; he drinks tea "twice or three times a week ... (with) different numbers of my companions". He enjoys cricket and fives with them,³⁵ is an enthusiastic combatant in at least one mock battle, and shares their boyish irreverence for magisterial authority. In short, there is no direct evidence to suggest that he became unpopular at any period of his time there, and any picture of the young Arnold as a solitary eccentric, virtually immersed in his books, is patently overdrawn. Neither must he be depicted as an exceptionally religious boy. Bamford cites as part of his evidence for young Arnold's oddity, that "He grew religious and decided on the Church as a career at the age of ten."³⁶ Now this gives an impression of his character wholly at variance with the evidence. Not only is there no other reference in the Warminster correspondence to this subject than:

"I am sorry William does not approve of my being a Clergyman,
 as I am so attached to that line that I could not endure
 any other,";

but the context of this statement (L.11), between a description of his

mustard and cress in the school garden and his having learned some dance steps, might suggest that as evidence for his habitual preoccupation, not too much weight ought to be attached to it. Indeed, the schoolboy correspondence as a whole is not the product of an excessively pious child.

A reader of the letters will notice the cordial relationship which existed between Arnold and one of the masters, the Rev. J.T. Lawes. We know also that the Headmaster was a family friend.³⁷ This raises the question of whether or not Thomas received preferential treatment at Warminster; was Lawes, for example, as familiar with all the boys?³⁸ It is not an easy question to answer; for, with the single exception of George Evelyn, we lack the evidence of Arnold's contemporaries. However, a clue may lie in the characters of the Headmaster and his assistant, and the regime they inherited.

Undoubtedly Lawes was very friendly with young Arnold: they dined, drank tea, played cards, and went visiting together. There is no question that Lawes treated Thomas anything but kindly, yet this same man was known as a brutal disciplinarian during his later Mastership of Marlborough Grammar School. One of his victims described him as "the greatest tyrant that ever tormented little and big boys."³⁹ At first sight, this apparent contradiction seems to indicate that Thomas must have been in a privileged position. However, evidence exists which suggests that Lawes' character changed after he left Warminster when he acquired a long and painful illness and a termagant wife.⁴⁰ There is one other piece of contemporary evidence about Lawes' character. Some years after he had left the school, Arnold's earliest friend, George Evelyn, wrote to his old master offering him the living of Abinger in Surrey, which he had in his gift. Although he had not seen Lawes since his days at Warminster, he wished to nominate him because, "time has not obliterated from my

recollection your kindness and attention to me",⁴¹ which is testimony to the impression he made upon one other boy at least.

Dr J. Griffith, the Headmaster of Warminster, seems to have been a benevolent and enlightened man and it is not inconceivable that his views on pupil/master relationships were equally humane. He had succeeded Dr Gabell, an excellent teacher, but a man who completely mistrusted schoolboys when they were not under direct supervision. Indeed, the petty restrictions and lack of tact which characterised Gabell's later Headmastership of Winchester College were a direct cause of the rebellion there in 1818.⁴² It seems likely that his regime at Warminster had been equally severe and that Dr Griffith deliberately relaxed the atmosphere.⁴³ In L.13 Arnold pays striking testimony to Griffith's character referring to "all that goodness of heart so natural to him", and, as noticed before, ample evidence for the tone of the school at this time is provided by the fact that it satisfied the moral standards of the Bowdler family. To this can be added that when Arnold went to Winchester, the boys' hostile reaction to his saying his prayers at bed-time may reveal something of a contrast in attitude between the two schools.⁴⁴

While there cannot be complete certainty of the extent to which the masters were familiar with the other boys, there is not a shred of evidence to support Wymer's assertion that a clique of "favourite" pupils existed in the school:

"Occasionally, if he was lucky enough to be among the favoured few, he was taken on an excursion to one of the landmarks of the district, a favourite objective being ... Longleat."⁴⁵

This is derived from L.5, which provides the only example in the entire correspondence of a visit to Longleat, or, for that matter, any other "landmark of the district,". All that Arnold records in L.5 is that

"I went yesterday with Mr. Lawes and Oglander to see Longleat and the Marquiss of Bath's park.". This certainly does not supply a factual basis for Wymer's gibe. Nor is there any evidence in the correspondence that Arnold suffered anything of the social ostracism which might have been expected had he been in any way singled out for preferential treatment.⁴⁶

With regard to his academic ability at this time, it may be useful to consider it in the light of the reasons his biographers give for his being sent to Winchester College. Wymer, with his fanciful view of Warminster, believes it became clear that the school could not provide a boy of Thomas's abilities with a sufficiently good education. He also states that the move was made despite Mrs Arnold once more finding her circumstances reduced.⁴⁷ Meriol Trevor shares this opinion, considering that the school was "not really good enough for this exceptional boy".⁴⁸ And Bamford adds to his view of Thomas as an eccentric oddity that he had become so rebellious and difficult to handle that the school would be a better place without him, and that there was just a chance that a larger school would restore him to "a more normal outlook."⁴⁹ When we examine these opinions against the facts of the letters, a rather different picture emerges.

There is nothing in the correspondence to suggest that young Arnold's scholarship was exceptionally advanced for his age. He went to Warminster with a rudimentary knowledge of Latin,⁵⁰ and it is significant that six months after entering the school he makes the plaintive remark that he is not yet in the next form, "nor ever will be".⁵¹ Further testimony to the fact that he did not acquire the ancient languages without a struggle appears in a letter he wrote in 1831 to his son Matthew, who was having difficulty in learning Greek Grammar.

"it puts me very much in mind of my own trouble when I was first

put into Phaedrus. You cannot think how many
impositions I got, and how many hard knocks;".⁵²

All of which shows that even when he reached "the next form" he did not find things easy. From the evidence of the letters, his progress in reading the Classics was steady but not spectacular.⁵³ He possessed a particularly retentive memory, and given the emphasis placed upon learning lines by heart, this would obviously assist him;⁵⁴ but the judgements he makes upon the ancient authors, which Wymer interprets as proof of unusual intelligence, are the commonplaces of the classical handbooks of the time, so it is difficult to assess how original they are. For example, while not denying that he read intelligently, Thomas's remarks in L.11 that Horace is "superior to all the ancient poets" and "at the head of all the Lyric poets both ancient and modern", can hardly be taken as proof that the ten year old boy had read them all. It suggests rather a tone of judgement adopted for the purpose of impressing the family.⁵⁵ Clearly he thought about what he was reading, and he was astute enough to make comparisons between the authors he read for his private pleasure and those in the regular school course.⁵⁶ But is this more than should be expected from a lively-minded boy with a passion for history and poetry?⁵⁷ Another reason for thinking his academic achievements unexceptional is that there is no mention in the correspondence of any scholastic successes. Had he been regularly gaining commendations and prizes, it might reasonably have been expected that some record of this would be found in his letters home. The memory of a glowing career at Warminster School would surely have been preserved as a reminiscence within the family circle and recorded by Stanley. They did remember his "forwardness in history and geography" for example.⁵⁸ Nor can any significance be attached to his election as a Winchester Scholar, for the examination was a mere formality.⁵⁹

If there is no evidence to suggest that he had exhausted the intellectual abilities of his instructors at Warminster, there is certainly nothing to justify Bamford's assertion that they found him unmanageable.⁶⁰ He may well have had a tendency to precociousness, but it may be doubted that the evidence warrants the pejorative remarks some of his biographers have made about his character. Therefore, if Thomas was not a rebellious oddity, and if there is reason to doubt that he had outgrown the education Warminster could provide, is there another explanation for his removal to Winchester?

While Wymer's account of the move is not reliable, it is worth exposing its inaccuracies because an answer arises from its very implausibility. It has been shown that his original premise - that Thomas had outgrown Warminster - is false. However, his account is further confused by his attempt to explain the transfer at a time which Mrs Arnold probably found inopportune. Wymer has to account for his belief that Thomas had to be moved, yet he has to concede that it was made at a time when Mrs Arnold's circumstances were once more reduced. In an attempt to explain this he asserts that the fees "demanded of scholars" were not much more than those she was already paying at Warminster.⁶¹ This statement, however, becomes equivocal when it is realised that despite being aware of a distinction between Scholars (Collegers) and Commoners at Winchester, he writes the word Scholar both with and without a capital letter. Such usage leads to ambiguity, particularly when we consider his assertion that "The fees demanded of scholars were only a little above those payable to Warminster; and Arnold was eligible, on residential grounds, for admission as a scholar.". Here he does not seem to be speaking of "scholars" in the sense of "pupils" since he refers to Arnold's "eligibility on residential grounds", a factor which only becomes significant if he means "Collegers". However, the fees for a Winchester Scholar (Colleger) and a Warminster boy were not virtually

the same. In fact, it would cost Mrs Arnold less to have her son educated as a Scholar at Winchester than to have him remain at Warminster. On the other hand, a Commoner's fees were in excess of those payable at Warminster.⁶² Yet it seems clear that Wymer's account is based (correctly) on the belief that Arnold was to enter College at Winchester. Is there a solution which fits all the facts?

Clearly, any explanation must take into account two points, that the move was probably not essential and that it occurred at a time which was financially awkward. We know that the Arnolds had to be careful with their money,⁶³ and there is little doubt that Mrs Arnold would notice the financial loss occasioned by her son William's death in November 1806. Not only had Thomas's school fees to be paid, but there was the prospect of even more expense if he followed his brother Matthew to university. The move to Winchester solved these problems, for with Thomas as a Winchester Scholar, his fees would be less than those payable at Warminster. Furthermore, Warminster possessed no scholarships or exhibitions to either of the universities whereas Winchester had several.⁶⁴ Educationally or economically, therefore, the move to Winchester made very good sense, since it met both present and future considerations.

Arnold's schooldays at Winchester College have received much more attention from his biographers. Wymer and Whitridge have examined this period at some length, and thirteen of the sixteen letters Arnold wrote from the school have been published in their entirety, and a substantial portion of another.⁶⁵ However, the question of why all sixteen of the letters were not reproduced in 1932 by E.G. Selwyn, either in the journal Theology or subsequently in his booklet of Winchester letters, merits

examination. There were three he did not publish.

Of these letters (L.24, L.25, and L.33), it seems certain that Selwyn never had access to L.33, for unlike the other two, it does not form part of the collection he presented to Winchester College in 1933. Whitridge reproduced part of it in his biography, and it seems probable that it was one of the letters owned by Mrs Vere O'Brien, which now form part of the collection held by the Brotherton Library.⁶⁶ If this accounts for the absence of L.33 from Selwyn's booklet, no such explanation can be offered for L.24 and L.25, for these formed part of the group he deposited with the College. Why, therefore, did he publish all of this collection but these? It cannot have been because he thought them uninteresting, for they are both, arguably, more interesting than, for example, L.29, which he did include. It is true that these letters contain allusions to individuals whose descendants might have been alive, but this applies equally to some of those he did publish. After fifty years there can be no certain answer to this question, but there may be significance in the fact that both these letters include criticism of the school's proceedings. L.25 for example contains some heartfelt remarks upon the value of the Classics - on the worth of Latin prose composition in particular - and the Winchester authorities might have felt uncomfortable about the appearance of such sentiments from such a source in a booklet on sale in Winchester and thus readily accessible to the boys.

If the possibility exists of some discreet censorship with regard to at least one of these two letters, there are stronger grounds for thinking that the disclosure in L.33 of the existence of a gang of thieves in College was deliberately suppressed. Whitridge concludes his quotation from this letter with the words "(manuscript torn)".⁶⁷ In fact, there are another fifty-four lines to this letter, the next seven of which are

untouched by the "tear", which in any case only affects the last words of sixteen lines. As Arnold changes the subject and starts a new sentence immediately after Whitridge's quotation, it is difficult to understand why Whitridge should have mentioned the torn manuscript. It does not affect his quotation, but it does suggest that the rest of the letter is missing. Neither he nor Wymer allude, even indirectly, to the contents of this portion of the letter elsewhere in their narratives. Yet the details contained in the omitted portion are of significance, not only for the further glimpse they provide into the realities of schoolboy life at the time, but also for the light they shed upon the actions of the prefects. Their management of the whole affair, from the closing of prefectorial ranks to the secret inquiries, intended to obtain sufficient evidence to lay before the authorities, has obvious relevance to Arnold's later views on the authority of the prefectorial body. The letter provides an example of the young Arnold and his fellow prefects displaying just the sort of responsible, independent behaviour that would undoubtedly have commended itself to the future Headmaster of Rugby School.⁶⁸

Although reasonably full descriptions of his life at Winchester have been written, the unpublished letters contain information which casts new light on Arnold's career at the school and enable emphasis to be placed on some aspects of the correspondence which have not been noticed before. For example, in L.24 Arnold remarks that "there has been no change of Chambers this half year", an innocuous remark, but it enables the impatience Thomas felt about his position in the school during his first year, and the remarkable efforts he made to remedy the situation to be revealed. Writing to his old tutor in December 1807 (L.19), within two months of his entrance, he states that although he is, in Winchester parlance, in Junior Part 5th Book, he is "confident I could do the

business of Middle Part.". This claim seems to have had substance, for in the same letter he declares that all of the books he has to construe, save one, he has read, in part, before. Consequently, "there is nothing very difficult in (them)"; a remark which provides yet more evidence that his previous school was not educationally moribund. His early disquiet at his position in the school⁶⁹ was aggravated by the fact that a Warminster contemporary had been placed in the form above (Middle Part 5th Book) and this despite, as Thomas indignantly records, his having "learnt no books but what I have."⁷⁰ The result of all this was that he found the work too easy and had time to spare.⁷¹ Wymer does not wholly support this view, stating that on one occasion "during his first year" he was so "overpowered" by the "rigorous curriculum" he feigned sickness.⁷² This argument, however, collapses when it is realised that Wymer is quoting from the letter of 29 March 1809 (L.26), written nearly a year and a half after he had entered the school and, as will be shown, when he was some two forms higher than the one in which he had spent his first year. Wymer had prepared the ground for this remark by quoting, from L.19, that "'everything is now easy to me, though I confess I found some difficulty at first'".⁷³ The general reader naturally assumes that Arnold's "difficulty" related to all his work whereas the quotation should read, "I found some difficulty at first in the verses.", a reference to the regular composition of Latin verse. Wymer's incomplete quotation thus disguises the real situation which was, that by June 1808, he was top of his class and certain of the form prize.⁷⁴ While most boys would have acquiesced in so agreeable a situation, young Arnold clearly believed that he had been unjustly treated and by his actions gave evidence of that determination which was to become so marked a feature of his character. Instead of taking the examination of his own form (Junior Part 5th Book)

in July 1808 and obtaining promotion to Middle Part, a promotion which he believed would merely lead to the waste of "a year or perhaps more", he felt so confident of his ability to do the work of the next form, that he asked Gabell, but a few weeks before the examinations, to promote him so that he could, if successful, commence the next term (October 1808) in Senior Part 5th Book.⁷⁵ As C.W. Holgate observes, with nice understatement, "a great advance over his position in 1807."⁷⁶ Gabell acceded to his request⁷⁷ and, by a great effort, Thomas vindicated his belief in his own abilities, rising from 130th to 57th in the school.⁷⁸ Whitridge would view this promotion as evidence of an "awakening critical faculty",⁷⁹ but the tenor of the relevant letters suggests that Arnold was actuated more by the desire to prove a point than to display his passion for the Classics. In fact, the whole episode is suggestive of that trait in his character which rendered him incapable of submitting to a situation he believed unjust despite the fact that, in this case, acquiescence meant an easier time and the kudos of a school prize.

In L.25 there are some revealing remarks about a hitherto unexamined relationship of his schooldays. Stanley tells us that Arnold's "boyish friendships were strong and numerous",⁸⁰ and certainly three of the most intimate friends of his later life were at Winchester with him: J. Tucker, who was two years his senior, F.C. Blackstone, and T.T. Penrose, who "kept almost side by side (with him) during their careers there"; although Blackstone reached the sixth form before him.⁸¹ However, it is noteworthy that the surviving letters from this period have virtually nothing to say about them. In fact, absolutely nothing about Tucker and Penrose, while Blackstone receives the briefest mention in but three.⁸² Undoubtedly the four boys were very good friends at Oxford, but just how close their relationship was at Winchester is open to question,

particularly in the light of some remarks Arnold makes in the letters about his friendships at the College, and especially about a boy "who has acquired an ascendancy over me that no one else can possess here." (L.32).

It was, perhaps, that streak of impatience in his character, a feature which can be traced throughout the correspondence, as much as anything else that made Thomas so "exceedingly variable in my friendships and dislikes" (L.32). Stanley mentioned one friendship, that with George Evelyn at Warminster, as a significant example of the high regard in which the young Arnold could hold another boy. Yet Arnold's biographers have remained silent about another relationship of his boyhood which, for us, holds more interest because of the insight it gives into the young Arnold's developing character. This is the warm attachment he formed at Winchester College with Cyril Lipscomb,⁸³ about which his biographers have maintained a uniform silence. Stanley chose not to mention it, and not because Lipscomb was still alive, for he died in 1815 at the age of twenty; Whitridge and Wymer both chose to pass over the matter; and Selwyn did not reproduce two relevant letters in his Theology articles.

The history of the friendship can be traced through the correspondence. Lipscomb's name appears first in L.23 in the form list given by Thomas after the examination in July 1808. Thomas's promotion to Middle Part 5th Book had placed him in Lipscomb's form. In L.25, written in March 1809, young Arnold says:

"I am as partial as ever to Lipscomb: I have got my scob
(desk) next his and I hope we shall continue so always:
it shall not be my fault if we do not:".

He anticipates suggestions that this will be just a casual friendship, quickly to be supplanted by "some other friend", and says, "I hope not, I am sure, at present I have no idea of any such,". In September 1809 (L.31)

he writes that,

"Lipscomb is very well and I am happy to say (as good a) friend as ever, I am very (much obliged to) you for your (asking) after him."

So the friendship had lasted, and by November 1809 (L.32) he had this to say,

"I have been constant for a considerable time in my esteem and affection for one particular person, I mean Lipscomb. My regard for him far from decreasing by time, or supplanted by other new associates derives on the contrary new strength from continuance, and new relish by experience of the inferiority of others. Playful and gay yet never foolish, sensible and well informed without moroseness, affectionate goodnatured and endearing he is bound to me by every feeling of love, esteem, and veneration. To me his friendship is invaluable. He has acquired an ascendancy over me, that no one else can possess here. Whenever I am inclined to be idle, he makes me industrious, he checks all my faults, not by lecturing which I never could endure, but by a winning manner, and his own example. Perhaps you may smile at the warmth of my expressions, but I am really sincere. I only wish to have it in my power to prove how sincerely I am attached to him."

Thomas goes on to relate their times together: they have supper together every night, they row together, walk together, drink Cherry Brandy together; in short, they are inseparable. Unfortunately there is a break in the correspondence, and the next surviving letter, dated September 1810 (L.33), records the end of the friendship. The details are few: Arnold had quarrelled with his friend over a boy named Jackson, the result of which had been that Jackson became Lipscomb's friend at

Thomas's expense. A subsequent rupture between these two caused Lipscomb to seek a renewal of his old intimacy, but Arnold was "very cool on the occasion" and unwilling to become reconciled. The consequence was that Lipscomb patched-up his quarrel with Jackson and Arnold was left to find a new friend. It cannot now be known why they quarrelled, although in view of what had gone before, it presumably must have been serious. Perhaps Lipscomb took Jackson's part in some dispute and Arnold resented it; although jealousy cannot be discounted as a possible explanation, for Arnold was obviously fascinated by Lipscomb and he might well have been unable to accept the prospect of having Jackson as a rival for his companion's friendship. Certainly it may be felt that Arnold's rebuff to his old friend's offer of reconciliation had more than a little of pique about it.

How should all this be evaluated? As the Public School historian, J.R. de S. Honey, has observed, spontaneous expressions of affection between boys were characteristic of the age;⁸⁴ it may also be well to state that the boys were born within six months of each other, so this was not a friendship between an older and a younger boy. It can be added that the relevant letters were addressed to his mother, aunt, and one of his sisters. However, there is no doubting the intensity of feeling which was aroused in the fourteen year old Arnold. It is revealing that he himself was conscious of expressing his feelings on the subject rather more freely than was usual: "Perhaps you may smile at the warmth of my expressions" (L.32). Nevertheless, their strength was such that he wished his family to know that he really meant what he said. Indeed, he went so far as to say that compared with Lipscomb all others were inferior and that he longed to prove his attachment in some positive way. A reader of some of the biographies, apart from finding no record

of any such passionate friendship, might find Arnold's reactions at variance with the character there portrayed. Where he might have expected Thomas to moralise the relationship, he finds him brief - Lipscomb makes him industrious and checks his faults by example. Instead, the whole affair is romanticised. In fact it is the strongest indication so far of that passionate, wholehearted side of Arnold's nature which, as Bamford has noted, made him "intense in everything he did".⁸⁵ Although the circumstances of their separation are unknown, a weakness of Arnold the man is foreshadowed by the sudden volte face and the suggestion of self-righteousness, "I had no inclination to be made his convenience", which he displayed. Despite all that had gone before, he was not prepared to pocket his pride and accept Lipscomb's offer of reconciliation. While the significance of his conduct in this affair in relation to his later character may be debated, his remarkable display of feeling deserves notice if only because it provides a more complete picture of the boy. Clearly the teenage Arnold underwent the same emotional upheavals as most adolescents.

That the letters fill hitherto unsuspected gaps in the biographical accounts is manifest, but they have a wider import, for they pose questions about the way in which the extant correspondence for this period has been used, and why the biographical interpretation is often at such variance with the evidence contained in the letters. From this investigation of the extant correspondence three general areas can be identified in which the misinterpretation of the schoolboy correspondence has produced error. Since they may often derive from each other, these areas are not entirely independent. Nevertheless, for purposes of

illustration they can be examined separately. They are firstly, the prejudice of the biographer for or against his subject; secondly, the use of quotations which have been detached from their context; and thirdly, often deriving from this, unwarranted speculation. As an example of how the evidence can be distorted by the biographer's own predilections, it may be useful to consider the earliest of the available accounts of Arnold's schooldays, that of Stanley, which has not so far figured in the present discussion.

When it is recalled that Arnold died on the eve of his forty-seventh birthday, it may be considered surprising that Stanley should devote just four pages out of some seven hundred to the first sixteen years of his subject's life. Indeed, the impression received by reading The Life, an impression common to most studies of Arnold, is that his boyhood was relatively unimportant and that his character and opinions were formed, in part, during his Fellowship at Oriel, but largely in his years at Laleham. The consequence has been a series of "top-heavy" works originating with The Life. The reasons for Stanley's cursory treatment of this early period cannot be explained by lack of evidence. He would have had two main sources: the family correspondence preserved at Fox How (and there is little doubt that he read all of the schoolboy letters which survive today⁸⁶), and the reminiscences of Arnold's sisters and schoolboy contemporaries. Yet the fact remains that in a biography designedly based on the reproduction of hundreds of letters intended to give the reader "a correct understanding of their writer in his different periods of life",⁸⁷ Stanley chose not to publish the schoolboy correspondence. Victorian reticence would have had something to do with his decision. The general disclaimer which he included in his preface embraces anything which might prove painful to living persons; anything

which, without detailed explanation, might be capable of misunderstanding; as well as domestic details, no matter how typical, because they could not be "published without a greater infringement on privacy than is yet possible,". It is obvious that the scope of these qualifications is so wide that virtually anything might be included within its purview. On the other hand, the amount of space afforded to this period of Arnold's career might accurately reflect Stanley's opinion of its comparative importance in relation to his life as a whole. It must also be remembered that Stanley had only known Arnold as the Headmaster of Rugby School. Nevertheless, although he chose not to publish any of the relevant letters, he did pass certain judgements upon Arnold's character as a boy. However, the picture they give of their subject is so one-sided that we may wonder if Stanley really understood the evidence. The little he has to say is devoted primarily to highlighting those points in the child which foreshadow the man. Thus the emphasis is placed almost entirely upon the "serious" side of the boy's character to the exclusion of all those boyish traits and incidents, the narration of which takes up by far the greatest amount of space in the extant correspondence. The portrait of Arnold the schoolboy, which might have been invested with so much interest and been the subject of quite illuminating anecdote, is, in Stanley's restrained narrative, not only a colourless reproduction, but an unfaithful one, for it does not satisfy his own guiding principle, that he would give "what was characteristic" of Arnold at each period of his life. What he gives is a picture of a studious, earnest boy who delights in poetry and history, the embryo classical scholar and Headmaster setting out on his course. There is too, for the first time, the notion that he was "unlike those of his own age"; a boy whose disposition was "shy and retiring", stiff and formal, "the very reverse of...(his later) joyousness and simplicity".⁸⁸

If Stanley really believed that this depiction of Arnold's schoolboy character was an accurate reflection of the correspondence, it argues a degree of misunderstanding which verges on the astonishing.⁸⁹ Of course, Stanley may have had access to more than the letters. Other primary sources available to him have been noted, and it is possible that he drew upon oral reminiscences of the young Arnold.⁹⁰ Yet if this is the explanation for his views, it may be asked why those recollections were at such variance with the correspondence; a point which surely cannot have escaped Stanley. A possible solution might be that in the immediate aftermath of Arnold's death, which is when Stanley began compiling his biography, any such recollections were heavily coloured by the knowledge of the figure Arnold had become. There is, however, more than conjecture, for two things can be said with certainty: that Stanley did draw indirectly upon the correspondence to support his narrative, and that he did it very selectively.⁹¹ This suggests that he made a conscious decision between any oral evidence which remembered the "serious" schoolboy, and the written evidence, which suggested the "typical" schoolboy. Given Stanley's biographical technique and declared intention of letting his subject speak for himself, he might have been expected to attach more weight to the written rather than the oral evidence. That he based his portrayal on a view of Arnold as a "serious" schoolboy and confirmed it by extracts from the written evidence that supported it seems clear. Therefore it has to be assumed that he did not wish to portray Arnold the boy as anything other than the embryo man.

Any explanation of Stanley's treatment must take account of three well-attested elements of his own character. Firstly, that he was writing, from an "almost filial relation(ship)",⁹² of the man he revered; secondly, his consciousness of what the boy he was describing was to become; and

thirdly, the fact that he was, by temperament, wholly unsuited to sympathise with the boyish traits in Arnold's character. Undoubtedly he would have felt a difficulty in reconciling some of Arnold's schoolboy escapades with his future dignity, and he took care not to provide examples of any such incompatible contrasts. By doing this, the possibility exists that he was evincing Arnold's own belief that the period between childhood and manhood should be passed over as quickly as possible. For without the benefit of modern child-psychology, he makes the sweeping statement that, "The period both of his home and school education was too short to exercise much influence upon his after life."⁹³ Nevertheless, his failure to provide a complete picture of Arnold the boy violates his avowed intention of giving whatever "was characteristic" of his subject. However, the real clue to Stanley's treatment of this period surely lies in his own most untypical boyhood.

Stanley's biographers repeatedly stress his dissimilarity to other boys - "a child so far removed in tastes and habits from the generality"⁹⁴ - and the exceptional course of his school career. A picture emerges of a delicate, short-sighted boy who suffered from headaches, a boy living in an intellectual "world of his own, apart from the ordinary pleasures of boyhood";⁹⁵ a boy who found Tom Brown's Schooldays, "an absolute revelation to me: it opens up a world of which, though so near me, I was utterly ignorant."⁹⁶ If it is hard to imagine a more complete contrast than the schooldays of Arnold and Stanley, it takes an immense effort of imagination to believe that Stanley could enter, even in spirit, into much of the life Arnold describes in the Warminster and Winchester letters. Consequently, there is no suggestion of young Thomas's exuberance and typically boyish high-spirits. "I went and dirted my hair so much by rolling on the ground", says the fourteen year old Arnold.⁹⁷ It may

safely be believed that Stanley was unlikely to empathise with this sort of remark. Such examples might not be particularly edifying, yet they are far more representative of the correspondence than Stanley's brief selection. There is a strong temptation to believe that by emphasising the "serious" side of Arnold's boyhood, and by choosing to dwell upon those points which coincided with his own juvenile characteristics, he was interpreting Arnold's character by his own. The "shy and retiring" boy immersed in his books and "unlike those of his own age" seems to be a far more accurate delineation of his own boyhood than Arnold's. Clearly, Arnold derived much of his knowledge of boys' behaviour from his own schoolboy experiences; that evidence of such experiences existed, would never have been deduced from reading Stanley's account of the period.

Although Stanley's brief treatment of the correspondence inaccurately reflects its value as evidence for Arnold's schoolboy character, and thereby provides a good example of biographical prejudice, it nevertheless remains, after the letters, as the principal source of contemporary evidence for Arnold the schoolboy. Though Whitridge's brief but balanced assessment of the period stresses Arnold's normalcy, Stanley's emphasis on the untypical nature of his subject as a boy has been followed by both Wymer and Bamford. However, when the citation of evidence in support of a narrative is based upon a fundamental misunderstanding of what that evidence reveals, it is unlikely to present an accurate picture of reality. This leads to the second general area of error, the use of incomplete quotations.

It has been shown that many errors of fact and wrongly drawn conclusion exist in Wymer's narrative of Arnold's Warminster schooldays, and that the correspondence has been used to underpin that narrative. What is particularly significant is the manner in which Wymer has used the letters

as evidence. In no case does he reproduce a complete letter. Instead he gives isolated quotations, detached from their context, and often extremely brief. That there are dangers inherent in this practice has been shown: not only because unconnected quotations, even when not used to support an incorrect premise, frequently lead to a distortion of the facts, but also because they may seriously mislead later commentators. Nor is this method of using the correspondence confined to Wymer. A striking example occurs in Whitridge's narrative.⁹⁸ Noted earlier was his unconnected reference to Prideaux's Study of the Old and New Testament, which Williamson, knowing nothing of the context, and being further misled by Whitridge's statement that Arnold "delights in" the book, has supposed might be an example of the young boy's interest in the nature of prophecy. The process by which he reaches this conclusion illuminates the point. All that Williamson can deduce about the source from Whitridge is that the reference derives from a letter written by Arnold during his days at Warminster School. His bibliography reveals that the only original schoolboy letters he has read in their entirety are those from Selwyn's selection in Theology, but these, of course, are confined to the Winchester period. In the apparent absence of further evidence, he sees Whitridge's reference as helping to corroborate that part of his premise which seeks to trace Arnold's moral idealism to his childhood training.⁹⁹ Thus he feels justified in offering a picture of the young Arnold deep in abstruse, religious study; a representation he might find not incompatible with the general biographical emphasis on the "serious" schoolboy. Setting aside the question of whether he should have endeavoured to trace Whitridge's source, and the fact that the letter had to be written by a boy not more than eleven years old, this unconnected reference to Prideaux has produced a supposition which has little basis

in fact; speculation has been heaped upon ambiguity. To a reader of the entire letter (L.9) this is obvious, but Williamson, having only a partial quotation to rely upon, has speculated erroneously in line with his premise and thereby invested the evidence with a significance which is entirely unwarranted. In one of the unpublished letters, the young Arnold mentions that he has been reading a copy of The Letters of Junius.¹⁰⁰ How fruitful a field of speculation might have been opened out by an out of context reference to that book!

The example from Williamson of speculation deriving from an incomplete quotation has shown how cautious the commentator must be when he has not examined the original source. An example can now be considered from a biographer who has examined the original documents.

As part of his evidence for Arnold's precocity, Wymer gives two detached quotations as examples of alleged rudeness. Despite the fact that precocity and rudeness are not synonymous terms, Wymer's treatment of the examples is worth examining:

"He was showing signs of becoming precocious. Even Susanna referred to him as 'my rude brother', and a bumptious letter to his aunt proved that he could be equally rude to her when he chose: 'I suppose, Aunt ... that you expect a few compliments to be paid to you: but really untill you can shorten your nose I must shorten all panegyric on your beauty.' Happily, Arnold was not often so impudent."¹⁰¹

The first point to make is that these instances of rudeness, if they are such, are the only examples in the extant correspondence, therefore, Wymer's "not often so impudent", suggests rather more than actually exists. Secondly, the remarks must be read in the knowledge that a good deal of mutual banter seems to have taken place between Thomas and his family.¹⁰² A feature of

all the letters is the frank and spontaneous style in which they are written. His home life was obviously such that he could write humorously and without reserve, especially to his sisters, therefore, all the quotations must be read with this in mind. The reference to "my rude brother" is taken from the letter of 26 February 1807 (L.15), which commences "Dear Somebody". In this letter he addresses directly both his sister Lydia and his aunt, and it is, in fact, Lydia and not Susanna who has rebuked him. Wymer's quotation, in context, reads, "You must never again call me your rude brother, I assure you I should think it a very great insult:". Taken at sight, this does suggest that Lydia had reprimanded her brother for some impertinence towards her - although the knowledge that Thomas was not devoid of humour might prompt the thought that the tone of this reply to her was studied. Nevertheless, it does seem to support Wymer's belief that he had insulted her. However, a closer investigation of the correspondence suggests another explanation. In this same letter Thomas says "I beg you will not let John forget the words I taught him;". While this remark may seem irrelevant to the case, it becomes important when we examine the next letter, that of 17 March 1807 (L.16), addressed to his aunt, but written both to her and his sisters. In this letter he says, "But though his (John's) pronunciation of the word 'Cake' does put dirty ideas into one's head, that was not what I meant;". Is it unreasonable to infer from this that Lydia was referring to this particular subject; that she called her brother "rude" because she believed (wrongly) that he was trying to teach a young child "rude" words, and, therefore, that she was not complaining, as Wymer believes, about a personal affront to herself? If we consider this speculation more plausible than Wymer's, then one of the only two supports for his argument has been removed.

Wymer's second example seems to have more substance, and, in this case, he has correctly ascribed the remarks as being addressed to Thomas's aunt. However, his speculations on this as an example of rudeness can be heavily qualified. For example, much of the letter is directed to his sisters and is generally written in a style of playful banter:

"Dear Aunt,

You must make my excuses to Fan for not writing to her but as I have not written to you since I came here, and you are the eldest she must wait with patience. How came you to expect another letter from me? You had not answered my last to Sue, I indeed have been in daily expectation of one, from what she said that Fan would write in a few days. I am as well as can be expected and have not the least cold. So much for that. I have learnt two lessons in Xenophon's Cyropaedia, which I do not like much: Upon my honor your Ghost story was remarkably entertaining, but for it to turn out to be a Petticoat!!! Oh Heaven! I expected, I confess, a far nobler catastrophe. I suppose, Aunt, from the rest of my letters that you expect a few compliments to be paid to you; but really untill you can shorten your nose, I must shorten all pænegetic on your beauty: But vanity is not your foible, you are far too wise to be offended at my bluntness: That's to sweeten it, you'll say: No it is not my dear Aunt it is my real opinion and so be contented. Frances you want a sugar-plum but you shall not have one, I promise you, Miss: You are a Fury, and I think a very good picture of Tisiphone: But if you mend your manners, I'll mend mine: Don't be offended:" (L.16,sic).

It will be noted that Wymer's quotation is preceded by a reference to a

ghost story which Thomas's aunt had sent to him. It might be wondered why he should immediately pass from this to an apparently gratuitous insult. Was there some connection which is now lost? It might be speculated that the grammar, the abundance of exclamation marks, indeed, the whole tone of the letter, suggest that at the moment of writing, his high-spirits were overflowing. His emphasis of certain words will be noticed too, and while, on the one hand, it is quite legitimate to interpret that emphasis as part of his rudeness, can it be said unequivocally that he was not alluding, in a jocose manner, to some humour current in the family circle? Indeed, so many are the qualifications which might be raised about the tone of this letter, that it would be hazardous to insist definitely upon any one interpretation. Just why should Thomas's aunt expect compliments upon her beauty? Perhaps such expectations had been solicited anything but seriously; and equally, perhaps Thomas anticipated a mock rebuke. In short, it could well be that no real offence was either expected or intended. Certainly it is worth noting that if Thomas thought he needed to soften his remarks, then he was obviously aware of something. Yet the fact that he rejected the option of starting a fresh letter, that he allowed his remarks to stand, surely suggests that he did not think they would give serious offence. And, after all, the letter was preserved by the family. It seems that rather than providing incontrovertible proof, this example of Wymer's, when read in context, raises more questions than it answers. Clearly, any such charge of disrespect must take into account the context of the remarks, their relation to the whole correspondence, and, especially, Thomas's character and home background. Given all this, would it, in any case, be so inexcusable if adolescent high-spirits occasionally led him into an indiscretion?

If such speculations as Wymer's, apparently trustworthy because based

on quotations from the original sources, can be heavily qualified, if not refuted entirely, how cautious must the reader be when considering the third area of error: ostensibly authoritative statements, which, when examined, are found to have little or not support in direct evidence, but are rather the biographer's own speculations?

Instances of this have already been noticed, but a more general example may be taken from Bamford. In describing Arnold's life at Winchester College, he gives some very detailed information about his predilections:

"He loved above all to talk of serious things, of Jacobins and saints, of social classes and revolution, of Rousseau and the Church. ... the old generation recoiled from the (French) Revolution ... but the country's youth argued ... and many found sense and justice there. For Thomas, this was his most agreeable stamping-ground. He became an apostle of the rights of man and the priority of fundamentals ... the extreme radicalism he proclaimed as a youth was with him throughout life, ...¹⁰³.

These are very positive statements. Yet Arnold's own retrospective account of these years depicts a much more fluid situation. What Arnold himself says is that as a youth he moved from Toryism to Radicalism and "at Winchester I was well nigh a Jacobin."¹⁰⁴ This phase lasted until the influences of Oxford "blew my Jacobinism to pieces, and made me again a Tory."¹⁰⁵ What this provides is evidence of rapidly fluctuating views, and thereby shows how careful the biographer must be in portraying the child as father to the man. Nevertheless, there seems little doubt that Bamford is justified in identifying Arnold as a radical - at least for a time - at Winchester. However, is he equally justified, as proof of this

characteristic, in ascribing to Arnold the specific examples of radical tendencies which he does? With no qualification to the contrary, the impression is given that these are well-attested examples of his radical outlook. Now while it is quite possible that Arnold the schoolboy did discuss "Jacobins", "Saints", "Rousseau", "the rights of man and the priority of fundamentals" during his days at Winchester, it is perfectly certain that there is no direct reference to any of them in the extant correspondence; nor, it seems, anywhere else.¹⁰⁶ These specific topics have been called "his most agreeable stamping-ground", but if they do have a basis in fact, such statements would have to be reconciled with the complete absence, in his own schoolboy letters, of any corresponding references. In those letters there are two examples of his disgust with the corruption he sees in high places,¹⁰⁷ and two references to the church,¹⁰⁸ but it would be straining the evidence very hard to interpret them as proof of "extreme radicalism". In fact, it would be no easy matter to deduce from his extant letters that he held the Jacobinical views at Winchester he later avowed. It may be that in writing home to "a strong Tory family"¹⁰⁹ he felt the necessity of moderating his feelings. Nevertheless, the fact remains that his own extant letters do not reveal the "extreme radicalism" that Bamford portrays as an abiding characteristic of his youth. Paradoxically, there is, in an unpublished letter of 1809 (L.25), a statement of Toryism which suggests a willing acquiescence in the status quo and a complete aversion to revolution:

"I am convinced that from the creation of the world to this hour there never was a free constitution anywhere but in England! ... if the wild ravings of unprincipled democracy, or the furious struggles of sedition constitute liberty, then indeed were the Republics of Greece and Rome the freest ...".

While this might be adduced as evidence for his interest in "social classes and revolutions", it certainly does not suggest that at Winchester, in March 1809, he was ready to man the barricades. On the contrary, for there is further evidence which indicates that at this period of his youth, far from proclaiming "extreme radicalism", he was under the influence of Toryism of a most reactionary kind - that of William Mitford. On 15 February 1809 (L.24), Arnold wrote, "I am reading Mitford's History of Greece over again, and could read it for ever I am so delighted with it:". Here it should be noted that much of Mitford's Greek history was an attack upon the Whig and Jacobinical principles of his day and a refutation of the idea that the ancient republics were free and contented.¹¹⁰ Arnold's next extant letter is dated 4 March 1809 (L.25), and contains, after an outburst of patriotic fervour, the panegyric on the English constitution previously quoted. The fact that Arnold's language follows so closely the sentiments avowed by "the Tory historian of Greece" surely indicates how thoroughly, for the moment, his enthusiasm for Mitford had carried him.¹¹¹ Yet within two years, by his own admission, he was avowing the very opposite principles. This is not so surprising, for it is the nature of youth to change rapidly, and there is no reason to think that the young Arnold was much different from the majority. Therefore, although it is always tempting to typecast a man, it is frequently misleading, so that from a biographical point of view, it would be more accurate to say that Arnold's youthful opinions were in constant flux rather than to portray them as inflexibly set in the mould of radicalism. Furthermore, such a view point would have the advantage of being supported by direct evidence; it would not have to depend upon unsupported conjectures.

In reviewing the correspondence for this period of Arnold's life, there

can be little doubt that these early letters not only reveal more about Arnold the boy than can be gleaned from the biographies but also provide the means of correcting some significant errors of fact in those accounts.

ARNOLD AT OXFORD

The Correspondence: 1811-1818 (L.35-L.81)

There are fifty letters extant for the years Arnold spent at Oxford (1811-1819), first as an undergraduate at Corpus Christi and then as a Fellow of Oriel College. Given the recipients of these letters, there is little doubt that Stanley would have read most of them. Only one letter, however, and that from 1817 (L.74), was printed in The Life. In this section the letters L.35-L.81) are considered; L.82-L.84, although written during his Fellowship, are included in the section dealing with his life at Laleham. In examining the correspondence for the years 1811 to 1818, it is convenient to discuss the undergraduate letters (L.35-L.65) first, and then those for his years as a Fellow of Oriel (L.66-L.81).

None of the letters which survive from Arnold's undergraduate days were reproduced by Stanley, since the account of Arnold at Corpus Christi in The Life was given in the form of a long letter written by J.T. Coleridge, Arnold's lifelong friend and sometime contemporary there.¹¹² In his letter, Coleridge observed that his recollections of the events of thirty years past were probably not "so fresh and true" as they might be, and he dropped the hint that "A true and lively picture of (Arnold) at that time would be ... interesting in itself;". However, to supplement Coleridge's account with selections from the correspondence did not accord with Stanley's biographical scheme, even though sufficient material to form just that "lively picture" existed therein.¹¹³ This defect was eventually remedied, first by Whitridge and then by Wymer, both of whose accounts are supported by quotations from the letters. Of the published accounts, therefore, Stanley, Whitridge, and Wymer represent the main sources for Arnold's days at Oxford. However, an examination of the undergraduate correspondence has

revealed not only new information about this period, but also the existence of a number of errors, both of fact and interpretation, in the biographies.

Before reviewing the letters, it is necessary to consider the circumstances of Arnold's admission to Corpus Christi, since the two most recent biographies have suggested that his entrance there was, if not a mark of failure, then at least something of a disappointment. This notion originated with Wymer, who says that:

"Having gained nineteenth place on the Election Roll (at Winchester) of 1810, with vacancies available only for two, Thomas Arnold failed to obtain admission to New College. ... If he was disappointed at first at being unable to enter Winchester's sister college, he soon forgot his disappointment"¹¹⁴.

Bamford, presumably seeing Arnold's position on the Election Roll as further support for his pejorative view of the boy, develops Wymer's idea thus,

"So in due course, in 1811, he went to Oxford, not to New College, where the brighter boys went, but to Corpus Christi. He was sixteen at the time ...".¹¹⁵

The first point to make is that both these accounts seem to be based on a misunderstanding, both of the nature of the election procedure between Winchester and New College, and of the academic standing of that latter institution at the time of Arnold's entrance. The situation was that at New College there were twenty undergraduates¹¹⁶ whose numbers were replenished by Winchester Scholars (Collegers). Every year an Election Roll (Indenture) was produced at Winchester, and this Roll listed the boys' names in the order in which they should fill any vacancies which arose among the undergraduates at New College during the following year. An examination of the candidates took place before the Roll was published; but this examination, like the entrance examination to Winchester College, was not

competitive. It was mere form and had little to do with the order in which the names were placed on the Roll.¹¹⁷ Once this fact is appreciated, it becomes clear that the position of Arnold's name on the Election Roll of 1810 cannot be advanced to support the view that he was not one of "the brighter boys". Moreover, the explanation of Arnold's position on that Roll provides additional evidence to refute Bamford's assertion that only "the brighter boys" went to New College.¹¹⁸

In fact, the order was determined primarily by age. Indeed, the compilation of the Rolls was so well known that "a boy of thirteen or fourteen would have a fair idea of his chances of a New College fellowship four or five years later."¹¹⁹ Now Arnold was quite young when he went to Oxford. Although Bamford says "He was sixteen at the time", he was actually fifteen years eight months when he entered in February 1811.¹²⁰ In point of age, therefore, he was unlikely to take a high place on the Winchester Roll of 1810. The election document itself supports this view.¹²¹ It shows that with one exception, all the boys on the list were older than Arnold. In fact, over half of them were older by three years or more, and it was from their ranks that the New College vacancies in 1811 and 1812 were filled. They might or might not have been "the brighter boys" - that was not the criterion. They were merely the boys who qualified by age.

One final point must be noticed which in itself renders Bamford's "brighter boys" remark completely untenable. Under the foundation statutes, any Winchester Scholar who could claim to be a descendant of the Founder, William of Wykeham, automatically took precedence when a vacancy arose at New College. In Winchester parlance, such boys were called "Founder's Kin". On the election document of 1810, the two boys who head the Roll, J.T. Pickard and S. Miller, have their names bracketed with the letters "C.F.". This is the abbreviation for Consanguineus Fundatoris, or

"Founder's Kin", and these were the boys who filled the first two vacancies at New College. For this reason alone, therefore, it would not have mattered had either the examination been competitive, or Arnold been the most qualified boy in point of age. For the existence of "Founder's Kin" on a Roll guaranteed that their names should head it - whether they were "brighter boys" or not.

The notion that he failed to enter New College because he was not bright enough can be dismissed as false. What the evidence does show is that he was trying to matriculate before his time. When he entered Winchester, he probably knew that his age would preclude his entry to New College before his seventeenth birthday. Now a scholarship there, followed by a Fellowship and the prospect of remunerative preferment, was undeniably attractive.¹²² Why then, if his sole aim were entry there, did he not remain at Winchester and await his turn in the normal way? The answer turns upon the number of likely vacancies at New College in the future. For clearly, boys could only enter when vacancies arose; and in point of fact, so few were the actual vacancies, that only seven of the twenty-one boys on the Winchester Roll of 1810 did eventually enter there. Since the number of vacancies was largely predictable, Arnold probably knew that his chances of ultimate admission, before he was superannuated, were slight.¹²³ Given this, and the knowledge that the financial standing of the Arnold family probably made an early matriculation desirable, his decision to sit a competitive examination for a scholarship at Corpus Christi is not surprising. And the fact remains that neither he nor anyone else (before Wymer) suggested that he was in any way disappointed at failing to enter New College.

A record of the Corpus entrance examination has been preserved in the account of William Whitmarsh Phelps, who sat for a Wiltshire scholarship

in October 1815. His testimony shows that the candidates were examined continuously over five days in what - unlike the Winchester "examination" for New College - was clearly a severe test.¹²⁴ Coleridge also testifies to the strictness and impartiality of the Corpus examination, and adds that Arnold, although very young, succeeded against strong competition.¹²⁵ These testimonies provide yet more evidence that any refusal to classify Arnold among the so called "brighter boys" is erroneous. Equally false is the assumption which underlies one, if not both of the quoted narratives: that the academic standing of New College at this period was exceptionally high. This is particularly apparent when it is compared with Corpus Christi.

There is no evidence that New College was, academically speaking, a particularly desirable place to reside. The thoroughness of the system of teaching practised at Corpus, and the high tone of that college, is well known through Coleridge's description¹²⁶ (the accuracy of which is attested by Arnold's correspondence and will be noticed later). In comparison, it is convenient to refer to Buxton and Williams' recent commemorative study of New College. In discussing the period from 1801, when a gradual change came over Oxford teaching through the institution of a competitive examination for an honours degree, they present a dismal picture of the college. They reveal a (typically) decayed institution whose character and outlook was firmly fixed in the past.¹²⁷ They portray a college in which, for the Fellows,

"Life was a matter largely of filling in the time and deciding by vote upon the disposal of offices ...",

and a society which took little part in the demand for higher standards posed by the institution of an honours school.¹²⁸ A college which preferred to hold "aloof from the debates over the functions of fellows,

(and) methods of teaching".¹²⁹ Far from believing it to be a much-coveted centre of academic excellence, Buxton and Williams are forthright in their condemnation:

"The intellectual life of the College was at a low ebb.

Until the 1850s the level of undergraduate attainment was unimpressive."¹³⁰

They traced this unhappy state of affairs to the foundation statutes, which confined New College fellowships to Winchester Collegers¹³¹ and gave it the "privilege of sending men up for degrees without their having first taken university examinations or supplicated for graces to Congregation."¹³² That it was the common practice of her undergraduates to avail themselves of this option, rather than entering into competition in the Schools is revealed by the Oxford Class Lists.¹³³ During a period of forty years - from 1802 when the first Class List was published - only eighteen New College men appeared on the Lists. And not until 1842, the year of Arnold's death, did they achieve a First Class in Literæ Humaniores.¹³⁴ This hardly suggests that New College was a centre of intellectual eminence. As Bamford says, "a good degree was essential" for Arnold's future;¹³⁵ but given the evidence, it seems unlikely that the system of instruction practised at New College would have provided the basis for distinction in the Schools. Indeed, not only is the generally accepted view of the superiority of Corpus's methods confirmed by the available evidence; it might seem that rather than being unfortunate, Arnold was, on the contrary, very lucky not to be entering New College.

Evidence for the academic life Arnold followed as a Corpus undergraduate exists in L.36. This letter deserves attention for the valuable information it provides about a neglected area of Oxford history, the academic routine of the early nineteenth century.¹³⁶ It was written at the start of his second term and gives details of his daily activities:

"... We have really lots to do this term; no time to myself: the whole morning taken up with lectures. Read the following and pity my case. I am obliged literally to read Aristotle with my breakfast, for we go to lecture in him at ten o'clock on Monday. Lecture ends at eleven, but then at twelve we go up to Bridges for a little Logic which lasts till one. Bathing employs me till half past two; and as we dine at four, there is no great deal of time to read. But this is the best day in the week. Tuesday we go to Mount's Quinctilian lecture at ten, and to Cooke's Aristotle lecture at eleven. Thus two hours together are employed in lectures. But to day and Friday are the worst days in the week. Cooke's lecture in the Hall begins at ten, as I do not go to this I can eat my breakfast in peace, but that is all; at eleven I go up to Aristotle in Cooke's rooms; and at one up to Bridge's with a little Logic so that on these two days we are not free from lectures till two o'clock and then bathing takes another hour and a half, so that dinner comes before I can sit down. Thursday is a blessed oasis in the desert for then we have no lectures at all. and Saturday is like Tuesday but really Wednesday and Friday are intolerable. If ever I am up late I am obliged to defer my breakfast till twelve o'clock and be quite fashionable; or if, as was the case yesterday, hunger

is too powerful, I eat in such a hurry that Aristotle is neglected and I go up to lecture in imminent jeopardy. As to going on the water (it) is quite out of the question except after tea, and I am indeed become a hermit altogether, and never show my nose in Oxford till it gets dark: so I am become very owlsh."

From this information, the following timetable can be constructed (the names of the lecturers are given in brackets):

TIMETABLE : MAY 1811

Monday

10-11 a.m. : Aristotle (G.L. Cooke)
 12-1 p.m. : Logic (T. Bridges)
 1-2.30 p.m. : Bathing
 4 p.m. : Dinner

Tuesday

10-11 a.m. : Quinctilian (C.M. Mount)
 11-12 a.m. : Aristotle (G.L. Cooke)
 4 p.m. : Dinner

Wednesday

11-12 a.m. : Aristotle (G.L. Cooke)
 1-2 p.m. : Logic (T. Bridges)
 2-3.30 p.m. : Bathing
 4 p.m. : Dinner

Thursday

No Lectures

Friday

11-12 a.m. : Aristotle (G.L. Cooke)
 1-2 p.m. : Logic (T. Bridges)
 2-30 p.m. : Bathing
 4 p.m. : Dinner

Saturday

10-11 a.m. : Quinctilian (C.M. Mount)
 11-12 a.m. : Aristotle (G.L. Cooke)
 4 p.m. : Dinner

College Chapel would be daily, probably at 8 a.m. and 6 p.m.

Coleridge has testified that the system of tuition at Corpus "was well devised for ... young men of our age",¹³⁷ and Arnold's timetable shows that contact between undergraduate and tutor was virtually daily; a state of affairs which was by no means typical.¹³⁸ Wymer's brief notice of L.36 was to record that "Arnold felt overpowered by his tasks";¹³⁹ but his account is not entirely accurate. For example he says that,

"Whereas the tutors in other colleges gave their lectures individually, those of Corpus Christi preferred to deliver theirs to small classes of undergraduates. Since the viva-voce renderings and tests that invariably followed those lectures were also conducted before an audience, the students were naturally always on their mettle".¹⁴⁰

The point here is that at that time, "lectures" on the prescribed texts commonly took the form of the class construing a portion of the classical author to the tutor, who would then correct any errors.¹⁴¹ This was the "viva-voce" aspect. It did not, as Wymer has it, follow the lecture, it was the lecture. This is why Arnold is "obliged literally to read Aristotle with my breakfast" and why, if he neglects to do so, he goes "up to lecture in imminent jeopardy.". If he cannot construe his portion of the text, he will be floored in front of his fellow students.

Another point which arises from this letter relates to the sub-division of the students for teaching purposes. Wymer, almost certainly on the basis of Coleridge's statement that the "classes (were) of such a size as excited emulation",¹⁴² says that the Corpus tutors "preferred ... small classes". This is confirmed by Coplestone, who states that a tutor's pupils were divided "according to their capacities" and that the number comprising a class varied between three and twelve.¹⁴³ Although these figures are not very large, it must be remembered that the total number

of undergraduates in a college at this period would only have been small.¹⁴⁴ For example, Coleridge says of Corpus that "the whole number of students ... under college tuition seldom exceeded twenty."¹⁴⁵ so that lecturing to small groups was the rule rather than the exception. This may explain why some of Arnold's lectures took place "in Hall", while others were held in his tutor's "rooms". Although the change of location might have been simply a matter of administrative convenience, it is possible that it reflected the size of the class involved. But it would be unsafe to infer from such speculation as this, that a small group was necessarily one of high ability. However, the knowledge that a system of sub-division existed, based upon ability rather than upon mere numerical desirability, probably explains a statement in Arnold's account of his routine on a Friday. For on that day, he says that "Cooke's lecture in the Hall begins at ten, as I do not go to this ..." (L.36, my emphasis). Now if he means by this that the lecture was part of Cooke's regular first-year course on Aristotle, then the probable explanation for Arnold's absence is that Cooke had indeed divided his undergraduates into "small classes". If this is the case, then it would, of course, be interesting to know how many groups there were, and whether Arnold had been placed in the one which showed most ability (Coleridge "rather think[s]" that he was¹⁴⁶). Unfortunately, these are questions to which the letters do not provide an answer.

At the time he wrote L.36, Arnold clearly felt that his studies were exacting, a point upon which Wymer lays emphasis. But it is worth questioning how much weight can be attached to this complaint. Was Arnold justified, or was it merely a reflection of how he felt about things at that particular moment? It is also worth considering Wymer's interpretation of those details in the letter which he feels support Arnold's view.

The reconstructed timetable shows that ten hours a week were given to

formal lectures. It also reveals that these were all finished by two p.m. at the latest; that there were never more than two a day; and that with the exception of Tuesday and Saturday, the lectures were never consecutive. Given that he would have to rise for chapel - probably held at eight a.m.,¹⁴⁷ then he should have been on his feet with time enough to eat his "breakfast in peace" (L.36). It is noteworthy that he always seems to have found time for one and a half hours bathing; although from his remark about not being able to go "on the water ... (until) ... after tea" (i.e. to row), he seems to have considered bathing as necessary exercise rather than amusement. Wymer quotes his remarks about becoming "a hermit" and never being out in Oxford before nightfall. Yet this latter assertion is demonstrably untrue from Arnold's own account of his daily occupations - unless it is supposed that he bathed and rowed in the darkness. And since L.36 is the only letter to have survived from Arnold's second term, Wymer's statement that "he devoted his second (term) almost entirely to his work."¹⁴⁸ is simply speculation. Wymer finds further evidence for overwork in that for Arnold there was "every week ... a lengthy essay ... and perhaps four or five volumes of Herodotus to be read, understood and précised."¹⁴⁹ Clearly he is unfamiliar with Herodotus' work, otherwise he would have realised the manifest absurdity of this statement, which is aggravated by the fact that he writes "volumes" despite "books" appearing in the MS. But even then, the thought of an undergraduate reading, translating, and summarising four or five "books" of Herodotus "every week", even without his other tasks, is improbable to say the least.¹⁵⁰ In fact, Wymer has fallen into error through a combination of unawareness and a lack of punctuation in the MS. Punctuated, the relevant passage in L.36 reads,

"Over and above all this, I have got, besides an essay every week, four or five books of Herodotus to read for Collections."

Wymer presumably thought the reference to "Collections" unimportant, but it actually provides the explanation of why Arnold was reading Herodotus at all. Although "Collections" usually refers to college examinations held at the end of term - and Arnold was examined in this way¹⁵¹ - the main reason for his reading Herodotus, was that this was one of the authors he intended to offer for the preliminary examination, *sophista generalis*,¹⁵² he was to take in May 1812 - over a year later.¹⁵³ Williamson says that for this examination, Arnold had only to construe one Greek and one Latin author,¹⁵⁴ but actually there were more elements than just these two. For Copleston, from whose account Williamson derives his information, also records that a student "is examined in some compendium of Logic (generally Aldrich's,) which is never omitted, and in the elements of Geometry and Algebra, which are not held to be absolutely indispensable."¹⁵⁵ Confirmation of some of this can be found in Arnold's account of the preliminary examination given in L.45, which also reveals that his chosen Latin author was Livy.¹⁵⁶

From the evidence of Arnold's timetable, it would seem that the Corpus tutors confined their first-year lectures almost entirely to those authors who would be needed for the final examination. It shows that the formal lectures were devoted to subjects which, on the basis of Coplestone's account, would be required for the final rather than the preliminary examination: Aristotle for Rhetoric, Ethics, and Logic; and Quintilian for Rhetoric.¹⁵⁷ Although the elements of Logic, which were necessary for the preliminary examination, were covered in the weekly lectures,¹⁵⁸ it would seem that the Greek and Latin author, which were also required, had to be prepared privately. However, the study of these authors was not merely for the preliminary examination, as the opportunity existed, which Arnold took, of including both of them among those authors offered

at the final examination.¹⁵⁹ Since, as Coplestone records, the preliminary examination was non-competitive, and only "an accurate grammatical acquaintance with the ... languages is the point chiefly inquired into",¹⁶⁰ it seems that the large number of books which L.36 mentions he was reading to illustrate Herodotus can be seen as evidence of his early and diligent preparation for the honours Schools.¹⁶¹

With all this in mind, the evidence for his feeling "overwhelmed", in May 1811, must be seen in perspective. In preparing for his ten hours of lectures a week, he would probably have found most difficulty with Aristotle, as this was not an author Arnold is likely to have construed at school.¹⁶² Next in order of difficulty would be the lectures on Logic, the elements of which were studied in Aldrich's Compendium. Again, this would be a new subject for him, and here the difficulty would lie in mastering the technical aspect of the course rather than understanding Aldrich's text, which is written in relatively simple Latin. The Quintilian lecture would probably be the least arduous in point of preparation, since he is not a particularly difficult author to construe.¹⁶³ In addition to his lecture preparation, it is known he had a weekly essay to write, and also that he was preparing Herodotus and perhaps Livy. But as has been shown, these latter two authors would not be needed for another year. Certainly, when all this is taken into consideration, he had a reasonable amount of work to do - but unmanageable? And it is worthwhile setting his own retrospective comments on this period against the notion that he found his work extremely arduous:

"until the Universities have an examination upon admission ... the standard of the college lecture rooms will be so low, that a young man going from the top of a public school will be nearly losing his time, ... as I can bear witness, when I myself was an

undergraduate ..." .¹⁶⁴

Perhaps the real explanation for his complaints then, lies not so much in the amount of academic work he had to fulfil as in those "indolent habits¹⁶⁵ ... occasional weariness of duty (and) the indulgence of vague schemes without definite purpose", which Stanley records as peculiar to his character at this period.¹⁶⁶ Given the absence of any similar complaints elsewhere in the first-year correspondence, and, as will be seen, the full social life he led, it seems probable that the feeling of being "overwhelmed", recorded in L.36, was purely temporary, as Wymer says.

Despite Stanley's judgement, not all of Arnold's schemes at this period lacked definite purpose, and there are examples in the letters of several projects apparently undertaken for his intellectual improvement. For example, one scheme, the progress of which can be traced through the letters, is his decision to learn French.

Wymer is quite correct when he observes that Arnold knew no French when he matriculated:¹⁶⁷

"I shall begin my French in a day or two; for I have waited

till he (Ellison) came up, that we might begin together." (L.40).

So Arnold wrote in February 1812, and the arrangements he made were typically systematic. He engaged a private tutor, "the Abbé Bertin, is a good natured old man, and very entertaining: he comes three times a week, for an hour each time." (L.44). After three months had passed, Arnold could record that, "I can pronounce it with tolerable facility, and am able to make some progress in the reading it." (L.44). He seems to have achieved a rapid mastery of the language, since by June 1812 (L.45) he says he "can now read a French book with tolerable ease", and by November he is delighting in the "comedies of Moliere ... probably the best in existence." (L.49). But he was not merely content to read light

literature, and his historical temperament led him to begin the abridgement of "Montfaucon's Antiquities of France, in five volumes folio;" (L.45). He began this task in June 1812, after he had sat the preliminary examination and with the summer vacation ahead of him. However, it is noteworthy that he continued the undertaking the following term despite his regular work which, at the time, included the "Herculean task" of "abridging Livy's Roman History," (L.49). That Arnold was prepared to increase his workload in this way by undertaking studies not directly related to his degree course is not really surprising, as it later became his firmly held belief that the mind had to be kept active: "because education is a dynamical... process", and "a man is only fit to teach so long as he is himself learning daily."¹⁶⁸ Therefore, it may not be unjustified in regarding this self-imposed task as an example of his gradual movement towards this principle. A further example of how early this viewpoint originated with him may be seen in the letter he wrote to his sister Frances in April 1814 (L.59); for the brotherly advice he imparts in that letter can be taken as an accurate reflection of his mature views:

"I know by experience that the more knowledge I get the more it adds to my happiness, and I should be sorry if I thought the work of acquiring it was likely to cease whilst I possessed the use of my faculties unimpaired."

Although it might seem that Arnold was immersed in his books, this is by no means the complete picture of his undergraduate life. It is worth demonstrating this, since his biographers are not entirely in agreement on the matter. Of course, he worked hard, but a point which emerges

quite clearly from the correspondence is that he "played" equally hard. In fact, this period marked the beginning of a pattern which was to dominate his life - the counterbalancing of periods of intense mental activity with periods of equally intense physical activity. In addition to bathing, which has already been noticed, his other outdoor recreations were boating and "skirmishing" (walking). Wymer, quoting L.35, mentions that he sometimes rows "two or three miles down the Isis and back.", and records his delight in rowing up the Charwell "on voyages of discovery".¹⁶⁹ This reference to "voyages of discovery" highlights another trait of his character, in that these pursuits were frequently undertaken with an object in view other than that of pure exercise.¹⁷⁰ With regard to his favourite pastime, walking, he says "(nothing) could induce me to do, what at all times is unusual with me, walk for the mere sake of walking." (L.52). His regular walks were no mere strolls; a long walk might be some fourteen miles (L.49), and a vacation ramble with his sister Lydia occupied four hours (L.47).¹⁷¹ The letters also reveal that he had little talent for riding. In L.40 for example, he calculates the result "of exhibiting my equestrian skill ... (as) the not impossible damage of raiment from a comfortable landing in the mud,". But his keenest enjoyment was undoubtedly derived from the boisterous horse-play of the cross-country "skirmishes" he undertook with his companions.¹⁷²

Tucker, Cornish, and Penrose seem to have been the closest friends of his undergraduate days, and probably his most regular companions on these skirmishes. Certainly in L.58 he names these three and John Keble as "my particular friends". R.J. Campbell states that John Taylor Coleridge "was Arnold's closest friend (at Oxford) and throughout all the years that followed."¹⁷³ But while the latter part of his statement is probably correct, it must be remembered that Coleridge was elected a Fellow of

Exeter in June 1812 and, as he himself says, "my residence at Oxford was thenceforward only occasional."¹⁷⁴ Although his friendship with Arnold was later renewed by correspondence, the first of these letters is dated five years later, in May 1817. While this may not have been their first written communication,¹⁷⁵ the lack of personal contact once Coleridge had gone down must inevitably have led to some loss of intimacy.

The correspondence shows quite clearly that Arnold was prepared to enjoy all the attractions of University life. Bamford, however, believes that he only relaxed "on rare occasions",¹⁷⁶ but the evidence does not support his view. The letters show that Arnold enjoyed a very full social life throughout his undergraduate career. For example, even with his final examinations looming, in April 1814, L.58, written in mid-February of that year, shows that his reading was "tolerably well suspended.": a situation which had been caused by "the unusual number of invitations" he was accepting, so that for almost a fortnight he had "been out somewhere or have had someone at my own rooms, every day without exception.". This hardly suggests an undergraduate who was only relaxing on "rare occasions" and who was not prepared to allow anything to come between him and his studies;¹⁷⁷ particularly when the same letter records his playing Loo from eight in the evening till five in the morning.¹⁷⁸ After all this, his comment that "reading has been put aside for some time, and I fear it will cost me much" (L.58) is hardly surprising. And with this in mind, it may be significant that for his final examinations he "was obliged to give up two of the books which I had intended to read." (L.60). He did not succumb to idleness, but to a reader of the unpublished correspondence, Whitridge's view, that Arnold the undergraduate was "not at all a scholarly recluse.",¹⁷⁹ is undoubtedly the correct one.

As for his political life, it is known that his Radical tendencies

were moderated by the Toryism of the Corpus circle;¹⁸⁰ but, as with the Winchester letters, there is very little evidence of his political opinions in the surviving undergraduate correspondence. In April 1812, he is hoping for Wellington's success in Spain since "people begin to croak sadly about the high price of bread, etc.," but he does not "much regard these prophets of evils" who say that all are "going to ruin fast," (L.41). If this reflects anything, it may be complacent Toryism. Certainly he does not dwell upon the plight of the poor, for whom the war with Napoleon meant growing hardship. The only other examples of direct political comment occur in L.43 and L.44 where he laments the assassination of Spenser Perceval and delivers a long panegyric on him. Apart from showing that Arnold was watching public events closely, these letters also reveal the re-emergence of a theme which first arose at Winchester: his fear and hatred of political violence. Whitridge's interpretation of these two letters stresses Arnold's anger at the assassin and his general concern over the incident, as an exceptional thing and untypical of "The average undergraduate ... oblivious to everything beyond his horizon."¹⁸¹

But his observation on the average undergraduate's lack of awareness of the world around him is hardly appropriate in this instance. It is clear from L.43 that many members of the University were equally affected by the crime. Whether the intensity of their feelings was so deep as Arnold's, is not known; but the state of public affairs was such that it is most unlikely that even "the average undergraduate" remained unconcerned by events. If the effect produced on Arnold is quite clear from L.43, not "any thing but the death of a very near relation could have affected me so deeply;" it is equally clear from that letter that behind this grief lay both hatred and fear. Hatred for the mob, "the vile rabble" who applauded the "worthy demagogue" (Sir Frances Burdett, Radical M.P., Perceval's

assassin) and called the soldiers "murderers"; and fear: the very real fear of what "the vile London rabble" and the "seditious incendiaries whether in Parliament and elsewhere," (L.44) might do next:

"I can well conceive the consternation in London ... (the government) are apprehensive of an insurrection in the manufacturing counties" (L.43). "God only knows what may be the results." (L.44).

With due allowance having been made for his grief, his panegyric on Perceval is noteworthy in that it anticipates to some extent his later belief in the union of Church and State. It is clear from L.43 and L.44 that for Arnold, a deep religious conviction had been the mainspring of Perceval's whole life, public and private. The reality of this belief had been such that it made any compromise in the conduct of affairs of state impossible.¹⁸² Arnold's view of Perceval's conduct foreshadows his own belief in the unity of Church and State, since it derives from the conviction that real Christian belief must express itself in all of a man's actions, public as well as private. Only in this way could "the principle of evil" (L.43) be effectually resisted. And it was precisely because he could see no one else in political life who exemplified this conviction; that Arnold despaired when he considered the abilities of those who were left: "all political talent is vain and nugatory" (L.43).

Through the medium of various societies, opportunities for Arnold to air his opinions did exist. It is known that the Attic Debating Society, "the germ of the Union,"¹⁸³ provided a forum for like-minded undergraduates at this time, and the correspondence shows that Arnold was also an active member of two Corpus groups: the Junior or Scholars' Common Room, which he refers to as "our room";¹⁸⁴ and a literary circle organised by the Dean, William James, "the most complete example of a pedant I ever met with" (L.52).

Arnold refers to the Attic Society in L.57 and L.58 calling it "our speaking club". Augustus Hare and a few others had founded this group, probably in 1810,¹⁸⁵ and given the strong Wykehamist connection of its early members, Arnold probably joined soon after he went up in 1811. That the Society grew rapidly is clear. Hare gives a list of members "later enrolled", in his account of the group, and to his sketch can be added information from the two Arnold letters of 1814. In L.57 he mentions four new members, from Christ Church, including Lord Clifton,¹⁸⁶ whom Arnold supposes will be "a regular oppositionist". He also speaks of "a Mr Scott", an undischarged bankrupt who had come to Oxford to take holy orders - as a last resort apparently. In L.58 Arnold records that the Society "flourishes immensely: We are now nine and twenty in number, and have others proposed as members,". That Arnold was a popular member may be seen from L.57 where he announces that he has come joint top of a poll for one of the two stewardships of the Society. Though "flattered at having had so many votes for so honourable a post", Arnold withdrew, principally, it seems, because he did not feel "qualified in point of age etc., to sit at the bottom of the table of so large a party" - perhaps a reflection of that bashfulness which Coleridge records as characteristic of him at this period.¹⁸⁷ Whitridge speculated that the authorities viewed such gatherings with suspicion, a surmise that is confirmed by L.58,¹⁸⁸ which shows that the members were conscious of a hostile atmosphere and acting with circumspection:

"We wish much to get ourselves estab(lished in our own) room,
but we are afraid of the interference of the higher powers.
Ambition has ruined many, and that we are safer in our
obs(curity is clear)".

Nevertheless, the members were undeterred, and these letters contain much new

information on the history of a society whose direct descendant was the Oxford Union.

In concluding the theme of Arnold's extra-curricular activities at Oxford, consideration of L.52 raises the subject of his competing for University prizes while still an undergraduate. The only published information on this topic occurs in Coleridge's letter in The Life, where he records Arnold's unsuccessful entry for the Latin Verse Prize of 1812.¹⁸⁹ Coleridge believed that Arnold might have competed in other years but he had no evidence. None of the later biographers add any information, although Whitridge suggests his versification was confined to writing verses for the Junior Common Room.¹⁹⁰ However, the unpublished correspondence does provide some additional information. There are two references to his entry for the Latin Verse Prize in 1812. L.41 shows that he was still writing the poem in April of that year, and L.42 reveals that he had little doubt about his chances:

"I sent up my Latin verses on Wednesday and never did I write so little to my satisfaction in my life. Indeed they were so bad that I was quite ashamed of them, and very unwilling to send them up, and as for getting the prize, the chances as Coleridge himself owned, are a thousand to one against me."¹⁹¹

Although there is no record in the surviving correspondence of his competing for the Latin Verse Prize in either 1813 or 1814, he did make an attempt for the English Verse Prize in 1813. The evidence lies in L.52 and shows also that he had enlisted both Keble and Coleridge as his advisers. As with his Latin verse, he was equally unsuccessful; and the general opinion has always been that he had little talent for writing poetry. Coleridge, his mentor, had no doubt,¹⁹² and says that his compositions were "not remarkable for fancy or imagination."¹⁹³ Arnold's lack of success raises

the question of why he continued to write verse. There are a number of possibilities. As a young man of slender means, with a career to make, the winning of a University prize was a sure way of bringing his name into prominence; and he continued to compete for these honours after graduating, although not for the verse prizes. On the other hand, we know that Arnold had become a fervent admirer of the "Lake Poets", through Coleridge's introducing him (and Keble) to the "Lyrical Ballads" and "Wordsworth's Poems."¹⁹⁴ This alone might provide sufficient reason for his continuing interest. Although there is no doubt about his enthusiasm, it is worth noting that his delight in the "Lake Poets" is not something that would be deduced from the extant correspondence from this period. There is only one direct reference, in L.40, where he explains to his sister that the authors of a poem she has read are Coleridge and Southey. And the only other reference is indirect and occurs in L.43, where Arnold delights in John Wilson's poem, The Angler's Tent, composed after a day in the Lake District with Wordsworth:¹⁹⁵

"some of the most affecting poetry I ever read, and which gave me most delightful ideas of the goodness of his own heart, and of those of his friends."

Another possibility lies in his growing admiration for John Keble.¹⁹⁶ And in this context, it is interesting to compare the sentiments expressed in the latter portion of the previous quotation, with Coleridge's recognition of a feature of Keble's judgement:

"it was hardly possible for Keble (to admire) any poetry, unless he had ... a good opinion of the writer."¹⁹⁷

With their developing friendship in mind - and Coleridge recalls that it was in emulation of Keble that Arnold began to write verse¹⁹⁸ - a more prosaic motive might be that Arnold persevered with his poetry because it

made his contact with Keble (and Coleridge) that much more intimate. And of course, it is equally possible that he was aware of the literal tendency of his mind and sought to ameliorate this by writing verse.¹⁹⁹

From this short survey of the non-curricular aspect of the undergraduate correspondence, it is clear that the letters do not support a one-sided view of Arnold the student. Rather a portrait emerges of an engaging youth,²⁰⁰ humorous and good-natured, with an abundance of friends: a young man with opinions,²⁰¹ keen to develop his intellect, and interested enough in his studies to pursue them for their own sake, regardless of the knowledge that his future prospects depended on a good degree.

Arnold's undergraduate career culminated in May 1814 when he was placed in the First Class in Literae Humaniores. No details of his final examinations have been published, although Williamson quotes from Coplestone's account of Oxford studies to suggest the kind of authors in which Arnold might have been examined.²⁰² However, a full account of his experience in the Schools exists in L.60. Since this gives a good insight into his preferred reading, it is worth considering the letter in detail; the more so as this is an area of Oxford history about which little has been published.

He was examined over two days, Thursday and Friday, 28 and 29 April 1814;²⁰³ and from the tone of L.60, he seems to have withstood the ordeal well. It might be concluded that he was not a nervous candidate since he declares that he was "perfectly well in health, and ... spirits ... up to the very moment of my examination". A comparison between Coplestone's account²⁰⁴ of those authors generally presented by candidates aiming for "the highest honours", and those actually offered by Arnold, tends to confirm his bias towards Aristotle and the Greek historians. The compulsory elements were: Divinity (translation from the Greek Testament and questions on the elements

of Christian faith), Logic (The Organon), Aristotle's Ethics and Rhetoric, and Latin prose composition. In addition, the candidate could present any number of Classical authors he chose (but not less than three, including both languages):

"Encouragement is given to an enlarged range (but) a hasty and unscholarlike manner of reading ... is ... much discountenanced."

Arnold offered nine authors, although, as was noticed earlier, he had originally intended offering two more books than he actually did. He was particularly fortunate in that great weight was attached in The Schools to one of his favourite authors, Aristotle. As well as meeting the philosopher at length in the compulsory texts, Arnold was also able to introduce the Politics as an option, thereby completing the Aristotelian corpus as designated by Coplestone. If this placed him at an advantage, he took care to strengthen his position by ensuring that his other major interest, history, was well-represented. Herodotus, Thucydides, Polybius, and Livy, all of whom figure on Coplestone's "highest honours" list, were offered. So far, it seems clear that he had selected authors who accorded with his own predilections. But this criterion does not apply so obviously to the remaining four authors he offered: Aeschylus, Sophocles, Virgil, and Horace; particularly when Coleridge's remark about Arnold's lack of interest in the ancient poets is recalled. Also, when Coplestone's list is considered, the question of why he omitted particular authors arises. The alternative authors were: Quintilian, Cicero's philosophical works (especially the De Officiis), Tacitus, Juvenal, Lucretius, Homer, Pindar, Aristophanes, Euripides, and "the other historians and orators ... according as the student's line of reading has been."²⁰⁵

Although he says that "neither of them are strictly indispensable",

Coplestone implies that Quintilian and the De Officiis, "as being of easier attainment", might be omitted; and Arnold, of course, had gone regularly through the Aristotelian system. As for the other omissions, a case could be made to explain their absence by reference to Arnold's personal tastes. Perhaps a lack of sympathy with much of the moral content would generally be accepted as a reason for Aristophanes' exclusion. But a more prosaic reason may lie simply in the fact that both he, and Euripides, have more extant plays than the other dramatists. For a student with an historical bias who had, after all, to leave something out, this might have been sufficient reason in itself. And, though for different reasons, the exclusion of Pindar might be ascribed to a failure to empathise with the subject matter. Likewise, Arnold is unlikely to have found the Epicurean system of Lucretius so congenial to his orthodox Christian beliefs as the philosophy of Aristotle. The exclusion of Homer is more difficult to explain, particularly as Arnold, like most boys, was steeped in him throughout his schooldays. Perhaps the answer lies in that very familiarity, in that it might have caused him to take-up other authors from a sense of their comparative freshness. This leaves Tacitus and "the other historians and orators" to account for. Tacitus, says Coplestone, was usually included; so Arnold had either chosen to disregard convention, or, which seems a more plausible possibility, he had decided to terminate his historical reading with the Republican period rather than embark upon Imperial history - a fact which may explain Juvenal's absence from his list. Of the others we can say that although Arnold clearly pursued a strong historical line in his reading, there was a limit to the number of historians he could safely offer without jeopardising his chances by being considered too narrow in his approach.²⁰⁶ Therefore, even though Coleridge says he preferred the philosophers and historians, we would

expect to find, on grounds of balance alone, several of the major poets in his selection. And this is just what is found in his choice of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Virgil. Nor is Horace a surprise since it would have been unusual if he had omitted a poet of his stature, even had he not been a childhood favourite. Explained in these terms, his choice of authors is not exceptional. Five confirm his bias towards history and philosophy, while balance is given to his selection by the remainder being drawn from the corpus of major poets. In all these speculations, however, it must be remembered that he had originally intended offering two more authors, whose names the correspondence does not reveal.

Examination of the correspondence for the second half of Arnold's Oxford career, the years 1815-1818, shows that only one letter from the period has been quoted directly by Stanley. This is the letter of 28 May 1817 (L.74) which is, chronologically, the first of the numbered letters to be reproduced in The Life. The principal events of Arnold's life during these years are summarised by Stanley, who concludes that it was now that his subject's character underwent "the great change from boyhood to manhood"; evidence of which, he says, can be seen in the "change of tone" which occurs in the letters of the period.²⁰⁷ But apart from the one letter previously mentioned, it is not until 1819 that Stanley embarks on his comprehensive publication of the correspondence, so once more it is Whitridge and Wymer who have made most use of the letters. And as with the earlier periods, an examination of the extant correspondence reveals both new factual information and the presence of several errors in the biographical narratives.

An example of incorrect interpretation occurs almost immediately and concerns the marriage, in August 1814, of his sister Lydia to the Earl of Caven. The matter is worth dwelling on since it has provided evidence for a gross distortion of the young graduate's character. Wymer says that the celebrations were "marred" for Arnold by "the bridegroom's obvious haste to cut short the wedding breakfast and be off for the honeymoon".²⁰⁸ Bamford enlarges on this:

"the fervour with which he carried off his bride to the honeymoon shocked Arnold, a new and sober graduate of Oxford. For the others it was all very romantic, ... no matter what Thomas might think".²⁰⁹

While this latter interpretation, with its suggestions of outraged prudery, is consistent with its author's view of Arnold's character, it bears little

relation to the evidence.

Examples have already been given from the correspondence which show that in his manner of living and outlook on life, Arnold was no pious young prig. And from these alone, it might be inferred that he was unlikely to be so serious-minded and unworldly as to be shocked by a bridegroom's apparent eagerness. Moreover, when the source for this particular episode is examined, it becomes clear that the biographical interpretation of the incident is highly suspect.

Wymer's account is based upon L.64²¹⁰ (11 August 1814), written by Arnold from Kensington to his aunt. The relevant extracts are as follows:

"This morning we were all up by eight o'clock, as Lord Cavan was in a violent hurry to be off, and we set off for the church ... we all returned here to breakfast, which was dispatched as soon as possible; and they then set off in Lord Cavan's carriage for Arlesford where they will remain tonight ...".

Wymer, it must be said, does not invest his account with overtones of outraged morality, but nevertheless, there is no support for his statement that the event had been "marred" for Arnold. His attribution of Arnold's disappointment to the premature termination of the festivities, is just another example of his incautious manner of embellishing his narrative. Yet his suggestion that Arnold was enthusiastically entering into the spirit of the occasion, is, in this instance, a far more realistic interpretation of his subject's character than Bamford's. Even allowing for his misconceptions about Arnold's character, the above hardly lends itself to Bamford's interpretation. For example, the word "violent" could, at that period, be used without any pejorative implications.²¹¹ So if the phrase "violent hurry" is considered in a less emotive way,

in the sense of "great hurry", for instance, then it may merely reflect the natural anxiety of the bridegroom to ensure that everyone arrived punctually at the church. Note particularly that the phrase is used in describing events prior to the church service, and certainly cannot be adduced as evidence for unseemly haste either during or after that ceremony. And a far more prosaic reason than romantic ardour can be offered to explain the wedding breakfast's being "dispatched as soon as possible". The clue lies in the couple's intention to spend the night at Arlesford in Hampshire. Such a decision necessitated a carriage ride of over fifty miles, a distance which would hardly be covered in less than six hours.²¹² With so long a journey ahead of them, the note of urgency and the desire not to linger at the house in Kensington - which Arnold himself was wont to call "that vile hole" (L.72) - is not really surprising. In short, all that the letter contains is a plain statement of facts. It provides no evidence either of disappointment or moral censure on Arnold's part - that is pure, and erroneous, biographical speculation.

Arnold returned to Oxford after the summer vacation of 1814 and began to read widely, supplementing his modest income by private tuition. With the exception of Bamford, the other biographies confine his coaching activities to the period after his election to an Oriel Fellowship in 1815. But L.63 shows that they had begun in the summer of 1814 with a Mr Plumer,²¹³ an undergraduate of Balliol College, with whom Arnold had recently become acquainted and whom he liked very much. Plumer had approached Arnold to see if he was prepared to stay at his father's house and act as his tutor in the long vacation. Arnold was delighted at the prospect, particularly since it was Plumer's intention to reside at Oxford for several years. For Arnold, therefore, there was the possibility that he would require tuition for some time to come (L.63).

This raises the question of Arnold's ultimate employment. It is clear from this letter (L.63) that he hoped to remain in Oxford for at least three more years. This would bring him to 1818, the earliest date at which he could be ordained.²¹⁴ Since the academic life was so congenial to him, it is not unreasonable to believe that he intended to stay in Oxford until that objective was attained. And in pursuing this course, he was following a well-worn groove. But speculation upon his ultimate occupation in life would, at this stage, be premature. For example, although he was prepared to coach undergraduates, it must not be thought that this necessarily implies something about his eventual choice of career as a schoolmaster, since at this period, he seems to have had a hearty contempt for the profession. When writing to his sister Frances in 1814, about her husband's decision to open a small, private school at Hampton in Middlesex, he says:

"With regard to the school, I certainly wish it away. You must positively use your influence to prevent Buckland from becoming a confirmed pedagogue. It will be all very well for the present, but I hope hereafter to see you comfortably settled at some country rectory and not continue all your days a schoolmaster's wife" (L.59).

Nor is it unreasonable to speculate that financial considerations rather than any sense of vocation led Arnold to undertake tuition. If he were to remain at Oxford until 1818, then the question of finance became an important one. His family was in no position to subsidise him heavily, and he had recently begun to embark upon those tours at home and abroad, which were to become a feature of his life. A Fellowship supplemented by an income from coaching students was the obvious solution. Arnold chose to sit for an Oriel Fellowship.

By 1815, Oriel had entered upon a brilliant period of her history, with a reputation based upon the great intellectual abilities of its Fellows, the principal group of which became known as "Noetics". The leading exponents of this group, prior to Arnold's election, were the Provost, Edward Coplestone, and among the Fellows, John Davison, Richard Whateley, and Edward Hawkins. The historian of Oriel characterises the tone they imparted to the college as "critical, rational, and sceptical."²¹⁵ Like many others, Arnold was impressed by the tone and reputation of Oriel,²¹⁶ and he had ample opportunity for gaining more information through his friends there, particularly John Keble, who had been elected to a Fellowship in 1811. As Bamford rightly says, it was ambitious of Arnold to try for an Oriel Fellowship. Unfortunately, there is a six month break in the correspondence between September 1814 (L.65) and March 1815 (L.66), which covers his preparation and sitting for the Fellowship examination. And L.66 provides no detailed information about the examination other than testifying to the severity of the ordeal:

"I was elected at Oriel this morning; after a week of such hard work as I never underwent before, and would not undergo again for any consideration."

This is doubly unfortunate: firstly, because his election to an Oriel Fellowship was a significant landmark in his life; and secondly, because the circumstances of his election were, to modern eyes, at first sight rather unusual. In fact Bamford goes so far as to say that "In justice he should have been eliminated,"²¹⁷ The unusual aspect lies in the fact that Arnold's election owed much to the recommendation of Richard Whateley. However, the degree of influence which Whateley exerted is rather more of an open question than some biographers have believed.

Stanley mentions that the style of Arnold's compositions at this

time was rather "cramped by a stiffness and formality", and says that Whateley "pointed out to the other electors the great capability of 'growth' ... in the crudities of the youthful candidate's exercises,"²¹⁸ The implication is that his main fault was a want of style and polish rather than a lack of intellectual ability. Unfortunately, the knowledge that the papers Arnold submitted were not the sole criterion for the electors' decision has resulted in a rather dramatic interpretation of the event. Wymer, although deducing from Stanley that lack of style was probably the main criticism, declares that,

"the examiners ... were not impressed. ... Arnold must ... be passed over. Then Whateley spoke ... (and) Whateley's logic prevailed."²¹⁹

If Wymer considers Arnold was fortunate, Bamford goes further and invests the electors' decision with overtones of illogicality and partiality:

"(Arnold) had ability of a kind ... but not enough for this. For one thing he was over-young, and inevitably came well down the list on merit. In justice he should have been eliminated, but ... he was already well known to the College ... John Keble ... knew ... enough about him to praise or condemn as the occasion warranted ... (and) Richard Whateley ... influenced the College and the Provost in its day-to-day business. ... the opinion of Whateley was decisive. He agreed that the marking of the papers had been accurate enough ... yet examinations were not everything. Whateley knew that Arnold was a man of ideas, and ideas were more important than paperwork for a future Fellow of Oriel ... the best of him had yet to come. ... in this way the excuses for written failure

were piled up ... To an outsider ... it must have seemed very odd that agreed and definite results could be so easily set aside by arguments ... which could easily have been dismissed ... by such a logician as Whateley himself, had he so desired it. Fair or not, Arnold was appointed."²²⁰

So the modern reader is left with the impression that the election was "managed", particularly when Bamford writes, "Whateley ... influenced his selection in defiance of the system".²²¹ But a closer investigation of the circumstances surrounding Oriel Fellowship examinations provides a much less disparaging explanation of the event.²²²

Firstly, the statement that Arnold's age "inevitably" placed him "well down the list on merit" cannot pass unchallenged. Since no list of the candidates has survived, there is no "inevitability" about the matter.²²³ It is merely an assumption which, in any case, is based on the further assumption that age was an important factor in these elections. But this is not so. Although most of the Fellows at this period were in their early twenties when elected, there was no statutory limitation. To give one example, John Keble was elected in 1811 while still eighteen. It would have been more relevant to have been told that the possession of independent means was a positive disqualification.²²⁴ The point is that Arnold was, by this distinction, eminently well qualified to stand. Also, it is well to be reminded that Arnold had actually obtained the honour of a First in the Schools at the age of eighteen; an achievement which Bamford refers to as "ability of a kind", and "not enough" for a probationary Fellowship at Oriel. Yet why should this be "not enough" for sitting the examination? Several men were elected to Oriel Fellowships at this period who had only obtained Second Class honours in the Schools, including Whateley himself; and J.H. Newman only secured a Third.²²⁵ Assertion is not proof, and there is

nothing in the evidence so far to support the statement that he should have been passed over. Furthermore, as the other competitors are unknown, apart from Hampden, and as there is no knowledge of the standard of the papers which were submitted, to what extent is criticism of Arnold's efforts justified? Bamford, for example, refers to "written failure"; but to what extent? Apart from Tuckwell's anecdote about Arnold's English essay,²²⁶ which will be considered later, there are no specific details of the Fellows' meeting other than that Whateley detected latent but great capability in Arnold's unsophisticated answers. The apparent authority with which some of his biographers have contrasted his efforts with those of his competitors suggests a knowledge of the proceedings we just do not possess.²²⁷ In short, the only point which stands out clearly is that the paperwork was not the sole criterion for the decision.

That the Fellows refused to base their decision solely on the written work is a matter which can be explained without charging them with illogicality or prejudice, since it reflects a principle instituted by their Provost, Coplestone. His view was that,

"Every election to a Fellowship which tends to discourage the narrow and almost the technical routine of public examinations I consider as an important triumph."²²⁸

The examination was constructed from this standpoint. As well as the written work - translation from and into Greek and Latin, and English and Latin essays - there were two viva voce examinations before the assembled Fellows. Such was the formal examination. But prior to this, the candidate had to write a Latin letter to each of the Fellows, "putting his own personal case and wishes and intentions", which was in itself designed "to test a man's power". He also underwent the ordeal of being asked to dine and visit the common-room, to be "more or less trotted out and observed upon."²²⁹ If

contemporary accounts are clear the paperwork was not the sole criterion, they are equally clear that the examination was "a trial, not of how much men knew, but of how they knew,"²³⁰ It was designed to reveal a man who was capable of thinking for himself rather than "a mere fine writer" of others' opinions; to the extent that "It created a prejudice against a man if he seemed to be trying to be flash, or to show off his reading,"²³¹ The historian of Oriel sums up in these words:

"according to the Copiestonian tradition, Oriel Fellowships were given in conscious independence of academic conventions, and in disbelief in the finality of the verdict of the schools."²³²

This explanation helps to place Whateley's role in perspective. If he pointed out that Arnold's work contained "ideas" and showed great promise, then he was doing no more than exemplifying that spirit which contemporary sources testify always characterised the Oriel Fellows' decisions in these examinations. The interpretation of the circumstances surrounding Arnold's election given by Wymer and Bamford fails to recognise this. Rather, they portray Whateley's attitude as something exceptional - "defiance of the system" Bamford calls it - and the reader is given the impression that partiality was shown. However, this is most unlikely given the principles on which the Fellowships were awarded and the great reputation Oriel enjoyed at this time. And what direct influence could Arnold exert? John Keble was his friend, but does this mean that he would have supported him in the full knowledge that he was unworthy of the Fellowship? Nor can it be accepted that Whateley was so interested in Arnold's election that he was prepared to browbeat his colleagues into acquiescence.²³³ There must, after all, have been something for Whateley to recommend; and, presumably, this is just the reason why his view would carry weight. And it is important to note that it was the whole body of Fellows - they who sat and dissected

the papers "sentence by sentence"²³⁴ - who elected their new colleagues by a majority decision. The pejorative view asks us to believe that when confronted by Whateley they became mere ciphers, prepared to jeopardise the reputation of Oriel and to sacrifice their commonsense, by acquiescing in a gross unfairness. Is this likely? They spoke with an equal voice; and while Whateley's influence in the College cannot be denied, it is too much to believe that he either forced Arnold's election through contrary to the opinions of the Provost and fourteen other Fellows, or that he had a vested interest in doing so.

This peculiarly "Oriel" approach to the selection of her Fellows was well known, and while it was certainly capable of criticism by the disappointed,²³⁵ the important thing to realise is that Arnold's election was neither "very odd" nor "in defiance of the system"; it was typically "Oriel". Further confirmation of this, and also vindication of Whateley's judgement, lies in the knowledge that the greatest weight in the examination was attached to "the English into Latin Prose (paper) and the English Essay."²³⁶ Stanley has noted that Arnold's Latin prose style was recognised as peculiarly his own, and not a reflection of the approved classical models.²³⁷ Given the importance attached to the Latin prose paper, this very fact might well have accounted for the initial disquiet of his examiners. And more significantly, the one detail there is about the papers Arnold submitted confirms the emphasis given to the English essay, and suggests this was the main cause of complaint:

"His English Essay produced an unfavourable effect upon the examiners; Whateley took it in hand, and showed the great capacities for growth discoverable in the boyish effort."²³⁸

Now when it is realised that within three months of his election to the Fellowship, and while not yet twenty, Arnold won the Chancellor's Prize

for the English Essay and that two years later he won the Chancellor's Latin Essay Prize,²³⁹ then this surely indicates that Whateley's confidence in his abilities was not entirely misplaced. The unflattering picture of Arnold's election to an Oriel Fellowship does not survive close scrutiny, and seems to be based upon a misconception of the nature of the election procedure practised there.

Of the letters which survive from Arnold's time as a Fellow of Oriel College (L.66-L.81) only three have been published: L.68 and L.70 by Whitridge,²⁴⁰ and L.74 by Stanley, the first of the numbered letters to appear in The Life. The correspondence as a whole confirms the veracity of Wymer's general account of the period, though it does contain information which affects the biographical record. This can be displayed under three general headings: Arnold's tutorial activities; his thoughts on a career; and his journalistic interests.

Little attention has been paid to Arnold's work as a private tutor in Oxford, and the letters both add to and correct what has been written. For example, L.69, written in November 1815, provides evidence to correct Wymer's statement that he "still had only one pupil" in June 1816.²⁴¹ For in a footnote to this letter, Arnold records that a Mr Montgomery will come to him for tuition "next term". This means that he had two pupils by the summer of 1816, the first of whom, C.J. Plumer, paid him fees of £30 in June of that year (L.71). Wymer records this transaction thus: "he received no more than £30 at the end of several months' coaching". Yet it is not known what period of tuition this sum represents.

A letter which sheds light on Arnold's attitude to the subject and gives an insight into his thoughts on his future career of teaching is L.72.

Arnold's friend, George Cornish, had suggested that he might coach his fourteen-year-old brother for matriculation. In view of his later profession, the diffidence which Arnold reveals in the letter may seem surprising at first sight:

"I feel very much obliged to you, and not a little flattered that you should think of entrusting to me such a charge. Were you not going to live in Oxford yourself, I should not venture to incur the responsibility of such a task, which of course is very much more than we meet with in Oxford pupils, where the line is previously marked out for us, and where in case of accident, our conscience may contrive to lay a good portion of the blame upon the incapacity or idleness of the unlucky pupil. To prepare a boy for College is a very different undertaking, and one which by myself I feel quite unequal to: but as you will be always at hand to consult and and arrange plans with, I should be most happy to lend you all the assistance in my power, as far as teaching goes: and as I believe we agree pretty well in our notions on the subject of education, I have no doubt but that we should proceed very comfortably. I think in any case it is much more satisfactory to instruct a person of fourteen than one of nineteen or twenty, and with a brother of your's, you will I am sure believe that I should take a very strong additional interest and pleasure in my employment. Nothing indeed could more gratify me than the prospect of having such a pupil; and not only on your account, but on his own, from every thing that I have heard. I look forward to meeting your brother next October in Oxford with very great and sincere pleasure. As for terms, as it would be

mere affectation in any one in my situation to pretend absolute indifference to such matters, so I am sure there are cases, and most truly do I consider the present as one of them, where they are not the highest consideration:" (L.72).

However, his diffidence seems to have had a two-fold origin: firstly a feeling of uncertainty about the course of study which should be pursued; and secondly, a keen realisation of the responsibility involved, in that the consequences of failure were more likely to be ascribed to the tutor rather than the pupil. If this was the negative side, then it was counterbalanced by the statement which, in retrospect, foreshadowed the end of his coaching career at Oxford and the start of his life as a schoolmaster:

"It is much more satisfactory to instruct a person of fourteen than one of nineteen or twenty,".

A measure of his willingness may perhaps be seen in his acceptance of a low fee despite his precarious financial position. It is worth remarking that while, in this same letter, he was prepared to advertise the school his brother-in-law and future partner had started at Hampton in Middlesex, there is no suggestion at this stage that they were to join forces. Yet with hindsight, perhaps the key to his eventual decision lies in the statements that it would be "much more satisfactory" to teach boys than young men, and that to be very fond of one's employment was "a point of the greatest importance.". Clearly these two beliefs might find joint satisfaction in a schoolmaster's career. Nevertheless, it is apparent from this letter that he envisaged little change in his circumstances in the foreseeable future:

"The term of my residence ... I never yet have thought of fixing:
You know that I cannot take orders for two years at the soonest:

and I do not know whether I shall avail myself of the first opportunity after I am three and twenty, to take them: till then I have always intended to remain in Oxford, as my mother and family would not like my taking any situation abroad: very probably I may reside much longer, but I hardly like to undertake for any thing at the distant period of two years; though if things remain in their present state, I foresee no probability of changing my plans and manner of living at the expiration of that time."

Interestingly, he sounds a note of caution over the question of his taking holy orders at the first available opportunity. This is significant, since if it is a reflection of the doubts it is known assailed him prior to his ordination, then it shows they had their origin at a much earlier period than was previously known. Certainly the biographies place the period of his religious doubts towards the end of 1818, immediately before his ordination as Deacon.²⁴² If it does not reflect religious disquiet, then it shows how questionable is the notion that he possessed a single-minded desire to become a clergyman almost from infancy. This extract from L.72 raises further questions. He refers to his mother and family not liking his "taking any situation abroad", which may refer to a private tutorship, but there are other possibilities.²⁴³ Does this, then, suggest that he was equivocal about the matter; particularly when it is known how naturally ambitious he was and, as Stanley says, "he was not insensible to the attraction of visions of extensive influence,"²⁴⁴ If so, it would show just how fluid was his outlook at a time when his biographers have him following an unexceptional course.

Information on the number of pupils who engaged Arnold as their coach can be found in the correspondence. On this aspect, L.77 requires notice in that it reveals another error of fact in Wymer. The question of the number of pupils Arnold had in 1815 and 1816 has been noticed earlier in connection with L.69. Wymer says that,

"Before the end of 1817, however, he had gained a fifth pupil, and this ... then, enabled him to make ends meet."²⁴⁵

The letter which Wymer is quoting from is L.77 (12 November 1817), but what the MS actually says is that Arnold's pupils (whom he humorously refers to as "Coaches") were four in number. The error has arisen because Wymer has misunderstood the punctuation. The letter reads:

"four of them have I to drive every day, and Thursby, who is going into the Schools this time, is getting so nervous and unwell ...".

The comma after the word "day" is important because it shows that "Thursby" was not a fifth pupil, but one of the four. This is further confirmed by the correspondence, since it provides the names of the other three: T.H.Plumer and G.A.Montgomery, previously mentioned, and W.Pole, whose name is given in L.73. In fact, Arnold did not acquire a fifth pupil until the Easter-Term of 1819:

"I have another ... coach engaged to come to me ... so that for a part of next term I shall drive five in hand ... " (L.79).

And even then, there is nothing in the correspondence to support Wymer's belief that this event solved Arnold's financial problems.²⁴⁶

New factual information on Arnold's literary activities also occurs in the correspondence for these years. According to Stanley's

bibliography of the "Miscellaneous Works", Arnold's first publications were two review articles for the "British Critic" in "1819-20".²⁴⁷ These were reviews of Southey's "Wat Tyler" and "Cunningham's De Rance". In fact, the latter article appeared in the issue of March 1816, and the former in that of May 1817.²⁴⁸ Neither of these reviews was discussed in The Life, although mention of the "Southey" article figures in the omitted portion of L.74, the first numbered letter to appear there. What appears not to have been known previously is that in August 1817, Arnold and Coleridge, assisted by Keble, were negotiating with the Oxford bookseller and publisher, J.H. Parker, to produce an "Oxford Review" (L.75). Arnold, who was keen to write, seems to have been the mainspring of the venture, although Coleridge was to be nominal editor since Arnold was anxious not to be known as such in Oxford. The enterprise perished, mainly, it seems, because Parker wished it to adopt a definite party line, in this case moderate High-Churchmanship. To Arnold, such an association was less than attractive, since he had no intention of ranging himself on the side of "old Oxford Toryism, and de facto with the Bishop of Peterborough and the Warden of Wadham ... things and persons for which I have no kindly feeling whatsoever" (L.75). Rather, he wanted a "fair Review" which would provide a means of expression for the moderates whose "capabilities (are) lying dormant in this place (Oxford)" (L.76). The reviewers seem to have made little headway with Parker, and the demise of the venture was hastened by Coleridge's and Keble's realisation that the time which they could afford to spare was limited. Arnold, who had cherished romantic notions of the scheme as "a sort of domestic Corpus production", eventually admitted that on "calmer reflection" his time would be far more profitably spent reading than in writing for a Review. But he was disappointed, even to

the extent that he would write nothing further for the British Critic, or for the Quarterly Review since he was not fond of sending articles to be accepted or rejected at the discretion of its editor or publisher (L.76).

That Arnold was so engaged at this early stage of his life might not be surprising, but it would not have been known from The Life or the other biographies.

ARNOLD AT LALEHAMThe Correspondence: 1819-1827 (L.82-L.237)

The general accounts which the biographers give of the years Arnold spent at Laleham as a private-schoolmaster are sound enough in outline; and Stanley has supported his description of these years by the reproduction, in whole or in part, of some 31 letters written from there (including nine from 1828). But as may be seen from Appendix One, over 150 letters from this period are extant. Not surprisingly, such an extensive correspondence, written during nine years, contains a great diversity of subject-matter. Therefore the commentary on this period, while continuing to be based on the unpublished letters and to draw attention to certain inaccuracies and misconstructions in the biographies, will display new information on four topics in particular: the religious "doubts" which tormented Arnold throughout these years; the management of the private school at Laleham, with particular regard to the termination of the partnership with his brother-in-law, John Buckland; the literary activities in which he engaged as a means of supplementing his income; and the various posts he considered during this period.

As in the previous sections, quotations from the letters have been made to support the various points under discussion, although when considering such topics as the religious misgivings which afflicted him, full appreciation of the intensity of the crisis and the despair into which he was plunged can only come from reading the relevant letters in their entirety.

That Arnold went through a period of religious "doubts" towards the end of his time at Oxford is well known to readers of the biographies. Most accounts of his life mention that these "doubts" turned upon the question of subscription to the 39 Articles and that nearly ten years elapsed between

his ordination as Deacon and his procession to Priest's orders, just before his transition to Rugby in 1828. Although these statements are correct in outline, the unpublished letters not only reveal that there is considerable confusion in the chronology and precise details given in the biographies, but their contents also suggest strongly that Stanley was less than candid in his account of the matter and that he deliberately minimised its importance as an event in Arnold's life. Because these religious misgivings lasted throughout the Laleham period, and the nature of them was subject to change, the evidence provided by the letters may be displayed chronologically.

Arnold was reduced to a state of acute, mental anguish by a religious crisis which had its origin in his ordination as Deacon on 20 December 1818. This was the initial, and in its physical and psychological effects, probably the most severe crisis of doubt he ever experienced. It is to this event that most of the biographers who write about this period refer when they speak of his "doubts" concerning the 39 Articles; although they neither sufficiently emphasise the effect that these "doubts" had upon him, nor do they fully reveal how they developed and changed in their nature.

This first crisis is vividly described in a series of unpublished letters (L.82 , L.83 , L.84 , L.102 , L.103, L.104) which show how his original disquiet over the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed led him on to more general doubts about the nature of the Persons of the Trinity. The importance of these doubts was such that he felt they compromised his retention of the Diaconal office, the forfeiture of which, as he well knew, would entail grave consequences for his future. Five of the letters were written to J.T. Coleridge, who, with John Keble, the recipient of the sixth, nursed Arnold through the crisis. Their contents were judiciously summarised by Coleridge in his contribution to The Life, although he neither revealed that Arnold's doubts included portions of the Athanasian Creed, nor that his

marriage itself was jeopardised. But as well as adding vivid detail to Coleridge's summary, the unpublished letters raise an interesting question about the extent of Stanley's knowledge of the affair.

Writing in The Life on the question of Arnold's misgivings over subscribing the 39 Articles, Stanley affects to know little if anything about them, and relegates his observations to a footnote. Since his footnote shows that he knew that the nature of Arnold's religious difficulties changed between the years 1819 and 1828, it is convenient to examine his comments chronologically.

Referring to the crisis of 1819-1820 (occasioned by Arnold's ordination as Deacon) he is vague:

"The graver difficulties, which Mr. Justice Coleridge has noticed as attending his first Ordination, never returned after the year 1820, when he seems to have arrived at a complete conviction both of his conscience and understanding, that there was no real ground for entertaining them. The morbid state of mind into which he was thrown ... makes it difficult to ascertain the exact nature of these doubts, or the exact view which he took of them himself ... the recollection of those friends who best remember him ... warrants the conclusion that, whatever they were, he was ultimately freed" ²⁴⁹ (my emphasis).

In these remarks Stanley is not being entirely candid, for he undoubtedly knew far more about the matter than he was prepared to reveal. This is simply proved by the fact that we know he read L.103 and L.104, since both of these appear in his Notebooks. Indeed, the very explicit account of Arnold's doubts and torments which is given in L.104, Stanley has characterised in summary thus: "Doubts. The Catholic Faith.". Even though it cannot be proved beyond all doubt that he also read the earlier letters in this group,²⁵⁰ the fact that he read L.104 is enough to show that he

knew about the affair in detail. So while his reluctance to discuss the matter in print beyond the limits of Coleridge's summary may be accepted, it would be wrong to think that Stanley knew as little of the subject as he suggests in his footnote.

In tracing the history of this event in the biographies, it is necessary to correct first a statement made by Whitridge on the involvement of John Keble as one of Arnold's advisers in the affair. Although he is quite correct in stressing the importance of Arnold's doubts, Whitridge is wrong in stating that Arnold and Keble were becoming estranged at this time.²⁵¹ It is clear to the reader of L.83 and L.84 that, along with Coleridge, Keble was Arnold's principal confidant; indeed, his first action had been to write to Keble (L.83). Furthermore, both L.83 and L.84 show that he was endeavouring to implement the advice Keble (and Coleridge) had given (to cease enquiry and pursue the practical duties of a holy life); while L.102, written to Keble in May 1820, shows Arnold once more pouring out the same doubts to him. There is, therefore, no doubt that Keble helped Arnold through this first crisis of doubt: their rift was a later event.

Another point is that we only know of Coleridge's and Keble's involvement. The correspondence provides no support for Wymer's notion,²⁵² repeated by Bamford,²⁵³ that other friends were privy to his condition. Nor does it provide evidence for their assertion of the Bishop of Oxford's participation. Surely if before his ordination as Deacon, Arnold's doubts had been allayed by the Bishop's counsel, this would be mentioned in the letters; particularly in L.83, which describes in minute detail the onset and progression of his doubts. The notion of the Bishop of Oxford's involvement seems to be either speculation or, more probably, a confusion of this ordination with his later one to the Priesthood in June 1828. Then Arnold did consult a Bishop about his difficulties, though this was

the Bishop of London, not the Bishop of Oxford.²⁵⁴

The chronology of the crisis is another point on which the unpublished letters shed light. The Life merely records that doubts arose "previously to his taking orders".²⁵⁵ Whitridge says they arose "Shortly before he was ordained Deacon in 1820"²⁵⁶ (he is in error over the year, which should read in 1818). Wymer, with characteristic licence, says "After weeks of silent meditation";²⁵⁷ while Bamford believes that Arnold had reconciled his difficulties and accepted ordination to the Diaconate in a spirit of compromise.²⁵⁸ There is, however, no need for speculation, since L.83 establishes the chronology quite clearly:

"It was I think as late as the Friday before my ordination, that I felt for the first time any of my doubts ... I should ... have postponed my ordination ... but ... I was ordained ... But on the Sunday my mind became more and more disturbed and uneasy ... my doubts had extended ... I went home to Hampton, distracted with doubts, regretting that I had taken orders so hastily ... " (my emphasis).

Arnold's doubts, therefore, began on Friday, 19 December 1818; he was ordained Deacon still holding them, on Saturday, 20 December; and they continued to grow in intensity throughout Sunday, 21 December. These misgivings continued to assail him in the months that followed, and at times he suffered the utmost torment. There is no support for the view that the church and he had reached an accord. There is no question of reasoned compromise, either before his ordination, or even by May 1820, when his ultimate recourse, as will be shown, was to stifle his doubts in the Confessio Ecclesiae. It seems that after March 1819, he achieved a measure of relief, firstly by trying to implement the advice Coleridge and Keble had given him; secondly, through his mind's being occupied by his

decision to leave Oxford and embark upon a private-schoolmaster's career; and thirdly, through his romance with Mary Penrose. But this calm was to prove deceitful, for between 28 April 1820 (L.101) and the unpublished letter to John Keble of 22 May 1820 (L.102), a recurrence of Arnold's religious doubts, compounded by the accidental death of his brother Matthew,²⁵⁹ shattered his complacency and provoked probably the most severe mental crisis of his life.

In addition to providing a detailed chronology of the affair, the unpublished letters also provide evidence of the specific points on which his doubts turned. Stanley's pretended ignorance of the details and Coleridge's "distressing doubts on certain points in the Articles",²⁶⁰ relate specifically to the Athanasian Creed.

It is clear from L.83 that his doubts originated in the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed and then extended to the doctrines of the Creed itself: particularly, the nature of the Persons of the Holy Trinity, especially the personality of the Holy Spirit. This letter confirms Coleridge's view that Arnold's difficulties were not the result of an inability to believe in the supernatural aspect of the doctrine, but derived rather from an intellectual failure to find convincing scriptural proof for the doctrines maintained. Although he tried to act on the advice given him, particularly by Keble, "to pause in his inquiries, to pray earnestly ... and turn himself more strongly than ever to the practical duties of a holy life";²⁶¹ this was unlikely to prove a successful remedy for a man of Arnold's scrupulously honest intellect; and the observation he himself makes in L.84, when he wonders if "this calm is but a deceitful crust" suggests he realised this. That the result of trying to act on this advice would lead to a further and probably more intense crisis of doubt seems, given his temperament, inevitable. As L.102 shows, this is precisely what

happened. In L.102 and L.104 can be found the most detailed extant statement of the nature of his difficulties and the torment they caused him. They also provide the hitherto unknown information that he was on the brink of abandoning his forthcoming marriage because of them.

The unpublished letters from 1819 have revealed his disquiet over the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed; now, in May 1820 (L.102),²⁶² he reveals his despair quite plainly. On the question of the three Persons of the Trinity, he finds the "definition of their relation to each other and to God", as given in the Athanasian Creed, "incomprehensible". He doubts specifically "the personality of the Holy Spirit", in that he cannot bring himself to believe that "worship to him distinct from the Father and the Son" is justifiable. And, L.104 reveals that a consequence of his failure to satisfy himself scripturally on these points led him into doubts about the doctrine of the Trinity itself. This is very plain speaking and undoubtedly reflects the torment in his mind. His intellect was still unable to find sufficient scriptural proof to allay his doubts.

Arnold's distress was further compounded by the proximity of his marriage, which was to take place on 11 August 1820. It would seem to be entirely new biographical information that he was on the brink of terminating his wedding arrangements. Yet L.102 and L.104 make it clear that this was so, and that the reason for contemplating such a course of action was directly related to his failure to resolve his religious problems. Because he could find no intellectual solution for them, he had begun to believe that this was a test of his faith; that a sacrifice was being demanded from him, a sacrifice that would reveal the true feelings of his heart. He had begun to fear that a solution would never be vouchsafed to him until he, "renounce(s) all plans of earthly good, and desire(s) the true faith ... for its own sake only." (L.102); an allusion to his belief that "to part with her", may be

the divinely appointed price he would have to pay for a settled conviction. Although he had deferred to Keble's advice in this crisis and not communicated these thoughts to his fiancée, his marriage hung in the balance for nearly a month, and he says to Coleridge in L.104 ²⁶³ that until 18 June "I verily thought my marriage was altogether doubtful".

If the question of a test of faith is set aside, why should his intellectual inability to resolve his "doubts" be the direct reason for contemplating the cancellation of his marriage? The answer lies in the tendency of these "doubts". Intellectually, he felt that the direction in which his thoughts were tending could well lead to "doubts" even more serious than those he had begun to feel about the doctrine of the Trinity (L.104). And Arnold knew only too well that his entire earthly prospects depended on how he resolved that tendency. It was not the fact that he could not proceed to Priest's orders without subscribing the Articles which troubled him, for there was no pressing necessity to enter the Priesthood. Arnold acknowledges this himself when he says that he could marry without taking orders and just "pursue my present occupation" (L.104). Rather it was the force of the moral dilemma which pressed most strongly upon his judgement. He might well continue in his career of schoolmaster, but his principles would not allow him to teach pupils the elements of a faith, a fundamental doctrine (and later, perhaps even doctrines) of which he held to be not proven. If he did not teach, he had no adequate income on which to marry, to say nothing of the scandal which would ensue. The stakes were high and finally Arnold chose to resign the argument, thereby saving his "earthly prospects" and thus avoiding "(the) real danger of losing my marriage." (L.104).

Although the force of such worldly consideration put great pressure upon him to conform, there seems little doubt that it was the fright he received at the direction in which his enquiries about the Trinity were leading, that

caused him to abandon his intellectual investigations and to acquiesce instead in "the belief of almost the whole Church of Christ since the days of the Apostles, since this must needs be the safe side to abide by." (L.104) . It is clear from L.104 that he had begun to question his belief in the very "doctrine of the Creed", and that he felt that this line of questioning showed that he was fast approaching the beginning of the road to unbelief itself - "God forbid that I should have seen more than the beginnings". It was with the prospect of this frightening situation looming before him that he decided to try again the advice he had received in May 1819: to cease from intellectual enquiries, "to shun all discussion or thought on the subject, and take quietly what the church tells me." (L.104). So it was that through a consciousness "of falling into worse errors" and because he was "tired with baffling and misleading inquiries" (L.104) , that he decided to sink his doubts in the Confessio Ecclesiae.

This whole dramatic affair undoubtedly deserves far more prominence than it has hitherto been given in accounts of Arnold's life. Clearly the letters raise important questions about his character. How, for example, do we interpret the fact that he was ultimately prepared to stifle honest doubts in fear of the consequences of investigating them? Undoubtedly the letters provide material for those who would condemn his cessation from enquiry as evasion, both intellectual and moral. Likewise, as he himself acknowledges in L.102 , his public recital of a Creed, some of whose clauses he disbelieved, was (at best) inconsistent with his subscription to the Articles. Of the later biographers, Whitridge alone realised the importance of these events. Given that these and similar questions remain open today, his explanation of Arnold's "seemingly equivocal position" is still valid:

"it is at once the strength or the weakness of the Protestant church, depending on one's point of view, that such

inconsistency is tolerated and even respected. If Arnold was able to pronounce certain doctrines in church of which he did not believe a word, it was because he did not consider the clauses in question an essential part of the creed."²⁶⁴

Arnold's conscience told him that his work lay within the Church of England, and rather than violate his conscience he acquiesced in an uneasy compromise. But it was uneasy, Stanley's confident dismissal of this crisis:

"The graver difficulties ... never returned after the year 1820, when he seems to have arrived at a complete conviction both of his conscience and understanding"²⁶⁵

hardly reflects the reality of the situation. Arnold was temperamentally unsuited to surrender any intellectual argument without coming to a conclusion, let alone one which touched matters of fundamental importance to him. Yet on the question of the nature of the Persons of the Trinity, he had to stifle genuine perplexities and instead to "take quietly what the church tells me." (L.104) . The fact that by 1826 (L.200) he had apparently satisfied himself on this point, does not justify Stanley's statement that "complete conviction ... of ... understanding" came in 1820. And this statement certainly cannot be used to describe Arnold's attitude to the anathemas in the Athanasian Creed, for he simply refused to believe them, either in 1820 or later. And further proof that Stanley deliberately minimised the significance of these events lies in the fact that he knew full well that Arnold did not accept these clauses.²⁶⁶ Indeed, he did not believe them himself and experienced the self-same difficulties over subscription as had Arnold,²⁶⁷ with whom he had corresponded on the subject.

If Stanley's expressions of complacency over the outcome of this first period of religious "doubts" can be qualified, it is worth considering his

treatment of those later problems which exercised Arnold during the Laleham period:

"It was on wholly distinct grounds that ... at Laleham ... arose ... scruples on one or two minor questions, which appeared to him ... to present insuperable obstacles to his taking any office which should involve a second subscription to the Articles."²⁶⁸

And he particularises Arnold's "scruples" as, doubts on whether the Epistle to the Hebrews dated from Apostolic times, and an opposition to the indiscriminate use of the Baptism and Burial Services.

There are four letters in which these later doubts are discussed: L.197, L.200 , L.214, L.228. The first two are unpublished and it is not known whether Stanley ever read them. The last two were used in The Life to refer to Arnold's doubts, but only in extract, without acknowledgement, and with no reference to the specific points in question. Indeed the quotation from L.214 was reproduced by Stanley as a footnote, with the unacknowledged omission of several words, including the alteration of one to disguise the fact that Arnold's inability to become a Priest would preclude his applying for a Headmastership (of Winchester College).²⁶⁹ And L.228, as Whitridge observed,²⁷⁰ was reproduced in The Life not only with the complete and unacknowledged omission of Arnold's discussion of his "doubts", but also in a way which disguised the fact that they formed one of the two chief points causing him to hesitate over applying for the vacancy at Rugby School. There seems little doubt that Stanley was not prepared to expose the religious misgivings which Arnold held at this period to public scrutiny.

An examination of the four letters enables a complete list of Arnold's later "scruples" to be compiled. In addition to the two points mentioned

by Stanley, these letters show that he would never sign the three articles of the 36th Canon; that he refused to believe that the Song of Solomon and the Book of Esther were inspired compositions; that he thought the "genuineness" of the Second Epistle of St. Peter and that of St. Jude, "exceedingly doubtful"; and that he "never would read any of the political forms of prayer". In addition to these "scruples", he refers to "several other objections ... to other points in our Services and Articles," although he does not specify them.²⁷¹ And carried over from 1820, there is his refusal to acknowledge the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed. This would seem to be the full extent of his later doubts.

Arnold's decision to remain in Deacon's orders was the direct consequence of his "scruples" on these points. Whether he was inconsistent in retaining even that office would seem to depend upon the interpretation each individual's conscience places upon the oath of assent to the Articles. Nevertheless, his scrupulous honesty in refusing to proceed to Priest's orders, despite temptations both spiritual and temporal to do so, has to be admired. His eventual solution was to lay his reservations before a higher authority and abide by the decision:

"if people who have authority to do so, will tell me that they

are only articles of peace, I will subscribe them tomorrow;" (L.228).

This the Bishop of London was prepared to do, and Arnold became a Priest on 1 June 1828.

Arnold himself referred to these points as "utterly trifling" (L.200), Stanley called them "minor". Yet there is no doubt that their consequences were of considerable importance. They kept Arnold from a curacy (L.228) and Priest's orders for nine years, a situation which exposed him to rumour and innuendo: "I know ... it was said in Oxford that I did not preach the Gospel," (L.259). They provoked much disquiet among his family and friends;²⁷²

and, as will be shown, they hindered his capacity for advancement at a time when his financial position required strengthening. Moreover, the personal cost in study and soul-searching was immense.

This short study of the matter clearly confirms Whitridge's suspicion that Stanley was not prepared to be frank about Arnold's religious misgivings.²⁷³ It also shows that apart from Whitridge, none of the biographers sufficiently emphasises the importance of these "doubts". Indeed, it seems that even a complete list of Arnold's difficulties prior to his ordination in 1828 has never been published. Consequently, a balanced assessment of the affair cannot be based purely upon the information given in the biographies; it must derive from a study of the unpublished correspondence, since that alone provides the detailed exposition of Arnold's condition which is essential to any judgement that is passed.

In addition to shedding new light upon the religious difficulties which beset Arnold during his years at Laleham, the correspondence also provides new information on another important topic, his career as a private-school-master.

No more than general accounts have been published of the private school at Laleham, run first as a partnership between Arnold and his brother-in-law John Buckland, and later as two separate establishments. A considerable amount of information, however, does exist in published reminiscences of the period, the journals which Mrs Arnold kept (now in the collection at the Brotherton Library), and the unpublished correspondence. The letters, especially, are a source of much detailed information on the management of the enterprise. A comprehensive study of the school does not fall within the scope of this thesis; but the letters do allow some general

observations to be made on the details given in the biographies, and they also provide evidence which suggests why the partnership with Buckland was dissolved. Firstly, it is worth considering whether the unpublished letters provide any information about Arnold's readiness to leave his Fellowship and begin a career in teaching with a partnership in a private school.

The biographers offer a number of motives for his decision to leave Oxford. Stanley is vague, saying only that "he had been gradually led to fix upon his future course in life".²⁷⁴ Whitridge speaks of "a latent passion within him which ... Oxford could not satisfy";²⁷⁵ although he does not enlarge upon this. Wymer believes that since Arnold's misgivings over the Articles prevented his becoming a Priest, his friends persuaded him that his vocation lay in education.²⁷⁶ And Bamford sees his departure from Oxford as a desire for financial security because he wanted to marry Mary Penrose; he also says that Arnold "turned to teaching only as a last resort."²⁷⁷

In considering these motives, it has to be said that until June 1819 (L.85), when he announced his resolve to leave Oxford to unite with Buckland in a scheme which "has been some time in agitation", the letters contain no definitive statement about his future. Prior to June 1819, clues about his intentions can be found in L.82, L.83, and L.84, letters which also record the progress of his first religious crisis. The difficulty is to determine whether and to what extent the remarks he makes about his future are a consequence of the unsettled state of his mind, or a reflection of gradually maturing plans about his intended career. Certainly it seems that by the end of 1818, Arnold was contemplating leaving Oxford. In January 1819 (L.82), he makes a clear statement of his dissatisfaction with the course of his life there:

"I at times feel a sort of impatient weariness of this place,
which would make me catch at any prospect of leaving it."

And in March 1819 (L.84), he describes his Oxford routine as "not a very agreeable occupation". So it does not seem implausible to suggest that a sense of disenchantment had been growing before the ordination crisis. If so, this would lend support to Whitridge's view that Oxford could not satisfy him indefinitely. Wymer says correctly that the Priesthood was closed to Arnold if he refused to subscribe the Articles, but is he equally correct in regarding the idea of taking pupils as something new and unplanned, a direct consequence of that refusal? The evidence can support another interpretation.

In the regular course of events, Arnold's ordination as Deacon should have led him to take some form of curacy prior to his ordination to the Priesthood. And while allowing for the fact that his mind was unsettled, his remark in L.83, that he hoped to obtain "some portion of parochial duty near Oxford ... wherein to learn my business", seems to reflect an intention to engage in pastoral work of some kind. In this he would be following the spirit of the advice given to him by Coleridge and Keble. From which we may infer that in February 1819 he had not yet abandoned his intention of becoming a Priest; and so it is reasonable to assume that he was still hoping eventually to settle down on a rectory. But even had Arnold become a Priest, does it follow that he would not have engaged in private tuition? For there was nothing to prevent his combining ordination with teaching private pupils. Letters L.82 and L.83 provide some evidence on this matter.

L.82 (31 January 1819) begins with Arnold's declining an offer to leave Oxford to undertake the tuition of a private pupil, John May. He refused because of the religious problems distracting his mind. The offer had been made in the hope that a change of environment would help him to clarify his thoughts; but this does not necessarily imply that the principle of teaching a youth, somewhere in the country, would be a complete surprise to

Arnold. Indeed his apparent willingness to have taken the boy (had his mind been settled) may well be due to the fact that he intended teaching to play a part in his future. Such an interpretation is strongly supported by L.83, written five days later, when he says "I should not like to begin my tutorial career ... with a case (so difficult)". The words "to begin my tutorial career" are significant, since they suggest that he had made a prior decision to make teaching form some part, at least, of his future course. And when it is considered that this statement was made in the same letter in which he anticipates obtaining some form of pastoral work in a nearby parish, a fact which suggests he had not yet given up hope of taking Priestly orders, it is not unreasonable to believe that a combination of the two had always been in his mind. The tutorial aspect does not have to derive from the religious crisis. Moreover, it is worth examining the evidence on which Wymer supports his belief that the idea of teaching was something new to Arnold.

He dates Arnold's decision to seek another career to June 1819, although a reference in March 1819 (L.84) indicates that he had already taken the decision and was planning to begin his tutorial career either "after Christmas or even ... after the long vacation"(i.e. October 1819). He also depicts Arnold as casting about for a career, and mentions that Coleridge had suggested the law. But that was never an option at this time, that suggestion had been made and rejected in 1817 (L.74). Wymer remarks that Arnold's previous experiences in coaching undergraduates had led him to reject teaching as an option for his future. But in the correspondence there is no evidence for this, nor anything which suggests he had an intense dislike for the occupation. It seems to be speculation. Furthermore, no evidence can be found for Hawkins' involvement in the matter, nor the specific arguments Wymer ascribes to that man. They seem to have their origin in advice Hawkins gave on other matters in 1827 and

1833, and Wymer has apparently construed them as being equally applicable to 1819.²⁷⁸ And finally, as L.84 shows, Buckland's offer of a partnership post-dated Arnold's decision to set up his own establishment. Indeed if anybody had pointed the way to teaching it was Coleridge and Keble with their remedy for his religious doubts;²⁷⁹ but the principle of his taking pupils in the country may have been well established. Therefore, while we may agree with Wymer that Arnold felt hesitant about embarking alone on a career as a private tutor (rather than combining tuition with the life of a country clergyman), we do not have to accept all of his background to that decision.

The notion that Arnold became a schoolmaster with considerable reluctance may derive from his views on teaching in a Public School, in that his stated antipathy to life as a master in such a situation is seen as a reflection of his views on teaching generally. But such an interpretation would be inaccurate. It would, however, be correct to say that at this period of his life, the prospect of a position in a major Public School held no attraction for him. The evidence for this is clear. In L.93,²⁸⁰ written in October 1819, Arnold answers Blackstone's suggestion that he should stand for a mastership at Winchester College by declaring himself quite content with teaching at Laleham, and opposed both in point of qualification and, more significantly, inclination to taking such a post. A position reinforced in L.97,²⁸¹ where he reiterates his objections and states unequivocally his aversion to teaching in a Public School:

"in turning over ... the various schemes of life which I might follow, the mastership of a public school had always appeared to me so little attractive, that I had never entertained any thoughts of such a thing for an

instant".

The point is that Arnold had made a distinction between teaching privately and teaching in one of the major Public Schools. Teaching itself was not the problem for him, but rather the environment in which he would exercise that profession.

If there is no positive evidence against the view that Arnold had always intended to teach private pupils, what evidence supports the idea? It has been shown that his remarks in L.82 and particularly L.83 can be taken as evidence for this view. In addition, the correspondence shows that for the previous five years he had, without dismay, been supplementing his Fellowship by coaching undergraduates. And L.72 and L.82 reveal that he was not opposed in principle to the idea of teaching boys in their early teens. All this creates a picture of a man who was conforming to a well-established pattern. As the biographer of W.W. Phelps, Arnold's near contemporary, said of his subject:

"(Phelps) had done about as well as his Corpus friends in general ... many of them were marrying on curacies and private pupils, College livings coming to them rarely enough."²⁸² (my emphasis).

So in point of fact, rather than being a "last resort", a desire to continue teaching was in many respects the natural consequence of his career to date. Once he had decided not to become ordained and live the life of a parish Priest, it seems only natural that he should consider teaching to be his first recourse.

The last of the motives given by the biographers is that Arnold left Oxford for a teaching career because he wished to marry Mary Penrose. Bamford says, correctly, that Arnold could not normally retain his Fellowship if he married, and that the chances of obtaining a living in the gift of the College were

remote. The latter point, of course, assumes his ordination to the Priesthood, a subject on which Bamford is equivocal. For on the one hand, as noticed earlier, he believes that Arnold accepted ordination to the Diaconate in a spirit of compromise, and seems not to recognise the distressed state of Arnold's mind during the early months of 1819; now, on the other hand, he mentions his anxiety about the Creeds as a consideration. But is it known that Arnold was in a hurry to marry? He did not actually marry Mary Penrose until August 1820,²⁸³ some eighteen months after their first meeting. Even if Bamford's original view is adopted, that Arnold was proceeding to the Priesthood in a spirit of compromise; then on this time scale, by the date of his marriage, he would probably have had his own living on which to support her. If his revised view is adopted, which assumes Arnold's uncertain religious outlook, then it does not have to be accepted that marriage to Mary Penrose lay behind his desire to leave Oxford in early 1819. For there is no trace of this motive in the extant letters for the period, which, on the contrary, suggest that his attention was concentrated on resolving his religious doubts by acting on the advice he had been given. In February 1819 (L.83), he still had hopes of becoming a Priest; if these hopes had been realised, then he would have had his own living on which to marry.

This is not to deny that Mary Penrose had made an impression upon him, and at a time when he was emotionally vulnerable, nor that his feelings towards her strengthened as the months went by. But it was not until the first week of 1819 that he made his initial acquaintance with her.²⁸⁴ Even then, his visit was short and the family of his friend Penrose were comparative strangers. His own mind was completely unsettled, in a ferment of anxiety over his ordination as Deacon, a state in which it remained for some months. Bamford's narrative suggests that his decision to marry her

was a consequence of this initial visit, during which they fell suddenly in love; and he thereby establishes Arnold's motive for leaving Oxford. However, his description of their making love "as far as the indulgence of chaperons would permit" and the suddenness of it all, while possible, is mere speculation. And his assessment of Arnold in his immediate post-ordination condition as "still a little proud ... at his new status, and a little pompous, too, no doubt"²⁸⁵ is simply not supported by the evidence of contemporary letters, which reveal a completely opposite picture. So although Bamford's choice of motive is not impossible, it nevertheless seems unlikely that Arnold's desire to marry Mary Penrose was coincident with their first, brief meeting.

In considering his future, the prospect of marriage sooner rather than later - to whomever - must naturally have been a factor in his thinking. Had the religious doubts not assailed him, his own rectory and private pupils would have answered his need for a suitable home and income. This was the path he was following when he became a Deacon in 1818. Once he had decided not to take Priestly orders, he had to consider the options which remained open to him. He could, for example, continue in his Fellowship at Oriel, coach undergraduates, and hope that his doubts would resolve themselves. But L.82 has shown that he was becoming restless with his manner of life at Oxford; added to which there was probably a limit to the time he could remain at Oriel in Deacon's orders without becoming the object of embarrassing speculation. Moreover, remaining in his Fellowship did not resolve the question of marriage in the future. His alternative, therefore, was to seek another career. As we have seen, to establish himself as a private tutor was not only a fairly obvious career for him to adopt, it also enabled him to meet the particular problems which confronted him. It gave him time to resolve his religious misgivings,

put him in receipt of an income, and provided a basis on which, at some point in the future, he could marry. Such a decision, therefore, would not have to be the direct consequence of a wish to marry Mary Penrose.

With the various possibilities having been examined, it can be said in conclusion that although the evidence does not provide a certain answer to the question of why he left Oxford to begin a teaching career, it nevertheless allows a compelling case to be made which conforms to a well-established pattern. Such a case would argue that Arnold did originally intend taking Priest's orders, and that with a view to settling in a country living where he would supplement his stipend by taking private pupils. The religious crisis which followed his ordination as Deacon compelled him to change his plans for the Priesthood; but as the teaching option remained open to him, he accepted this - after due consideration, since it was presented to him in a form different from that which he had originally envisaged - because it had always formed part of his scheme for the future. A consequence of which would be that he had sufficient income with which to support both himself and his dependant relatives and to provide a reasonable basis on which he might eventually marry.

The biographies generally consider Arnold's life at Laleham in terms of the foundation this provided for his later career at Rugby; a result of this is that the emphasis tends to be placed on his professional relations with his pupils. It is not the intention here to enter into the minutiae of school-life at Laleham, although the letters do contain much unpublished information on Arnold's management of the school. Instead, the specified topics from this period which remain for discussion are set in the general context of Arnold's financial affairs; an approach which views them in a different life from that in which they usually appear.

Arnold's brother-in-law, John Buckland, had been running a small, private school at Hampton for some years. This school catered mainly for young boys, according to L.74 none being more than eleven or twelve years of age, plus a few older pupils Buckland was preparing for the universities.²⁸⁶ Arnold's previous teaching experience had been confined to undergraduates, although he was quite prepared to instruct younger boys. By March 1819 (L.84), he had decided to pursue the life of a private tutor and he writes of his hopes of "setting up in the country". Arnold's original idea was to found his own establishment, but this scheme was modified by his entry into a partnership with Buckland on the basis of offering instruction to all age groups up to and including matriculation.²⁸⁷ The most detailed account of their enterprise is to be found in Wymer, but inaccuracies emerge when his narrative is read alongside the correspondence.

Discrepancies occur almost immediately when his description of the way in which the partners envisaged the school would be organised is compared with the correspondence. He says that:

"Buckland, would accommodate and teach the younger boys; ...

Arnold ... all the older pupils ... they would work independently of one another,"²⁸⁸

Yet L.85 shows that the intention was that only half the older boys would live with Arnold;²⁸⁹ all meals would be taken at Buckland's (in practice this certainly excluded tea for Arnold's boarders); and that the two would share the teaching of all pupils, both juniors and seniors. It is important to establish these facts, since they have a bearing on the reason for their eventual separation.

Similarly the figures he quotes for fees²⁹⁰ are not those the partners originally envisaged. Wymer's source of information for the figures he quotes would seem to be L.72, a letter written in July 1816, in which

Arnold gives the fees then being charged by Buckland at his school in Hampton. Reference to that letter shows that the terms for the younger boys of seventy guineas p.a., an entrance fee of ten guineas, and the provision of towels, knife, and silver fork and spoon; and eighty guineas p.a. for the older pupils, all correspond with the figures Wymer says the partners intended charging in 1819. The only other figure he gives in his account of the Laleham period is that for Arnold when he had gone his own way in 1824. Then his fees were "200 guineas a year for their board and tuition."²⁹¹ Fortunately, the whole question of fees is one on which the unpublished letters provide detailed information.

L.85 makes it clear that the fees Arnold believed they intended to charge in 1819 were £100 p.a. for the younger boys and probably £200 p.a. for the older pupils. L.96, however, written in December 1819, shows that for the younger boys they were actually charging 70 guineas p.a., a ten guinea entrance fee, plus four guineas p.a. extra for history and geography. Added to which the boys had to provide two pair of sheets as well as towels, knife, fork and spoon. It will be noticed that these are the terms Buckland had charged for the younger boys at Hampton in 1816. Presumably, it was decided that the market would not stand the sum originally envisaged, £100 p.a. (L.85). For the older pupils, however, the fees were 200 guineas p.a. as opposed to the £200 p.a. Arnold thought they would charge in L.85. The fees were still at this level in September 1821 (L.118). A full account of all the expenses, including the incidental ones, which one of Arnold's boarders would have had to pay may be found, along with the system of instruction he employed, in L.176, written in October 1825, and thus after the separation. This letter shows that his fees had remained unchanged at £210 p.a., a figure which never varied throughout his time at Laleham; and this despite straitened circumstances and advice to raise

them.²⁹²

For five years the partners shared expenses, profits, and the burden of teaching, until 1824 when they mutually agreed to dissolve their partnership and work independently: Arnold taking the older and Buckland the younger boys. The reason for their decision has been the subject of speculation. Wymer says the motive for such a move is unclear and speculates that it may have been a matter of convenience; he emphasises that no personal rancour was involved.²⁹³ Bamford also expresses uncertainty and suggests a number of possibilities: finance, Arnold's inability to empathise with little children, or the partners' incompatibility.²⁹⁴ This latter point finds no confirmation in the extant evidence, which supports Wymer's view that the separation began and ended amicably. Since Arnold's personal expenses were increasing, a desire for more money seems a possible motive. But this must be considered against the facts that a) he continued to remain short of money; b) that he consistently refused to increase the level of his fees; and c) that there was a limit to the number of pupils he could accommodate and teach on his own, his preferred maximum being seven,²⁹⁵ a figure it must be assumed he had taken into consideration in making his decision. In fact, an examination of the correspondence reveals that there was little difference in the gross income he derived from pupils' fees either before or after 1824.

The letters show that until 1824, the partners had in joint residence an average of sixteen younger and eight older boys a year.²⁹⁶ After the separation, Arnold averaged seven pupils a year. If these numbers are applied to the fees that were charged, approximate figures for the partners' income from this source can be calculated. These show that up to 1824 their average, combined gross income was £3024 p.a., say £1500 each. Arnold's post 1824 average gross income was £1470p.a. Therefore the

gross income he derived as an individual was virtually unchanged. Given this evidence, it seems that any additional profit Arnold hoped to make from the separation would be derived from a reduction in the level of his expenses. In the absence of information on the total amount of his expenses, either in or out of the partnership, the calculation cannot be completed on the basis of hard evidence. However, the general terms which are given in L.85 and L.176 show that the charge of £210 p.a. related to tuition, board and lodging. The only additional charge levied by Arnold was for washing, all other expenses incurred by his pupils were charged at cost. On this basis, therefore, the largest single item of expense to be deducted from his gross income would, at any time, most likely be that relating to the feeding of the boys. In general terms then, the notional saving Arnold would make would be the difference between the cost of feeding eight boys and four youths (his share of the partnership up to 1824) and feeding seven youths when he worked independently. There might have been a saving, but was it likely to be enough in itself to make it the motive for dissolving the partnership? On the assumption that Arnold had not miscalculated, then the motive of extra profit is by no means obvious; and if there is no evidence for mutual antipathy forcing the issue, is there a more convincing explanation for the decision to separate? The unpublished letters suggest that there is.

It is important to remember that although there was an imbalance in the lodging arrangements - Buckland had all "the little boys" and half "the great ones" (L.85) - the labour of teaching was equally divided. They both had a share in the teaching of the older boys, which took place sometimes at Arnold's sometimes at Buckland's. Likewise the younger boys, though never leaving Buckland's, were taught by both men (L.85, L.91). Such was the initial arrangement; but by November 1819 (L.95) Arnold was

advising Coleridge of a change in the management of the enterprise. They had decided to announce to parents that, while mutually assisting each other, Buckland would be alone responsible for the junior boys and Arnold for the senior:

"that as the two establishments are distinct in fact, they may be so in name." (L.95)

The partners felt that such an arrangement would reassure any parents who might feel that the union of two distinct age groups within a single enterprise might lead to a neglect of, or too great an emphasis on, one or other of them. Henceforth, they were to have clearly defined responsibilities. The basis on which this division had been made would obviously please Arnold, who although still having a part in the teaching of the junior boys, had shown from the start a preference for instructing the older ones.

In this connection, it is important to notice two distinctions which Arnold makes when referring to the school and the pupils. When he writes:

"Buckland is naturally fonder of the school, and is inclined to give it the greatest part of his attention; and I, from my Oxford habits ... like the other part ... best". (L.95),²⁹⁷

he is not expressing dissatisfaction with his new occupation. Rather, he is equating "the school" with teaching the junior boys, whereas he prefers teaching "the other part", that is, the senior pupils.²⁹⁸ Its usage with this meaning is common in the period of his partnership with Buckland. Similarly his letters now make the distinction between "the boys" and "the pupils", the latter of course being the youths. When reading quotations from the letters of this period, it is important to realise that these distinctions exist, since a failure to recognise them can create a misleading impression.²⁹⁹

Arnold's preference for teaching the older boys can be traced in the

correspondence. In December 1819 (L.97) he refers to the division of the school as that between "the boys and the private pupils". In L.98 he remarks on the unlikelihood of a prospective "pupil" joining them, since "his father wants him to be under my exclusive care and superintendence.". Arnold, of course, was still sharing their instruction with Buckland. On 9 October 1820 (L.108) the teaching arrangements have so far changed that he can say he has increased the work of "the pupils", with the result that he has "hardly now anything to do (with) the boys". Eighteen days later, none of "the pupils" are taught at Buckland's house but all at Arnold's. The pattern is clear and reaches its logical conclusion in September 1821 when he informs Cornish that he has now freed himself entirely from teaching "the boys" (L.118).

With his University background and familiarity with coaching undergraduates, it is not surprising that Arnold found the teaching of boys of seventeen, destined for the Universities, much more interesting and stimulating than the inculcating of the elements of grammar and accidence into boys of eleven and twelve. The letters show that within two years of the start, he had managed to obtain overall responsibility for, and the entire academic instruction of, the youths. And during the same period, he had shed all responsibility for "the boys". That Buckland seems to have acquiesced in this arrangement need not be a matter for surprise: by far the higher number of scholars in his previous establishment had been "boys", and he seems to have enjoyed teaching that age group. For the purposes of tuition, therefore, there were for the next three years two independent establishments. Given this evidence, the mutually agreed separation of 1824 seems predictable, since it was the logical consequence of the previous three years' working arrangements. Arnold preferred to teach the youths; for three years he had been doing nothing else but that. In respect of the teaching, therefore, the

partnership had existed in name only since 1821. The formal termination of the arrangement merely acknowledged the reality of this situation.

Considered in terms of numbers, the school was undoubtedly a success. Wymer says £210 p.a. was a "high fee" and that Arnold attracted pupils despite it, to the extent that even the sons of friends and relatives could not be accommodated.³⁰⁰ Bamford, however, thinks that "this was not a princely sum".³⁰¹ From the evidence of the letters, there is no doubt that the school was well able to attract pupils. Analysis shows that apart from a low point in 1825, when only four pupils were in residence (L.168), Arnold's preferred limit of seven was easily sustained.³⁰² In fact from August 1825, a waiting list was maintained on the basis of date of application.³⁰³ Nor were his boarders the sons of wealthy parents, for Arnold's principal reason for not increasing his fees, despite necessity, was that this would attract the sons of the rich, a class he was determined to keep out as he considered them virtually impossible to "sophronize".³⁰⁴ This point alone suggests that his fees were not unreasonably high, since he easily attracted pupils of the class he wished to instruct. There is, however, no doubt that his finances were constantly stretched. Prosaic as it may seem, this lack of funds was to become the main reason for his going from Laleham to Rugby. For as will be shown, the decision was largely a matter of acquiring more money.

Arnold's precarious financial position is a theme which pervades the correspondence throughout the Laleham period and may be examined with two related topics: the various posts for which he considered applying, and the literary activities in which he engaged. The unpublished letters provide new biographical information on both of these subjects.

A general idea of his financial situation can be constructed from the letters of the period. Arnold had no private capital.³⁰⁵ His principal source of funds was derived from the school: therefore his gross income from fees during the years 1819 to 1827 averaged £1470 p.a.. From this figure had to be deducted the costs incurred in feeding and lodging his pupils; the payment of a lease on two houses, his own (which in 1827 was renewed at £100 p.a.) and the one in which his more or less dependent mother, aunt, and invalid sister lived; the repayment of a £1000 loan incurring interest at 5% p.a., which was finally discharged in 1828;³⁰⁶ and the daily expenses of living in a large home with its establishment of servants etc. and a rapidly increasing family. In addition to all this was the financing of his custom of touring, either at home or abroad, in almost every vacation. From the outset he was in debt: both when he went into partnership with Buckland and when he entered into marriage with Mary Penrose,³⁰⁷ who brought no money with her (£.100). He needed to supplement the income he derived from school fees in any way he could, so it is not surprising to find his writing in November 1819 that he must add to his income "by every possible means" (£.95). He decided that one solution was to engaged in paid literary work.

Two years had passed since his last known writing for the press, and he took up his pen again now from necessity. Naturally he undertook work which was congenial to him, but the unpublished correspondence shows that he turned to writing largely as a means of earning money, a motive which the biographies do not notice.³⁰⁸ How far he succeeded in his intention will emerge from a comprehensive survey of his literary activities at this period, which were, in some respects, more extensive than has hitherto been supposed.

His first idea, in December 1819 (£.95), was to write an article on the

French Revolution; he hoped to place this with the British Review. As was his custom, he first consulted his friend Coleridge, who seems to have instantly advised against it (L.96). Despite Arnold's assurance that he would write "without the slightest party feeling" (L.95), Coleridge was probably alarmed by the emotive nature of the subject matter and doubted Arnold's capacity to remain impartial. In this he had probably foreseen what the consequences of a controversial article might be; not only for Arnold as an individual, but also for the school and the new partnership. Whatever the reason, nothing more is heard of the proposed article.³⁰⁹ Arnold was left rather dismayed by this and, more importantly, "poorer than poor", to the extent that he could not even find £18 to pay a bill (L.98).

In February 1820, he was emphasising his need to find "ready money" and asked Coleridge's advice on three projects (L.99). The first of these he calls "the Chrysostom scheme", apparently a joint production he and Coleridge had discussed in the past and whose appeal to the booksellers Arnold now queried. It is known from The Life³¹⁰ that Arnold had analysed Chrysostom's Homilies in 1818, although the MS. does not appear to have survived. Perhaps this scheme was a development of that work. The second project was to write elementary school histories of Greece and Rome, an idea that came directly from his teaching experience, which made him "daily lament the excessive follies of the school histories" in common use.³¹¹ His third notion was to write "a brief and popular sketch of Ecclesiastical History, chiefly for the use of the Universities". He believed that a work of two octavo volumes written in a popular style would meet a need and sell well.³¹² Although he began preparing the classical and ecclesiastical histories, none of these schemes came to fruition. "The Chrysostom scheme" and the "Ecclesiastical History" are not mentioned again in the letters.³¹³ The Grecian history was progressing,

albeit slowly, in October 1822 (L.133), but appears to have been given up soon after under pressure of other work. And the Roman history was left incomplete as his attention turned towards a full-scale history.³¹⁴ So as a means of alleviating his financial difficulties, none of these schemes was a success.

His marriage and school business seem to have kept him occupied until the Autumn of 1820, when he announced to Coleridge (L.108) that he was contemplating an article for the Quarterly Review on "Poppo's Observations on Thucydides".³¹⁵ Arnold began to send drafts of the article to Coleridge, who had connections with Gifford, the editor of the Quarterly. The result of this arrangement was that he spent the next fifteen months writing and rewriting the review in response to Coleridge's criticisms.³¹⁶ By January 1822 Arnold, who was now exasperated with the affair, submitted what he declared would be his last draft (L.125). Since nothing more is heard of this article in the correspondence, and since it was not published,³¹⁷ the assumption must be that the last version did not suit either.³¹⁸

Not only was there a potentially useful link for Arnold between Coleridge and Gifford, but Gifford was also familiar with Whateley, and it was through him that Arnold was indirectly approached in April 1821 to write a review of "Cramer's book on the passage of the Alps"³¹⁹ (L.115). Arnold's response was enthusiastic and he said he would write the article if time allowed. Gifford expressed the hope that he would become a regular contributor to the Quarterly (L.116). But despite these encouraging signs, nothing more is heard of the review. Whether Arnold even wrote the article is now unknown; certainly it never appeared in the Quarterly Review.³²⁰

The letters reveal that he contemplated another review in 1821, that of a novel entitled "Valerius".³²¹ This was entirely his own idea, for he

wished to publicise the work through the medium of the Quarterly on account of the book's good principles and emphasis on the superiority of the Christian character (L.122). But as with the proposed Cramer review, the project does not seem to have been pursued.³²² The probable cause of any failure to write these articles was, that since May 1821, another literary venture had taken up most of his spare time, a venture which seemed certain to provide some additional income.

Stanley records that much of Arnold's leisure was spent on a lexicon of Thucydides,³²³ an edition of whose history was to form one of his later, successful ventures.³²⁴ Hitherto, it appears to have been unknown that he actually had a contract with J.Parker, the Oxford bookseller and publisher, to compile this lexicon (L.116), and that it was to be a "lexicon triglotton" (L.117). The progress of the work can be traced in the unpublished correspondence. Arnold enlisted the help of his friends in preparing an "index vocabulorum" (L.116) and by November 1821 he had reached what he considered would be the most interesting part, the conjunctions and prepositions (L.122). Then, after more than a year of hard work, the project was stopped. The explanation for this lies in L.130, written in August 1822, following a meeting he had had with Parker. It appears that a rival lexicon, in which Parker had a share, was ready for publication and that Parker's associates were anxious to publish. Having explained this to Arnold, Parker then asked him to undertake the invidious task of pronouncing on his rival's lexicon's merits.³²⁵ Arnold thought the work sound and, perhaps with little option, abandoned the publication of his own.³²⁶ By holding an interest in both projects, Parker was in a strong position; but since his interest was a joint one with other London booksellers, he may have had little option in presenting Arnold with a fait accompli. Whether Arnold received

recompense for the work he had done is not known; but given the circumstances and the fact that he continued his association with Parker, he probably received some remuneration for his labour. For a time it seems he hoped that his own lexicon might accompany his edition of Thucydides,³²⁷ also published by Parker, but this hope was not fulfilled. He did eventually complete the lexicon, but the work remained unpublished.

So despite good intentions and hard work, the evidence suggests that with the possible exception of a fee for the lexicon, his scheme to supplement his income by writing was proving a failure. In fact the first proposition that we know produced a fee did not occur until May 1822, when he negotiated with the editor of the Encyclopaedia Metropolitana to write a series of articles on Roman History (L.129), the first of which he commenced writing in August of that year³²⁸ (L.130). Arnold took the work because it was congenial and he felt capable of doing it justice, but as he himself says, the main reason was the "amor nummi in a man who is a husband and a father and who has nothing ... but what his own wits can earn" (L.129). In April 1823, L.138 records the rate at which he was being paid for these articles as seven guineas a sheet. But this addition to his income had little immediate effect on his finances, which were now so straitened that in the same letter he even doubted whether he could afford a visit to his relatives at Fledborough.³²⁹

The period from October 1823 to March 1824 was probably the most difficult Arnold experienced at Laleham. The activities of a particularly bad set of pupils created such distress that his health gave way.³³⁰ Because of these problems he seems to have attempted nothing other than his articles for the Encyclopaedia, and he even considered abandoning those owing to the pressure he was under (L.144, L.145). By the Spring of 1824 the situation had grown calmer, but the letters do not indicate that there

was any addition to his income through writing activities. They do, however, record the beginning of one important literary work, his negotiation of a contract with J.Mawman, the London bookseller and publisher, who was also the publisher of the Encyclopaedia Metropolitana, for a full-scale history of Rome based largely upon the articles Arnold had already written for the Encyclopaedia (L.153).

The work which Arnold originally envisaged was one of two quarto volumes tracing the history from the earliest times to the death of Marcus Aurelius, "embracing thus the whole early history of Christianity". For this, Mawman offered him 500 guineas a volume.³³¹ The idea had been maturing for some time, since in L.154 he remarks that Mawman's offer "last year" (i.e. 1823) had been 300 guineas.³³² Arnold also wished to make an abridgement of the history for the use of schools,³³³ a work for which he hoped to negotiate a separate contract. His intention was to have the first volume published by the end of 1824 to forestall rivals (L.155) and to provide a welcome boost to his income; but once he began to read Niebuhr's Roman History,³³⁴ he realised the need for much greater research³³⁵ than that which had gone into his articles for the Encyclopaedia Metropolitana. Some idea of the scale of this extra work may be gauged from the fact that the first volume of his Roman History did not actually appear until 1838.³³⁶ Nevertheless, this period marks the start of the project.

The letters also reveal the existence of a pamphlet written by Arnold, a work apparently unknown to his biographers. In March 1824 he was trying to rally support among his friends to oppose a motion which was to come before Convocation at Oxford. If carried, it would have resulted in the substitution of four Books of Euclid for the study of Logic in the examination system (L.150). As part of his opposition to that proposal,

Arnold wrote a "handbill", which he had printed and circulated (L.151). This "handbill" - in fact it is an anonymous four-page pamphlet - should be added to the bibliography of his printed work.³³⁷

From the point of view of his finances, the year 1824 was no better than its predecessors. Although he had begun working on his Roman History, this was just another project for which payment was deferred until a future date. His articles for the Encyclopaedia remained his only source of income from literary work. By early 1825 the situation had deteriorated even further, when the lack of additional income was compounded by a reduction in the number of pupils in residence to four. Arnold acknowledged the effect that this hazard of his occupation would have on his finances and could only console himself by reflecting on the extra time this would give him for his Roman History work (L.168). However, given our knowledge of his overall situation and the hopes he had placed in finding additional income through paid articles, his financial position in February 1825 must have been extremely worrying. It was, therefore, perhaps more than coincidence that Coleridge, who was then acting as temporary editor of the Quarterly Review,³³⁸ immediately commissioned him to write an article on contemporary German historians' views of early Roman history.³³⁹

A note of caution concerning the authorship of this article must be sounded. In the biographies it is commonly attributed to Arnold, and indeed he did write most of it; but not all. To a diligent reader of The Life, this information would not be new, for L.174, which is partly reproduced there, ends with the sentence that his article "was slightly altered by Coleridge here and there, so that I am not quite responsible for all of it.". No more details are given, so the question is to what extent did Coleridge alter Arnold's draft; how much is meant by "altered ... here and there,"? Some information is revealed in the unpublished

letters L.168, L.169 and L.173.

The works of three German historians: Niebuhr, Wachsmuth, and Creuzer stand at the head of the article in the Quarterly, although the text is chiefly concerned with Niebuhr's History of Rome. In L.168 (5 February 1825) Arnold had asked Coleridge:

"Do you mean to have a review of Niebuhr and Wachsmuth, and what progress have you made towards filling your sixteen sheets?".

It was probably in response to this letter, the same one in which he mentions his shortage of money, that Coleridge offered him the work; for five days later, Arnold wrote:

"I will try an article on Niebuhr and Wachsmuth, who is a more recent writer and well deserves to be joined with Niebuhr, and if I induce anyone to read them who would not otherwise have heard of them, I shall do a good deed" (L.169).

Nevertheless, the implication of L.168 is that Coleridge probably intended to write the article himself, and he may have handed the commission to Arnold as a gesture to a friend in need. It will be noted that Arnold only mentions writing on Niebuhr and Wachsmuth, whose works were first published in 1811-1812 and 1819 respectively;³⁴⁰ which prompts the question of whether he wrote that portion of the article relating to Creuzer.

The article is concerned with the German editions of the authors' works. The letters show that Arnold began to learn the German language in the summer of 1824 (L.159), initially on his own but later under the guidance of a tutor. His progress was so rapid that by September 1824 he was reading Niebuhr and "some other very valuable German books ... preparatory to my Roman History." (L.161). From their subject-matter,

it is likely that Wachsmuth and Creuzer³⁴¹ were amongst these, although Arnold does not mention Creuzer, whose work only appeared in 1824, by name in the correspondence. In the article itself, Creuzer's work receives no critical comment; indeed, it is barely mentioned,³⁴² which may suggest that the reviewer had not had long to peruse it. The references are so brief that their authorship cannot be determined on the basis of style. But since they harmonise with the text that surrounds them, and since Creuzer's work would be of interest to Arnold, there is no especial reason to think that they were not written by him. The letters, however, do reveal that one portion of the article was certainly not written by Arnold.

In the unpublished portion of L.173, written in August 1825, two months after the article appeared, Arnold told Coleridge that:

"your note about the Eton Grammar in my article has got me into a great scrape as it is called a piece of personal irony against the Fellows of Eton".

This refers to the footnote on page ninety of the review, which castigates the Eton Greek Grammar by name and suggests that the Fellows should "do something for its improvement.". The irony lay in the fact that most of the Fellows were not competent to undertake such a task. That Arnold was anxious not to incur hostility at Eton is explained by the fact that he was contemplating an article on Public School education³⁴³ and would not wish to give the authorities cause to view unfavourably any comments he might subsequently make on the system pursued both there and at the other Public Schools. There was also the possibility that Buckland might have been harmed by association. For in L.198 (1826) Arnold remarked that one of the reasons for Buckland's success was that "they recommend him so strongly at Eton". It is clear, therefore, from the evidence of L.173 that this footnote at least was not the work of Arnold; it was

written by Coleridge.

There are no more clues in the unpublished correspondence to the extent of Coleridge's involvement in the article. If we analyse the work, there is no part of it which obviously could not have been written by Arnold. Its content accords with his well-attested interests,³⁴⁴ and its style is uniform. In fact the only statement which calls for notice lies in the introductory paragraph where, in speaking of the three writers, the reviewer says:

"Yet we are not aware that they have been so much as noticed in this country, except by ourselves in a former number of this journal".

This is a reference to an article which appeared in volume twenty-seven of the Quarterly Review, in 1822.³⁴⁵ Since that article referred primarily to Niebuhr and Wachsmuth, it could not have been written by Arnold, who could not read these historians, or any other German book, until 1824. But equally it means that the word "ourselves" quoted above cannot be taken literally to mean "me", i.e. "Arnold". It either refers to Coleridge, which may suggest that he wrote the introductory paragraph, or, more probably, the word is simply being used "editorially".

In conclusion all that can be said of this investigation is that apart from the footnote on page ninety, of whose authorship the correspondence now provides certain knowledge, the question of the extent of Coleridge's involvement in the text must, as far as the letters are concerned, remain conjectural. If this footnote was the only portion of the article not written by Arnold, it does seem strange that he did not refer to it specifically in L.174 instead of using the more general expression, "altered ... here and there". Of course "here and there" might just refer to minor editorial corrections of the MS, where it not for the fact

that the unacknowledged interpolation of a lengthy and potentially controversial note is more than a mere minor correction of the text. Nevertheless, the subject-matter of the review is such that there is no reason to doubt that most, if not all, of it was written by Arnold.

As mentioned previously, Arnold was particularly concerned not to incur hostility at Eton because it might have jeopardised another article which he was engaged upon. Perhaps influenced by Coleridge's connection with the Quarterly,³⁴⁶ he wrote a long - but uncommissioned - article on the current state of education in the Public Schools and universities,³⁴⁷ the existence of which has remained apparently unknown to his biographers.³⁴⁸ It is significant because it provides a detailed exposition of his ideas, particularly with regard to teaching the classics, before his career at Rugby School.

He began the article in December 1825 (L.179) and was in direct communication with Lockhart, the new editor of the Quarterly, about its contents (L.180); but soon the familiar cycle of returns for amendment repeated itself, often with considerable delays on Lockhart's part (L.186, L.195). Eventually, in 1827, the matter ended in acrimony with Arnold demanding the return of his MS and declaring that he would have no more to do with Lockhart (L.212, L.218). And in fact, he never wrote for the Quarterly again. The letters tend to support Arnold's belief that he had been badly treated, in that Lockhart does seem to have allowed him to think that the article would be published. A possible explanation for Lockhart's hesitation and eventual refusal may lie in the fact that much of Arnold's essay combined an attack on the low level of proficiency in classical studies attained by the vast majority of those who matriculated, with a critique of the traditional curriculum. Moreover he had particularised his arguments by giving a detailed exposition of the work

done in the highest forms at Eton, Winchester and Westminster. It may be that Lockhart feared the reaction such an article would provoke.

While these events were taking place, Arnold was successful in placing a review of his friend Whateley's, Letters on the Church in the Edinburgh Review of September 1826,³⁴⁹ the third and final literary project in this period which was actually printed and for which he probably received a fee. And no more can be learned from the extant correspondence of his literary activities. By the end of his time at Laleham, Arnold was concentrating exclusively on his edition of Thucydides, which he seems to have begun in 1826 (L.187) and his Roman History, for which he was exploring the new avenues of research revealed by his reading of Niebuhr.

From this examination of the literary work he undertook during the Laleham period, it will be seen that probably only three of the schemes on which he embarked produced immediate financial reward. So as a means of supplementing the income he derived from school fees, his intention of earning money by writing was a comparative failure. On the other hand, the research in which he engaged during these years resulted in the foundations being laid for his two major works of scholarship. His intention to write a complete Roman History had been preceded by the Encyclopaedia Metropolitana articles, which in turn, followed the research he had done for his uncompleted school history of Rome. Likewise, his edition of Thucydides had its origin in the unpublished Lexicon Thucydideum. These major works took several years to complete, but it can be argued that they originated in simple economic necessity; for they were, as the unpublished correspondence shows, the by-products of a largely unsuccessful attempt to create a second income based on paid literary work.

Another way for Arnold to have increased his income was to have sought a more remunerative position, which introduces a second theme from the letters of this period. Writing on this subject in The Life, Stanley says that while in residence at Laleham Arnold "had been urged, more than once, to stand for the Mastership at Winchester".³⁵⁰ The unpublished correspondence clarifies this comment and also provides information on his reasons for declining other situations³⁵¹ before his appointment to Rugby School.

In October 1819, shortly after commencing his partnership with Buckland, Arnold was urged by his friend, F.C. Blackstone, to apply for the Second Mastership at Winchester College. He declined this on the grounds that he was "ill-qualified",³⁵² would find it disagreeable, and had, in any case, only just begun his career at Laleham.³⁵³

Despite his need for additional income, the question of a change of employment does not next arise in the correspondence until February 1826 when, in L.185, a piece of what appears to be entirely new biographical information is given. This is that Whateley, who was Principal of St. Alban Hall, Oxford, had offered Arnold the post of Vice-Principal in succession to J.H. Newman, who had recently resigned after holding the position for a year.³⁵⁴ This was a post of some authority and responsibility, since the Vice-Principal was a combination of Dean, Tutor, and Bursar.³⁵⁵ The letters only reveal that Arnold thought hard and then declined:

"It was a great temptation both to Mary and myself;

but we found that it would not do" (L.185).

Since the salary attached to the position is not known, it is not possible to determine to what extent, if at all, it was a factor in his decision.³⁵⁶ The offer was certainly attractive in so far as it would

have allowed him to renew his acquaintance with Oxford and provided him with arguably more interesting work. Against this, it is possible that the purely administrative duties involved were not to his liking; and he was, of course, still in Deacon's orders. Added to which was the fact that Whateley had himself only been appointed Principal in 1825, so the chance of Arnold's succeeding him might have been long deferred.

Whatever the reasons, Arnold declined; but this was not because of a fixed determination to remain at Laleham, for in October of the same year, the question of an appointment at Winchester was reopened. The matter is dealt with in L.196 and L.197, the latter being the more convenient source.

Arnold had heard that the Second Mastership at Winchester, the position for which he had been urged to apply in 1819, might become vacant and he wished to establish precisely what would be required of a candidate. Not surprisingly he was particularly concerned with the financial aspect and required to know whether "the sum total of the emoluments including the advantage of a house rent free, etc, was equal to about £1000 a year" (L.197). But he was by no means settled in his own mind; for,

"my inclinations lead me to continue as I am, though I should like too to be Master of Winchester,³⁵⁷ if there were no insurmountable impediments in the way." (L.197).

The letters suggest that there were two problems for Arnold. Firstly, as he acknowledges, that he was likely to incur extra expense because he would have to do more entertaining and live in a grander style. Secondly, and more importantly, although he would only accept the Second Mastership if there was the prospect of succeeding to the Mastership, such a progression would have meant having to take a Doctor of Divinity's degree, "which I would not do".³⁵⁸ This, of course, refers to the previously

discussed problem of subscribing the Articles, and is the first example of how his "doubts" seriously handicapped his ability to obtain advancement. That he was prepared to contemplate a move was almost certainly related to the financial pressures by which he was becoming increasingly beset. The birth of his fifth child was imminently expected, and his enquiry about the salary at Winchester virtually coincided with an application for a reduction in his rent at Laleham (L.197).

There is, however, no doubt about his motive for approaching Blackstone in March 1827 (L.214). For in that letter he believes the Mastership itself will fall vacant, in which event "I ought in justice to my children to try what I can do about it". In other words, the expenses of a large and increasing family, whose education would soon become a factor, were such that they could not be supported indefinitely by his present occupation. The old problem of ordination remained, but now he suggests that a solution might be found by laying his difficulties before a Bishop.³⁶⁰ But since this particular vacancy did not arise, and Arnold felt unable to approach a Bishop hypothetically, the problem of subscription remained unresolved. From this point, however, the unpublished letters clearly reveal that the economic factor became the dominant motive in his seeking other posts.

By July 1827 his wife was pregnant with their sixth child, so the necessity of increasing his income had become even more acute. His preferred solution would have included his remaining at Laleham:

"I know that I should personally be much best pleased to remain as I am, but I think that I ought to try to get a situation ... if I can" (L.214);

unfortunately, his options were limited. Although the number of pupils he had in residence had soon recovered from its low-point of four in

February 1825 (L.168) to his preferred maximum of seven, and he had, as a favour, increased the number of pupils he was instructing to eight; this proved more than he could conveniently manage (L.219). Therefore additions to the number of pupils under tuition was no remedy; and, as noticed earlier, he would not increase the level of his fees. He had given up all hope of the Quarterly Review publishing his article on education (and perhaps anything else), and the other literary projects on which he was engaged were not likely to provide an immediate source of income. Finally, Arnold continued to be handicapped by the unresolved problem of his ordination.

Given these circumstances and that he was "really desirous to add ... to my income" (L.229), his application for the post of Professor of History at the London University was a convenient solution. The position was non-residential, so Arnold could have remained at Laleham and travelled up to London to deliver the one or two lectures a week which were necessary (L.229). And although he intended to ensure that his lectures would be Christian (L.229), the new university was non-denominational. He applied for this situation in late October 1827, just after his first refusal to stand for Rugby.³⁶¹ He was in a strong position, for his candidature was being actively promoted by the influential William Tooke, whose sons Arnold was educating at Laleham. Tooke was a member of the University Council and its Treasurer, he was a powerful ally. It is likely that Arnold's regretful withdrawal - in view "of the Council's favourable dispositions towards me" (L.234) - reflects the strength of his candidacy.

As well as bringing to light the connection with William Tooke, the unpublished letters also clarify a point of detail regarding the chronology of his interest in this vacancy and the Rugby School post.

They show clearly that Arnold withdrew his application for the Professorship before a vote was taken on the post and after he received news of his appointment at Rugby.

L.228 contains the first reference to the vacancy at Rugby and was Arnold's response to his "Oxford friends", primarily Hawkins and Whateley (L.228, L.229), who were urging him to stand. In this letter he stated his two principal reasons for his reluctance to put forward his name. As previously noted,³⁶² Stanley, in his partial reproduction of this letter, edited the text in such a way that only one of these reasons - that concerning Arnold's doubts over the Trustees' willingness to give him a free hand - was disclosed to readers of The Life. The second reason, that which takes up most of the letter, concerns his unwillingness to become ordained if that meant subscribing the Articles, a scruple which he judged would disbar him from the Headmastership. The information he subsequently received on both these points confirmed his doubts, and on 2 November 1827 (L.229) he gave up all thoughts of Rugby and chose to pursue the London University Professorship. Between the second and the twentieth of November (L.230), the situation changed dramatically. Arnold learned that the information he had previously received about Rugby was erroneous and, on 28 November, two days before the close of applications,³⁶³ he decided to stand for Rugby School. On 18 December he was informed of his success, and on that same day relinquished his interest in the Professorship (L.234).

It has been necessary to establish this chronology because Bamford has the London University matter settled before Arnold's attempt for the vacancy at Rugby School. He also says that his application for the Professorship did not meet with success: "He applied for a Professorship ... but without luck",³⁶⁴ a comment which is equivocal. The

correspondence has shown that Arnold was a strong candidate for the Professorship, who resigned his interest in that post before the election took place; and that the reason for his withdrawal was that he had accepted the Headmastership of Rugby School.

Although Arnold's financial problems were largely resolved by this success, it must not be thought that he had compromised on the question of ordination by sacrificing his conscience to economic necessity. For he was appointed to the Headmastership of Rugby School while still in Deacon's orders (and without an interview). To his friends at least, he had, it is true, expressed a willingness to lay the question of his doubts before a Bishop (L.228); but this was a step he did not actually take until 1828, when he discussed them with the Bishop of London. Even then, his reason for becoming ordained to the Priesthood was simply that:

"I wished to administer the Sacrament in the chapel at Rugby, and because, as I shall have in a manner the oversight of the chaplain, I thought it would be scarce seemly for me as a Deacon, to interfere with a Priest;".³⁶⁵

Throughout this period the correspondence shows clearly that his decision to leave Laleham was taken purely upon economic grounds, and with great reluctance. Even at the time of applying for the Rugby post he had written:

"If I consulted my own inclinations, I should greatly prefer Laleham and the Professorship to a removal to Rugby." (L.230).³⁶⁶

It is a point worth emphasising that the unpublished letters give no support to the notion that he left Laleham because he was dissatisfied

with his occupation, or that he was motivated by visions of extended influence. If the financial situation had been different, he would have preferred to remain there. Although Wymer's account takes some notice of this - though his notion that Arnold might have found a solution to his problems by increasing the number of his pupils is wrong³⁶⁷ - it is fair to say that in the numerous assessments of Arnold's career, insufficient prominence has been given to the economic motive which lay behind his application for the post at Rugby School.

In concluding the subject of those other situations which attracted him at this period, it can be said that the unpublished correspondence has proved to be a valuable source of information. It has clarified Stanley's remark that Arnold was "urged, more than once, to stand for the Mastership at Winchester", to the extent that it has revealed three occasions on which he was considering a position at that school. On only one of these, the first (October 1819), was he urged to stand for an actual vacancy, and that was for the Second Mastership. On the second occasion (October 1826), he showed cautious interest in a possible vacancy, again the Second Mastership. The final occasion (March 1827) was also for a possible vacancy, this time the Mastership. The letters have also revealed the probably new information that he was offered the Vice-Principalship of St. Alban Hall in 1826. Finally they have given detailed information of his candidature for the London University Professorship and the chronology of that event in relation to his application for the post at Rugby School.

NOTES

1. See Appendix One
2. 'Dr. Arnold as a Winchester Boy.', Theology, Vol. XXIV (London, June 1932), pp. 9-18 and Vol. XXV (July 1932), pp. 303-311. The eight letters are L.19-L.23 and L.26-L.28 in Appendix One
3. Dr. Arnold As A Winchester Boy, Letters from College 1807-1810 (Winchester 1932). A slim booklet containing the letters from Theology, ibid., plus L.29-L.32 and L.34 in Appendix One. Copies of the booklet are in The Fellows' Library, Winchester College.
4. Stanley, op.cit., p.4, quotes from the letter of 4 March 1809 and also shows that he had read the Winchester letters. On p.2 he refers to "The tone and style of his early letters".
5. Whitridge, op.cit., pp.6-7, 9-14. They are taken from the following letters: p.6 and p.12, letter dated 29 March 1809 (L.26); p.9 letter dated 30 September 1810 (L.33); p.13 letter dated 16 June 1808 (L.22).
6. Wymer, op.cit., pp.20-25 passim. Two other biographers, Rose Selfe and Emma Worboise, also had access to some of the letters, but they follow Stanley in their conclusions and generally add little to his account.

7. Wymer, op.cit., pp.23-5.
8. Neither in his biography nor in his later study, Thomas Arnold on Education, does Bamford indicate that he has read the extant schoolboy correspondence.
9. Bamford, op.cit., p.3.
10. Whitridge, op.cit., p.6.
11. An awareness of the mutability of human affairs came to Thomas at an early age, for his father's death was a memory that remained with him throughout his life. In 1835 he recalled the circumstances to his young son William, even remembering the text of the sermon his father had asked him to read the day before his death: "Boast not thyself of tomorrow for thou knowest not what a day may bring forth ... and that very next day ... my dear Papa died."
Brotherton Library MSS, Mrs Arnold's Journals, 9 December 1835.
12. See Wymer, op.cit., pp.11-14, for a summary of their ancestry.
13. "'I don't suppose we shall ever have enough money to go round,'" Thomas's mother had written in 1795, ibid., p.11. When her husband died she was left to support five children and maintain a substantial farm. As Wymer says, the prospect of having to sell the family home was very real, ibid., p.18. A full account of Thomas's parents can be read in Rear-Admiral D. Arnold-Forster's, At War with the Smugglers (London, 1936).

14. Wymer, op.cit., p.18.
15. The Free Grammar School, Newport whose terms were £28 p.a. for boarders. N.Carlisle, A Concise Description of the Endowed Grammar Schools in England and Wales (London, 1818); Vol.2, pp.444-5.
This figure may be compared with Warminster's terms in 1807 of £51.17s.0d., p.a. (L.14). Although the Warminster figure may include a sum for extra subjects, the disparity would still be great.
16. Geography, for example. See L.17.
17. As the school has no attendance records for these years, and since Wymer gives no authority for the numbers he uses, op.cit., p.25, I incline to the view that they are based upon speculation. The researches of Mr. R.S. Hope, F.R.H.S., the Archivist of Warminster School, led him to believe that the school at this period may have had in excess of fifty pupils, the majority of whom were boarders. Certainly the reference in L.14 to the school as, "the world in miniature (with) different parties and cabals," suggests a sizeable establishment.
Unless otherwise attributed, all references to Warminster School are derived from my own private correspondence, extending over ten years, with Mr. R.S. Hope, Governor and Honorary Archivist of the school, and from a privately published history of the school which he compiled for the School Parents' Association. I am greatly indebted to Mr. Hope for much information.
18. For example, George Evelyn came from Wotton in Surrey, Charles

Ormerod from Essex (L.20). And the letters reveal a strong Isle of Wight connection: the Ogländers, the Bowdlers (L.3) and the Hattons (L.14).

19. See N. Perrin, Dr. Bowdler's Legacy (London, 1970).
20. For the quotation, and some evidence of his distrust of schoolboys, see W.R.W. Stephens, Memoir of Lord Hatherley (London, 1883), vol.1, pp.11-14. Evidence for Gabell's academic talents and his disciplinarianism can be found in many of the histories of Winchester. See, for example, H.G. Adams, Wykehamica (London, 1870), pp.174-182, who states that "as a teacher, if he had any equal, at least he had no superior." ibid., p.174, and J. D'E. Firth, Winchester College (Winchester, 1949), p.106.
21. Salisbury Journal, 11 January 1790.
22. ibid., December 1789. L.18 reveals that Arnold attended a course of astronomical lectures. Given his interests, Griffith had probably arranged for the boys to attend.
23. Wymer, op.cit., pp.22-23.
24. Bamford, op.cit., p.3, and his Thomas Arnold on Education, p.1. Unfortunately, he provides no direct evidence for these assertions.
25. Written when Thomas was nearly eleven and soon to enter his last

year at Warminster.

26. i.e. its modern connotation: Wymer, op.cit., p.23. For the traditional definition: "pertaining to sport, jocular, witty, humorous", see A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles (Oxford, 1908). Arnold has used the word to describe a particular genre of literature. Whitridge's view op.cit., p.6, that Arnold thoroughly enjoyed such works, is undoubtedly the correct one. See also L.36 where he refers to "Baron Munchausen", whom he probably read for pleasure at Winchester.

27. E.L. Williamson, Jr., The Liberalism of Thomas Arnold University of Alabama Press, 1964), p.26.

28. D. Newsome, Godliness and Good Learning (London, 1961) pp.6-8, 74-82. Arnold's alleged "precocity" has to be viewed in the light of his family background. For example, note 11 (above) shows that he was being asked to read sermons aloud at the age of five.

29. Stanley, op.cit., p.4 mentions the impression Priestley had made upon Arnold.

30. Whitridge, op.cit., p.12, tends to confine his interest in history to his Winchester days; but the correspondence clearly shows this was part of his life at Warminster.

31. Williamson, op.cit., p.26. See L.9. I can trace no subsequent reference to this work in any of Arnold's later writings.

32. Wymer calls it "an unusually well-equipped library"; op.cit., p.23. However, Arnold later described the library thus: "although not larger than might be contained in the drawing-room book case", (my emphasis). Brotherton Library MSS, Mrs Arnold's Journals, February 26, 1826.
33. Wym er and Bamford use some particularly emotive words: "prig, oddity, eccentric". See notes 7 and 9 above.
34. "I like all the great boys." (L.2). "Oglander is as kind to me as ever and so is Fletcher." (L.3).
35. "We went upon the Down to play cricket when I was much amused." (L.6). "I play cricket, fives or something else all day." (L.12).
36. Bamford, in his biography of Arnold, op.cit., p.3, presumably following Wymer, op.cit., p.24. Williamson, op.cit., p.27, dates his decision to become a minister to the end of his Winchester days. However, this is the first recorded mention of his intent.
37. See Wymer, op.cit., p.20. Arnold seems to have enjoyed good relations with all the masters. See for example L.16: "Messrs. Lawes, Griffith and Philpot are all very civil to me."
38. On three of the nine occasions in the extant letters on which he mentions being in Lawes's company, another boy was with them.
39. For this remark and other instances of his violent behaviour, one

of which led to his prosecution for cruelty, see A.R. Stedman,
A History of Marlborough Grammar School (Devizes, 1945), pp.53-5.

40. ibid., Ch.6, passim.
41. Letter from G. Evelyn to Rev. J.T. Lawes, dated 27 December (1817),
in the Marlborough Grammar School archives.
42. See H.G. Adams, op.cit., pp.173-90 passim, also Roger Custance,
Winchester College Sixth-Centenary Essays (Oxford, 1982), pp.369-73
passim.
43. See Wymer, op.cit., p.20. Gabell, for example, would not allow
tea-drinking, Griffith would; but not, as Wymer erroneously
supposes, as a substitute for lessons; ibid., p.23.
44. J.D'E Firth, op.cit., p.117.
45. Wymer, op.cit., p.22.
46. There is nothing in the letters to suggest that Thomas himself
felt he had any special privileges. See for example L.14, where
he talks of the struggles for popularity which existed among the
boys; and in L.368, the "hard knocks" he mentions receiving when
he was at Warminster may well have included magisterial beatings.
47. Wymer, op.cit., p.25.
48. M. Trevor, The Arnolds (London, 1973), p.16.

49. Bamford, op.cit., p.3.
50. See L.2. He was placed in "Delectus", the Second Form. The First Form, in which Arnold's aunt (and instructress) thought he would be placed, was probably for boys who knew little or none of the Latin declensions and conjugations, for he refers to them as "the grammar boys". The Latin lines which Arnold quotes in L.2 as the class-work for the Second Form are taken from the early pages of an elementary text-book designed to give a thorough grounding in Latin accidence and easy syntax: R. Valpy, Delectus Sententiarum et Historiarum ad usum tironum accommodatus (London, 1800), Lesson 7.
51. L.3. Thomas concludes L.4 thus: "Have you yet put the seeds in my little one (garden) at home. This is such a stupid place that I can tell you no more news and therefore must conclude and believe me to be ...". Wymer interprets "such a stupid place" as evidence of his bad relations with the other boys - yet there is nothing to suggest this from the context. In fact, it may well be evidence of his lack of progress in class.
52. L.368. At Warminster, the forms were known colloquially by the text-book in use, hence "Phaedrus".
53. The classical authors he mentions construing at Warminster are as follows, although some would only be read in extract:

	<u>Date</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Author and Work</u>
<u>L. 2:</u>	Sept 1803	8	Valpy: Latin Delectus.
<u>L. 3:</u>	Feb 1804	8	Phaedrus: Fabulae.
<u>L.10:</u>	Mar 1806	10	Homer: Odyssey; Caesar: Commentaries.
<u>L.11:</u>	May 1806	10	Horace; Odes. ("I have done seven Odes.")
<u>L.12:</u>	Sept 1806	11	Lucian: Dialogues.
<u>L.16:</u>	Mar 1807	11	Xenophon: Cyropaedia.
<u>L.17:</u>	Apr 1807	11	Polyaenus: Stratagems.
<u>L.18:</u>	June 1807	11	The half-year's work (i.e. Jan-June): Homer: Iliad, 3 books; Horace: Odes, 1 book, Epistles: 1 book; Virgil: 5 books; Parts of Sallust, Aelian, Xenophon, Polyaenus, "and others".

54. Stanley, op.cit., p.3. For general information see M.L. Clarke, Classical Education in Britain 1500-1900 (Cambridge, 1959), Chs.4 and 6.
55. See L.11 and Wymer, op.cit., p.23. Thomas's sentiments are not unlike those found in such school-books as J. Trapp, Lectures on Poetry (London, 1742), a book the Winchester scholars used to abridge: see Whitridge, op.cit., p.7; or N. Tindal, A Guide to Classical Learning; or Polymetis Abridged (London, 1777), pp.1X-X.
56. See, for example, L.10, L.11.
57. In L.14 he writes that "politics is stale" and complains that he has no new author to criticise.
58. Stanley, op.cit., p.3. On the basis of L.18, in which he gives a minute account of an astronomical lecture he has attended, we might

also add that his descriptive powers were well-developed.

59. Wymer's account, op.cit., p.27, is not strictly accurate, for a piece of Latin of the boy's choosing, and for which he had naturally been coached, had to be construed. However, this was a mere formality for the election roll had already been drawn up. See H.C. Adams, op.cit., p.51; W. Tuckwell, The Ancient Ways (London, 1893), p.8, who calls the election "a farce". Among other things, election was based upon residential qualification and sponsorship, both of which Arnold possessed through his residence in the Isle of Wight and Warminster School's magisterial connection with Winchester College. See Liber Scholasticus (London, 1829), pp.108-110. The previous three Headmasters of Warminster had been Wykehamists and two of them, G.I. Huntingford and H.D. Gabell, later returned to Winchester as Warden and Headmaster respectively. It may be as well to note that although Wymer, op.cit., p.25, Bamford, op.cit., p.3, and M. Trevor, op.cit., p.16, all state that Arnold's Headmaster J.C. Griffith was a Wykehamist, this is not so. Griffith entered Wadham College, Oxford in 1779; the place of his early education is unknown but it is certain that Winchester College has no record of him. Arnold was placed twelfth out of thirty on the Winchester Roll. See the Winchester College magazine, The Wykehamist, June 1895, and Wymer, op.cit., p.27.

60. The letters provide no factual evidence to support the remarks made by Bamford on this matter, nor can I discover any other source for them. If this is speculation based on Wymer's account of Arnold and Warminster, it is, to say the least, intemperate.

61. Wymer, op.cit., p.25.
62. In 1807 the Wærminster fees were £51.17s.0d. p.a. (including any extras), see L.14. From N. Carlisle, op.cit., whose book was published in 1818, the cost of educating a Scholar (Colleger) at Winchester can be calculated at about £34 p.a., ibid., vol.2, p.462; for Commoners, about £64 p.a., ibid., vol.2, pp.467-8.
63. See note 13 above, to which Thomas's explanation of excessive expenditure in L.11 might be adduced as further evidence.
64. See H.C. Adams, op.cit., p.360.
65. See notes 2 and 3 above. The portion of a letter was published by Whitridge, op.cit., pp.9-12.
66. ibid., preface. The fact that Whitridge had reproduced it, albeit partially, might itself be sufficient reason for its exclusion from Selwyn's booklet.
67. ibid., p.12.
68. See Stanley, op.cit., pp.93-7, *passim*.
69. Out of 201 boys in the school, he had been placed 130th. See The Wykehamist, June 1895.

70. L.20
71. In L.20, for example, he requests a book to occupy the "great deal of spare time".
72. Wymer, op.cit., p.31.
73. ibid., p.30.
74. See L.23.
75. See L.23.
76. The Wykehamist, July 1895. Compare this with Bamford's opening remark on this period: "His career at the new school was not distinguished either."; op.cit., p.3.
77. Wymer, op.cit., p.34, says that Arnold was "astonished" by this, although there is no evidence for it in L.23, the only source.
78. The Wykehamist, July 1895. Of the week devoted to examinations, Thomas says, "I shall get up every morning at 3 o'clock and learn all day ... I shall say ... 3000 lines of Homer," (L.23). Commentators have tended to quote this in awe (as well they might, see Whitridge, op.cit., p.7, and Williamson, op.cit., p.26, for example), but the circumstances in which Thomas was placed before the examinations might well have had a bearing on the efforts he had to make.

79. Whitridge, op.cit., p.8.
80. Stanley, op.cit., p.2.
81. The Wykehamist, July 1895. Arnold seems not to have reached the Sixth Form until September 1810.
82. L.20, L.23, and L.26.
83. Cyril Lipscomb (1795-1815) of Welbury, Yorkshire.
84. J.R. de S. Honey, Tom Brown's Universe (London, 1977), pp.191-2.
85. Bamford, op.cit., p.210.
86. See note 4 above. Most of the extant letters from this period are addressed to Arnold's aunt, Susan Delafield. It is almost certain that they were preserved as a group within the family after her death in 1834.
87. Stanley, op.cit., p.v.
88. ibid., p.2. Yet there is enough in the letters to reveal his sense of humour and also his ability to mix with people of all ranks: see L.14, L.16, and L.17.
89. Examples have already been given for the Warminster period. The Winchester letters reproduced by Selwyn contain descriptions of

- dormitory battles, mock sieges, sinking boys' hats with stones, illegally playing "five Card Loo": see L.22, L.27, L.28, L.31, and L.33 (not published by Selwyn; see Whitridge, op.cit., pp.9-12).
90. "his family and schoolfellows both remember him", Stanley, op.cit., p.2. The "family" probably refers to his sisters.
91. For example, Stanley's comments on his reading at Winchester derive from L.24, L.27, and L.28. His quote on the "Latin writers", comes from L.25.
92. Stanley, op.cit., p.v.
93. ibid., p.4.
94. R.E. Prothero and G.G. Bradley, Life and Correspondence of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D. (London, 1893), vol.1, p.33.
95. ibid., vol.1, pp.56-7, 61, 234-5.
96. ibid., vol.1, p.68. Patrick Scott concludes that the historicity of Tom Brown's Schooldays is authentic enough in outline. See 'The School and the Novel: Tom Brown's Schooldays' in The Victorian Public School, ed. B. Simon and I. Bradley, (London, 1875), ch.3.
97. L.30.

98. Whitridge, op.cit., p.6.
99. Williamson, op.cit., p.17.
100. L.14.
101. Wymer, op.cit., p.24.
102. See L.14-L.17 for examples.
103. Bamford, op.cit., pp.3-4.
104. Stanley, op.cit., p.508.
105. ibid. Further evidence for this, and for his love of debate at the time he entered Corpus Christi, can be found, ibid., p.9.
106. I can find no specific mention of these subjects in the few other sources for this period.
107. L.26, L.27.
108. L.22, L.27.
109. Stanley, op.cit., p.508. In 1794 his father had written, "I never wish to live under any other government than what I do, and am perfectly satisfied with our constitution, laws, and government."; D. Arnold-Forster, op.cit., p.175.

110. For an assessment, see G.P. Gooch, History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century (London, 1928), pp.308-9.
111. W. Mitford, The History of Greece (London, 1835). See, for example, vol.1, pp.232-3, vol.4, p.294. In later life Arnold acknowledged the great effect produced on him when he first read Mitford. See Thomas Arnold, Introductory Lectures on Modern History (London, 5th. ed., 1860), pp.85-6.
112. J.T. Coleridge entered Corpus Christi in 1809 and left in June 1812. He spent a probationary year as a Fellow of Exeter College before removing to London. The period of time they spent together at Corpus was, therefore, about sixteen months. See Stanley op.cit., p.6 and p.14.
113. Stanley's original intention had been to superintend the compilation of a memoir in which "the several parts should have been supplied by different writers, as... has been furnished ... by Mr Justice Coleridge;" Stanley, op.cit., p.iii. See also, Prothero and Bradley, op.cit., vol.1, pp.319ff.
114. Wymer, op.cit., p.37.
115. Bamford, op.cit., p.4, my emphasis.
116. A Winchester Scholar was elected to a New College "fellowship". That is, seventy fellows were on the foundation, and twenty of them were undergraduates from Winchester. It is necessary to understand

- the terminology since although they were all called "fellows", twenty of them were not postgraduates. See New College Oxford 1379-1979 (Oxford, 1979), ed. J. Buxton and P. Williams, pp.76-7.
117. ibid., p.77.
118. Presumably he means "the brighter boys (from Winchester)". Though even if he does not, it will be seen from what follows that the intellectual standing of New College in 1810 was very low.
119. Buxton and Williams, op.cit., p.77.
120. T. Fowler, The History of Corpus Christi College (Oxford, 1893), p.303.
121. Winchester College Muniments, WCM 21793. This document shows Arnold as nineteenth of twenty-one boys. He did, however, rise to eighteenth through the sudden death of the fourth boy, John Ridding (see L.33). This accounts for the discrepancy between Wymer and C.W. Holgate's, Winchester Long Rolls 1732-1812 (Winchester, 1904), since Holgate's list omits the name of the dead boy.
122. Buxton and Williams, op.cit., p.79.
123. Boys eventually became superannuated between eighteen and nineteen years of age. See Liber Scholasticus, op.cit., p.109.

124. Mon - Latin Prose and Verse composition; translation from Horace's Satires, Sallust, Sophocles (Oedipus Coloneus), Homer's Iliad, and Xenophon.
- Tue - English Essay; translation from Xenophon, Iliad, Livy, Horace's Epistles.
- Wed - "Translating Pliny into English" (presumably on paper), and the Spectator into Latin.
- Thu - Latin Prose and Verse composition; translation from Horace's Epistles, Virgil's Aeneid VI, Sophocles (Oedipus Coloneus), Thucydides, Xenophon.
- Fri - Virgil's Aeneid VI, Iliad Bk.22.

See Rev. C. Hole, The Life of the Reverend and Venerable William Whitmarsh Phelps, M.A. (London, 1871), vol.1, pp.65-6.

125. Stanley op.cit., p.7 and p.9.
126. ibid., pp.6-10.
127. Buxton and Williams, op.cit., p.45, p.65, and p.79.
128. ibid., p.64. See also p.65.
129. ibid., p.65.
130. ibid. p.77.

131. ibid., where they list the "gloomy catalogue of disincentives" which produced such a poor quality of undergraduate. Their list culminates with "the existence of Founders Kin."
132. ibid., p.66.
133. The Historical Register of the University of Oxford 1220-1900 (Oxford, 1900). See also Augustus J.C. Hare, Memorials of a Quiet Life (London, 1873), vol.1, p.177, who refers to "an attack made on the privilege or custom of New College men not going into the schools for the public examinations, but claiming a B.A. degree (from) their own authorities".
134. This may be compared with Corpus' record for the same period: ninety-one successes including twenty-three First classes, of which Arnold, in 1814, was the sixth.
135. Bamford, op.cit., p.5.
136. W.A. Pantin, Oxford Life in Oxford Archives (Oxford, 1972), p.41, observes that not much is known "about exactly how college tutors and college lectures (or tutorials) functioned in the early nineteenth century;" and that the main source would lie in contemporary letters and diaries. It has remained a neglected area of scholarship; see a private communication to the writer (16 February 1984) from the Committee of the History of the University of Oxford.
137. Stanley, op.cit., p.8.

138. E.G.W. Bill, University Reform in Nineteenth Century Oxford (Oxford, 1973), pp.13-14, quotes W.F. Hook (c.1817) to the effect that it was not uncommon for a tutor only to see a first year man twice a term, and that Honours' students "were expected to read more widely without tutorial supervision.": Cf. this with L.36, which shows that Bridges, one of Arnold's tutors was prepared to encourage him by lending him books.
139. Wymer, op.cit., p.39.
140. ibid., p.38.
141. Cf. Coleridge's account, Stanley, op.cit., p.8, with L.36 and Mark Pattison's description of the procedure in the 1830's (when things remained relatively unchanged): "a college lecture meant 'the class construing, in turns, some twenty lines of a classical text to the tutor.'": quoted by Pantin, op.cit., p.42. See also on this system, A.J. Engel, From Clergyman to Don (Oxford, 1983), p.4, who adds to the above that the tutor would also comment "on both the language and the substance of the work.". It is clear that lectures were mainly devoted to hearing the class construe.
142. Stanley, op.cit., p.8.
143. Edward Coplestone, A Reply to the Calumnies of the Edinburgh Review against Oxford, Containing an Account of the studies pursued in that University (Oxford, 1810), pp.146-7.

144. Pantin, op.cit., p.42.
145. Stanley, op.cit., p.7.
146. ibid., p.9.
147. Certainly 8 a.m. in 1815. See Fowler, op.cit., p.310.
148. Wymer, op.cit., p.38.
149. ibid., p.39.
150. As there are only nine books of Herodotus, the task would, on this basis, have been completed in a fortnight anyway!
151. See Stanley, op.cit., p.8 and Coplestone, op.cit., pp.152-3: "It is the practice of most colleges ... to examine every student at the end of each term in the studies of the term."
152. G.R.M. Ward and J. Heywood, Oxford University Statutes (London, 1844-51), Vol.2, pp.78-81.
153. See L.45. Also L.42, dated 19 April 1812: "I am over head and ears in my examination; and am obliged to read pretty hard at my Herodotus every day, as I shall go up in less than six weeks".
154. E.L. Williamson, op.cit., p.30.

155. Coplestone, op.cit., pp.138-9. Coplestone seems to imply that the elements of mathematics were not always offered. Certainly Arnold does not mention the subject in his account of the examination in L.45, nor when he is cataloguing his studies in L.36. Rev. C.Hole, op.cit., p.72 and p.110 note 1, writing four years later, implies that Bridges' lectures covered Logic and Mathematics alternately.
156. The classical authors chosen thus reflecting his bias towards the ancient historians; and confirming a characteristic of this period noted by Coleridge: see Stanley, op.cit., p.11.
157. See Coplestone, op.cit., pp.140-142. A good general discussion of teaching for the examinations can be found in M.L. Clarke, op.cit., Ch.8. Arnold's timetable reflects the emphasis given to the study of Aristotle at that time ("Aristotle today, ditto tomorrow", ibid., p.101) with five of the ten hours of lectures devoted to him.
158. Read in Artis Logicae Compendium, (H. Aldrich), (Oxonii, 1804).
159. See Coplestone, op.cit., p.142, and L.60.
160. Coplestone, op.cit., pp.138-9.
161. "My order of battle is this. Smith's great Atlas in a chair near me, (Bridges will lend me D'Anville in a few days.) two volumes of the great universal history, the size of your Rapin, three volumes of Mitford, both lent me by Bridges, Sir I. Newton's Chronology out of the library, (a great quarto) Major Rennell's

- Geography of Herodotus, another quarto out of the library, another great folio of Chronology out of the library, one lexicon in quarto and another in octavo, Beloe's (sic) translation, and lastly the author himself in octavo, like a little kernel enveloped in an enormous shell." (L.36); the brackets appear in the Ms, apart from the editorial "(sic)".
162. M.L. Clarke, op.cit., p.80: "essentially an author who belonged to the university".
163. The edition in use was, Quintilian, De Institutione Oratoria Libri Duodecim ..., curante Jacobo Ingram (Oxford, 1809).
164. Stanley, op.cit., p.320, letter dated 28 January 1835 (L.500). Bamford, in his Thomas Arnold on Education, p.152, has the date 25 January, but this is incorrect.
165. Stanley, op.cit., p.2, describes his marked dislike for early rising as "almost a constitutional infirmity."
166. ibid., p.22.
167. Wymer, op.cit., p.41. See also L.52: "French is one of those things that can hardly be learnt too young, and I often regret that I did not begin it earlier myself."
168. Bamford, Thomas Arnold on Education, p.102. See also his biography, op.cit., pp.176-7, and Newsome, op.cit., p.71.

169. Wymer, op.cit., p.37, taken from L.35, which also records his preference for rowing rather than sailing: "I go frequently on the river, and am very well known already by all the boatmen; Matt (his elder brother) ... used to prefer sailing, and I rowing,".
170. Wymer, op.cit., p.40 and pp.46-8, gives some examples.
171. As a further example of how cautious the reader must be when using Wymer's narrative, it is worth noting that although parts of his description of this walk, ibid., p.47, are charmingly picturesque, the fact is that Arnold's account neither records that they "begged ... a cabbage-leaf" from a fruiterer nor "sat by the waterside to eat their frugal luncheon.". The effect has been achieved at the expense of accuracy.
172. Stanley, op.cit., p.14. See also L.65 as a good example of the nature of these "skirmishes". They were not mere cross-country strolls: "We have taken the field ... and have had several bloody actions ... a dart narrowly missed Tucker's skull. The country is in fine condition for leaping ... the ditches not too full of water ... I shall not mind tumbling in some day.".
173. Campbell, op.cit., p.11.
174. Stanley, op.cit., p.14.
175. However Coleridge does say, "I carefully preserved from the beginning every letter which I ever received from him:"; ibid.,

- p.15. This collection is now in the Bodleian.
176. Bamford, op.cit., p.5.
177. L.57 gives details of various parties he attended, "all hostile to studies".
178. Arnold liked card games: "Cassino"(sic) at Warminster (L.3), Loo at Winchester (L.33). L.40 records another Oxford card-party at which, after their host retired to bed drunk, Arnold "sate playing Commerce till a quarter past three o'clock in the morning, and excellent fun we had;".
179. Whitridge op.cit., p.16.
180. Stanley, op.cit., pp.9-10 and 152.
181. Whitridge, op.cit., p.17.
182. "a man who disdained to compromise his principles ... for the sake of popularity".(L.44).
183. Stanley, op.cit., p.15.
184. See L.49. This is the "common-room" referred to by Coleridge in Stanley, op.cit., p.9. Fowler, op.cit., pp.322-4, gives a good sketch of its character at this period.

185. See Augustus J.C. Hare, op.cit., pp.167-70. Also H.A. Morrah, The Oxford Union 1823-1923 (London, 1923), p.7.
186. Their only nobleman, it seems (L.58).
187. Stanley, op.cit., p.12.
188. Whitridge, op.cit., p.16, and Hare's account: "The Dons always looked unfavourably upon it."; Augustus J.C. Hare, op.cit., p.170.
189. Stanley, op.cit., p.12.
190. Whitridge, op.cit., p.15.
191. The subject was "Coloni ab Anglia ad Americae Oram missi", and the prize was won by Henry Latham: see L.45.
192. "though not a poet himself, ..."; Stanley, op.cit., p.12.
193. ibid. This accords with his preference for the concrete as opposed to the abstract, as exemplified by his preferring the ancient historians to the poets. See note 156 above.
194. Stanley, op.cit., p.12, and J.T. Coleridge, A Memoir of the Rev. John Keble, M.A. (Oxford and London, 1870), p.18.
195. John Wilson, Poems (Edinburgh and London, 1825), 2 vols. The reference in L.43 is to pp.83-111, vol.2.

196. See, for example, his description of Keble's triumph in the Sheldonian, (L.45).
197. Coleridge, op.cit., p.18.
198. ibid., p.21.
199. Coleridge records that Arnold continued this practice for many years because "he thought it a useful and humanizing exercise.", Stanley, op.cit., p.12. Many poems and fragments survive among his MSS.
200. See the reference in L.40 to his pet dog, aptly named Rover since it accompanied him wherever he went in Oxford, including an "unseasonable appearance" in the lecture room.
201. The correspondence tends to support Coleridge's view that there was nothing distinctive about his religious beliefs at this time; Stanley, op.cit., p.15. There are no pious ejaculations or traces of a heightened religious awareness to be found in the correspondence. For instance, he rejoices (L.57 and L.58) that the weather has cancelled chapel services thereby allowing him to stay in bed longer!
202. Williamson, op.cit., pp.30-31.
203. Some confusion exists in Wymer and Bamford over the date of this examination. Wymer, op.cit., p.41, says he completed his examination on 30 April - but he has misread L.60. Bamford, in his

Thomas Arnold on Education, says on p.1, that he obtained a first in 1815, but on p.170, that it was 1814 "(aged nineteen)". The chronology is as follows: he sat the examination on 28 and 29 April 1814 (L.60); the result was declared on 24 May 1840 (L.61); and the degree was conferred upon him on 27 October 1814 (Oxford University Calendar 1814). So since he was born in June 1795, to be strictly accurate he was nineteen when he received his degree, but not when he sat the examination.

204. Coplestone, op.cit., pp.138-43 on which this account is based. See also Clarke, op.cit., pp.98-103 for a general survey.
205. At this period, Plato was virtually disregarded. Even in the 1840's a First Class could still be obtained without reading him. See M.L. Clarke. op.cit., p.100 and his Greek Studies in England 1700-1830 (Cambridge, 1945), p.112, p.121.
206. Otherwise it might reasonably have been expected that Xenophon, another favourite historian, would have been included.
207. Stanley, op.cit., pp.19-22. The reference to "letters", ibid., pp.21-2, providing more confirmation that he had seen many of them.
208. Wymer, op.cit., p.48.
209. Bamford, op.cit., p.6.
210. The sole source.

211. J.A.H. Murray, (ed.) A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles (Oxford, 1908), vol.10, pt.2, pp.222-3.
212. A calculation based on the time taken by the Royal Mail coaches on the London to Portsmouth route (on which Arlesford was a stage) in 1821. On a daylight run, they averaged 8/9 m.p.h.. See W. Outram Tristram, Coaching Days and Coaching Ways (London, 1893), pp.158-9. Also Lt. Col. Paterson, A New and Accurate Description of all the Principal Cross Roads in England and Wales (London, 1808).
213. T.H. Plumer (1796-1852). He had matriculated on 29 March 1814. Arnold's second pupil, G.A. Montgomery, was not acquired until January 1816; see L.69.
214. "You know that I cannot take orders for two years at the soonest: and I do not know whether I shall avail myself of the first opportunity after I am three and twenty, to take them:"; L.72 (26 July 1816).
215. D.W. Rannie, Oriel College (London, 1900), p.173.
216. See L.57, for example.
217. Bamford, op.cit., p.7.
218. Stanley, op.cit., p.20.
219. Wymer, op.cit., p.49.

220. Bamford, op.cit., pp.7-8.
221. ibid., p.10.
222. For advice and assistance in what follows, the writer is indebted to Mr W.E. Parry, Librarian of Oriel College, and his assistant, Mrs J. MacDonald.
223. Private communication from Mr Parry, 31 October 1983. R.D. Hampden was the other successful candidate. In L.66 Arnold's happiness is tempered by the knowledge that he has "succeeded against a friend"; but who this was the writer has not been able to discover. The point is that no list of candidates appears to have survived.
224. As, in fact, it was. See H.P. Liddon, Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey (London, 1894), vol.1, p.66.
225. See G.C. Richards and C.L. Shadwell, The Provosts and Fellows of Oriel College Oxford (Oxford, 1922).
226. See note 238 below.
227. Wymer, op.cit., p.49: "several of his rivals revealed rather more polished scholarship ... his papers could be classed as neither best nor second best.". This seems to be a "development" based on Stanley, op.cit., p.20.
228. Quoted by Rannie, op.cit., p.169.

229. Liddon, op.cit., pp.66-7. See also Rannie, op.cit., pp.169-72.
230. Liddon, op.cit., p.67.
231. ibid., pp.68-9.
232. Rannie, op.cit., p.169.
233. In his Thomas Arnold on Education, p.30, Bamford says "Arnold ... certainly ... was a protege of Whateley well before he (Arnold) was twenty"; and in his biography he says "Whateley knew that Arnold was a man of ideas," op.cit., p.8. But aside from the examination itself, just how much did Whateley "know" of the young Arnold? There is no direct evidence. Though Whateley may have heard about him from Keble, the first mention of Whateley's name in the correspondence does not occur until December 1815 (L.70). And there, the twenty-year old Arnold describes Whateley in terms which suggest that his family have not heard about him before: "Whateley is a very singular man - a hard dry logician ...". And Stanley says op.cit., p.19, that only after he was elected a Fellow did he become acquainted with Whateley: "Amongst the friends with whom he thus became acquainted for the first time, ... (was) Dr Whateley" (my emphasis). The degree of knowledge which Whateley possessed about Arnold, and his intimacy with him at this time, must be open to question.
234. Liddon, op.cit., p.68.
235. Rannie, op.cit., pp.172-3.

236. Liddon, op.cit., p.68.

237. Stanley, op.cit., pp.113-114.

238. W. Tuckwell, Pre-Tractarian Oxford (London, 1909), p.97.

239. This, the chronology followed by Bamford, is the correct one. The other biographers (and the D.N.B.) follow Stanley, who says erroneously, "he gained the Chancellor's prize for the two University Essays, Latin and English, for the years 1815 and 1817."; op.cit., p.5. Whitridge, op.cit., p.24, also gives them in this order, but without dates. Campbell, op.cit., p.9, says "Latin in 1815 ... English in 1817.". Wymer, op.cit., p.49 follows Campbell. Bamford, op.cit., p.8, merely records the fact of Arnold's winning the English Essay Prize without, apparently, seeing any connection with Whateley's arguments. While of the Latin Prize, he says that "In his classical studies he progressed rapidly so that in 1817 he became an M.A. and won the Chancellor's Latin Prize.", ibid., p.10. In point of fact, the implication that his progress in studies was a factor governing the award of the M.A. degree is false; this was conferred as a matter of course: "In 1807 ... the examination for the Master's Degree was abandoned", W.R. Ward, Victorian Oxford (London, 1965), p.14. Wymer, op.cit., p.49, who at least recognises that Whateley's judgement was vindicated, records Arnold's surprise in winning the Latin Essay. Further unpublished information on his entry for the Chancellor's Latin Prize can be found in L.73 and L.74. Interestingly, his

entry was not premeditated, but rather a last minute affair (L.74): and he thought that "success ... (was) quite out of the question:" (L.73). In fact, Arnold had only entered as "a sort of debt due to the College". (L.73).

240. Whitridge, op.cit., pp.24-35.
241. Wymer, op.cit., p.50.
242. Stanley, op.cit., pp.15-17; Wymer, op.cit., p.52; Bamford, op.cit., p.10. And in L.74 (May 1817), he implies he has some doubts about subscription to the Articles (Stanley, op.cit., p.43).
243. L.74 shows that he had been considering his fitness for a legal career.
244. Stanley, op.cit., p.26.
245. Wymer, op.cit., p.51.
246. An undated fragment is preserved in the Brotherton Library, which lists the "coaches" and the subjects in which Arnold was "driving" them. The MS gives nine names and must date from the period 1818-1819. It probably records the maximum number of pupils Arnold had at Oxford.
247. Stanley, op.cit., p.720.

248. A fact previously noticed in Notes and Queries, Oxford, December 1961, pp.465-6, by E.L. Williamson, Jr.
249. Stanley, op.cit., pp.459-60, note A.
250. Stanley's Notebooks make no reference to L.82 , L.83 , or L.84 . They record an untraced letter: "Jan. 1, 1819", and then the next entry is that of L.85 , 11 June 1819. It is possible that Coleridge thought the subject matter of these letters was too sensitive to entrust them to Stanley; certainly he went beyond the limits of his contribution to The Life to deal with the subject: see Stanley, op.cit., p.15, "(The crisis) does not properly fall within my chapter". But in that case, why did he send him L.103 and L.104 ? Given that the Notebooks are not a comprehensive index of the letters Stanley read, and that Coleridge preserved all his letters from Arnold, it is quite possible that Stanley did, in fact, read every one.
251. Whitridge, op.cit., p.52.
252. Wymer, op.cit., p.52.
253. Bamford, op.cit., p.10.
254. See Stanley, op.cit., pp.459-60, note A. Bamford's comment, op.cit., p.10, that "the Church and he agreed to differ", can hardly apply to Arnold's condition in 1818; it is much better suited to 1828. Certainly I can find no evidence for the Bishop of Oxford's

involvement in 1818; nor do the letters give any support to the notion of compromise at this time. In fact, the first mention of laying his "doubts" before a Bishop does not appear in the correspondence until March 1827 (L.214).

255. Stanley, op.cit., p.15. Although Arnold was studying the Articles in 1817 (see ibid., p.43) and he had experienced misgivings before (see L.72 and L.74) - though nothing like this - it is clear that the doubts which arose before his ordination as Deacon were last-minute ones, and much more serious than any that had previously arisen.
256. Whitridge, op.cit., p.52.
257. Wymer, op.cit., p.52, (my emphasis).
258. Bamford, op.cit., p.10, an account which seems to derive from Wymer.
259. He had been drowned in a boating accident. See L.102 , L.103 and Wymer, op.cit., p.62.
260. Stanley, op.cit., p.15.
261. ibid., pp.16-17.
262. L.102 also shows that he had written to J. Tucker and J. Keble on this subject, but these letters do not appear to have survived.

263. This is the second of "the two occasions" mentioned by Coleridge in Stanley, op.cit., p.16.
264. Whitridge, op.cit., p.53. In June 1838 (L.681) Arnold wrote unequivocally to Stanley, then himself troubled by the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed: "I do not believe the damnatory clauses in the Athanasian Creed, under any qualification given of them But I read the Athanasian Creed, and have and would again subscribe the Article about it, because I do not conceive the clauses in question to be essential parts of it.": Stanley, op.cit., pp.449-450. See also the comments of James Martineau, Essays, Reviews and Addresses (London, 1890), vol.1, on this topic, pp.50-61.
265. Stanley, op.cit., p.459, note A.
266. See note 264 above.
267. Further information on Stanley's views of the question can be found in Frances J. Woodward, The Doctor's Disciples, (O.U.P. 1954), pp.36-7, 65-8.
268. Stanley, op.cit., p.459, note A.
269. A short extract from the letter was quoted, without acknowledgement, in The Life on page 460 in the footnote carried over from the previous page: "'As my objections ... at once.'" There are, however, a number of verbal differences between the MS

and the printed text. In the first line in The Life, "As" should be "as"; and the word "other" should precede "objections". In the second line, "on" should be "upon"; "consider" should read "think". In the fourth line, the words "to him" should follow the word "statement"; and after the words "would not,", should come "or felt that he could not". In the fifth line of the printed version, the word "it" should read "the Headmastership".

Stanley has thus ensured that no connection between his quotation and Arnold's interest in the Headmastership of Winchester College could be made: firstly, by detaching it from its context, and secondly, by substituting the impersonal word "it" for "the Headmastership". Moreover, the letter is dated 1827 not 1826 as Stanley says on page 459 of The Life, a slip (?) which further confuses the issue.

270. Whitridge, op.cit., pp.49-52.
271. L.200 is a convenient source for most of his "scruples". References may also be found in L.197 and L.228. The source for the question of infant baptism and burial is L.214.
272. See L.200 and L.213, for example.
273. Whitridge, op.cit., p.52.
274. Stanley, op.cit., p.21.

275. Whitridge, op.cit., p.24.
276. Wymer, op.cit., p.53.
277. Bamford, op.cit., p.12.
278. See Wymer, op.cit., p.53: his interpretation is highly suspect. Hawkins' comments on Arnold's doubts over the Articles relate to the correspondence he had in 1827 over whether Arnold should apply for the Rugby position. And the reference to Arnold's shortcomings and incomplete understanding has its origin in remarks Hawkins made on Arnold's pamphlet on Church Reform in 1833: see Stanley, op.cit., pp.274-5. I can find no evidence for Hawkins allegedly stating that Arnold was not "in the least suited to the Church", a statement which is improbable to say the least. Furthermore, Hawkins' confidence in Arnold's ability to contribute to the field of education refers to 1827 and the Rugby School vacancy: ibid., p.42. Although Arnold probably did consult Hawkins and other friends in 1819, that probability is by no means supported by this "evidence" of Wymer.
279. ibid., p.17.
280. The first extant letter to F.C. Blackstone; partially reproduced by Stanley, ibid., pp.44-5.
281. An unpublished letter, partially quoted by Wymer, op.cit., p.58.

282. Rev. C. Hole, Life of ... W.W. Phelps, vol.1, p.449.
283. At this point it is convenient to notice two errors in the biographical record relating to his marriage. L.105 and L.106 are concerned with the wedding arrangements and much of their content has been incorporated into Wymer's account, op.cit., pp.62-4. He is, however, incorrect in ascribing Arnold's decision to proceed with his marriage to the "extra responsibilities" and need to share them with a wife which followed the sudden deaths of his brother Matthew and his uncle, Joseph Delafield. The wedding date had been fixed definitely in February 1820 (L.100) for August of that year. Matthew's death did not occur until May 1820, while Joseph Delafield did not die until September 1820, a month after the wedding.
284. ibid., p.60
285. Bamford, op.cit., p.12. His view of Arnold's disposition deriving, of course, from his belief that Arnold had been ordained Deacon in a spirit of compromise with his conscience satisfied.
286. See L.72, L.74, L.85.
287. It is worth noting that while Arnold acknowledges the assistance "Buckland's experience and firmness (will be)" (L.85), of equal importance in his decision to combine was

the fact that it would enable him to have his mother and relatives with him (and, presumably, the assistance of his sister Frances). He was prepared to accept some financial loss for this.

288. Wymer, op.cit., p.54.
289. Since Bamford, op.cit., p.13, p.15, says the two shared a house until Arnold's separation in 1824, a view held by Whitridge, op.cit., p.37, it may be as well to state that they each possessed a house from the start of their partnership: see L.85 and L.90 for example.
290. Wymer, op.cit., pp.54-5.
291. ibid., p.70.
292. Other letters mentioning his fees are L.205, L.221, and L.233. In L.224 (September 1827) he was positive he would increase them; but he did not do so.
293. Wymer, op.cit., p.70.
294. Bamford, op.cit., p.15.

295. See L.175, L.199, L.219, for example.
296. An analysis of letters from L.107 (Sept. 1820) to L.225 (Oct. 1827).
297. See also Stanley, op.cit., p.47.
298. An unacknowledged omission in Stanley's quotation from L.95 records his satisfaction at now having "the exclusive management of all their compositions".
299. Wymer, op.cit., pp.57-8, for example, supports his belief that Arnold was not entirely happy in his new situation with a long quotation from L.95; but he fails to distinguish Arnold's use of the word "school".
300. Wymer, op.cit., pp.70-71, 83.
301. Bamford, op.cit., p.15.
302. For a short time in 1827 he took eight; but only as a favour, and he could barely manage to teach this number (L.219, L.223).
303. Exceptions were not made for friends: see L.184, for example.
304. See Stanley, op.cit., p.28, quoting L.209.
305. In L.100 he says that he will marry without "a penny of private fortune".

306. A loan made to him by his uncle (L.132 and L.739).
307. Wymer, op.cit., p.86, quoting Mrs. Arnold's Journals: "We had married with a considerable debt". See also note 329 below.
308. They merely record that he wrote on certain subjects. Wymer, for example, op.cit., p.76, records that Arnold "managed to undertake a great deal of literary work", and gives some examples, but he fails to recognise that Arnold's activity was owing to sheer necessity as much as anything else.
309. Coleridge seems to have extracted a promise from Arnold to do nothing further without first consulting him. A chastened Arnold reminded him that after all it was only an idea, "not a determined resolution", (L.96).
310. Stanley, op.cit., p.20.
311. His idea was to write histories about "the size of the abridged Goldsmith"; which may give a clue to the text-books in use at Laleham: O. Goldsmith, The Grecian History, From the Earliest State to the Death of Alexander the Great (London, 1785); abridgements and revisions for the use of schools were still being published in the 1860's. The same compiler's History From the Foundation of the City of Rome to the Destruction of the Western Empire (London, 1769) had a similar life. Stanley's reproduction of L.131, op.cit., pp.55-6, also mentions these two histories.

312. "at present one must read through six volumes of Mosheim or five of Milner" (L.99); a remark which gives a clue to his own reading at Oxford: J.L. von Mosheim, An Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern 6 vols. (London, 1806). J. Milner, The History of the Church of Christ ... 5 vols. (London, 1810).
313. There is an indirect allusion to the latter in L.131, reproduced by Stanley, op.cit., p.56.
314. Stanley, op.cit., p.33, mentions a short history of Greece never finished or published; while in his Notebooks he records seeing the following Arnold MSS: "Sketch of Church History", "History of Rome (Laleham)", "History of Greece to 501". These probably refer to the three schemes discussed here. See also Stanley, op.cit., pp.55-56. None of these MSS have been traced.
315. E.F. Poppo, Observationes Criticae in Thucydidem ... (Leipzig, 1815; London, 1819).
316. L.113, L.115, L.122, for example.
317. I can find no trace of this review; not even the MS seems to have survived. Stanley, however, might have seen it, if the reference in his Notebooks to "Observations on Thucydides (Evidences)" in his list of Arnold's extant MSS refers to this article.
318. The objections to his article comprehended more than his style of writing, with which L.113, reproduced in Stanley, op.cit., pp.54-55,

is chiefly concerned. Arnold's whole treatment of the subject was criticised.

319. H.L. Wickham and J.A. Cramer, A Dissertation on the Passage of Hannibal over the Alps (London, 1820). See also Stanley, op.cit., p.54.
320. A review of Cramer's book did appear in the Edinburgh Review, (November, 1825), pp.163-197, but this was not by Arnold.
321. (Anonymous), Valerius, A Roman Story 3 vols. (Edinburgh, 1820).
322. An unenthusiastic review appeared in the Edinburgh Review, (October, 1823), pp.179-180, but this was not by Arnold.
323. Stanley, op.cit., p.33.
324. When Wymer, op.cit., p.76, for instance, speaks of the lexicon taking "something like ten years to complete", he seems to be confusing the lexicon with the edition. He is correct in saying that Arnold began the lexicon in 1821 (L.116) and that it occupied three volumes (a point which is confirmed by Stanley's Notebooks). Arnold did finish the lexicon, but there is nothing in the letters to suggest that it took him the next ten years. The last time it is mentioned is in 1825 (L.168). Once publication of the lexicon was denied him in 1822 (L.130, L.151), he began to prepare a full, critical edition of Thucydides. This too occupied three volumes, the first of which appeared in 1830. See also the commentary to

note 326 below.

325. (Anonymous), Lexicon Thucydidæum ... (London, 1824). Presumably Arnold was the most convenient source possessing the requisite knowledge. The fact that this lexicon was anonymous suggests that the compiler was an "unknown"; a supposition which may explain a statement in L.130 that the author would receive an additional sum if Arnold approved the work.

326. The terms of his contract with Parker are not known. In L.151, speaking of another scheme, he says:

"but I am resolved to go on quickly with my own plans, and not to give them up again as I did with regard to the lexicon.",

which suggests he was less than happy with the outcome.

327. See L.201.

328. The unpublished letters correct a point of chronology in the biographies. Stanley, op.cit., p.33 and p.720 says that Arnold began writing for the Encyclopaedia in 1821, as does Bamford in his Thomas Arnold on Education, p.171, a year repeated by others. Wymer, op.cit., p.76 comes closest to the true date of starting, which was August 1822.

329. Further information on his poor financial situation at this period is given in three unpublished letters, L.132, L.137 and L.139, which are concerned with the drafting of his first will. They show

that his only assets were his personal property and a life insurance policy for £2000. He had no disposable cash. They confirm that he began his partnership with a loan from his uncle and that it was his "being in debt which makes me anxious to earn as much as I can by writing as well as by my pupils." (L.132). It may be of interest to know the provisions he made at this date. They were that all money should go to Trustees for the use of his wife during her life, and that an equal division of the residue should be made among his children after her death. He asked Coleridge and Trevenen Penrose to stand as executors and guardians with his wife.

330. In L.145 he says his doctor's bill should be charged to his pupils, "for it was all owing to them".

331. L.153, L.154, and L.155 are the relevant letters.

332. A reference to this may lie in L.141 (30 June 1823) where he speaks of "a protracted history ... of which you will hear more later".

333. An echo of the scheme originally mentioned: see note 311 above.

334. Stanley, op.cit., p.33 says that he first became acquainted with Niebuhr's history in 1825; but the letters reveal that he was reading the book in September 1824: see L.158, L.160, for example. Wymer's remark, op.cit., p.77, that Arnold read Niebuhr for the Encyclopaedia articles is wrong. L.158 makes it clear that he read Niebuhr for his projected Roman History. Wymer's quotation, derived

from L.160, mentions how Niebuhr's work had saved him from exposure "by publishing too soon"; but this is a reference to volume one of his Roman History not to his articles for the Encyclopaedia.

335. The effect was instantaneous. In L.158 (16 September 1824) he had told Mawman that the idea of publishing volume one by the winter of 1824 was now out of the question.
336. T. Arnold, History of Rome 3 vols. (London, vol.1, 1838; vol.2, 1840; vol.3, 1843). Arnold's death in 1842 caused the history to terminate with the First Punic War (vol.2). However the work was continued to the end of the Second Punic War (vol.3) by using his MSS and the life of Hannibal he had written as an article for the Encyclopaedia Metropolitana in 1823. A further work by Arnold, History of the Later Roman Commonwealth, 2 vols. (London, 1845) was derived from his Encyclopaedia articles and published posthumously. This work carried the history to the end of the reign of Augustus and included a life of Trajan.
337. "A Non-Resident Member of Convocation", Address to the Members of Convocation on the Expediency of the Proposed Statute. Oxford, March 8, 1824.
338. Coleridge acted in this capacity for three or four months during the interregnum between Gifford and Lockhart.
339. Quarterly Review, vol.32 (London, 1825), pp.67-92. The article

is unsigned. See Stanley, op.cit., pp.34, 720.

340. B.G. Niebuhr, Romische Geschichte 2 vols. (Berlin, 1811, 1812).
W. Wachsmuth, Die Aeltere Geschichte Des Romischen Staates Untersucht (Halle, 1819).
341. F. Creuzer, Abriss Der Romischen Antiquitaten (Leipzig and Darmstadt, 1824).
342. Four times: p.68, p.84, p.91.
343. Discussed hereafter.
344. The article can be analysed as follows: Introduction, p.67; discussion of Niebuhr's history, pp.67-70; Roman agrarian legislation, pp.71-77; Roman military developments, pp.78-83; Niebuhr, Wachsmuth and Creuzer, pp.83-4; Niebuhr's religious scepticism, pp.85-7; intellectual character of Germany and Britain, pp.89-90; observations on the British educational system, pp.90-92.
345. p.280.
346. By the time Arnold had embarked on this new article, Coleridge had handed over to the new editor, J.G. Lockhart, but obviously his influence would remain during the period of transition.
347. The article is ostensibly a review of (J. Yates), Thoughts on the Advancement of Academical Education in England (London, 1826), but

in fact is a critical essay on the state of education in the Universities and the highest forms of the Public Schools. Letters L.179 and L.180 may be read as a commentary on this article.

348. Stanley notes the survival of the MS in his Notebooks - "Review of 'Thoughts etc.' on Education, 1826" - but does not refer to it in The Life (perhaps because it was never published). The MS is now in the archives of Rugby School.
349. "An Episcopalian", Letters on the Church (London, 1826). Edinburgh Review, vol.44, 1826, pp.490-513. The article is unsigned, but see Stanley, op.cit., p.720.
350. Stanley, op.cit., p.41.
351. Stanley also reproduces part of L.242, which mentions that he had been a candidate for "the historical professorship at the London University;", ibid., p.69.
352. By this he probably means his lack of "perfect familiarity with my grammar" (L.95) and his continuing dislike for verse composition.
353. See L.93, partially quoted by Stanley, op.cit., pp.44-5, and L.97; also commentary relating to notes 280 and 281 above.
354. Newman had resigned on February 21 1826. See The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman (Oxford, 1978), ed. I. Ker and T. Cornall, vol.1, p.221 and p.277. There is a connection between

Newman and Arnold which, in view of their later history, is curious; for Newman succeeded to Arnold's Fellowship at Oriel; Arnold was offered Newman's post at St. Alban Hall; and Newman "disputed" with Arnold when the latter took his B.D. degree.

355. See Letters and Diaries of ... Newman, vol.1, p.222.
356. At Laleham from August 1825 onwards, the letters show that he was continually full with seven pupils, i.e. receipts of £1470 p.a.
357. i.e. the Headmaster.
358. Reasons which render Wymer's remark, op.cit., p.98, that "He refused the mastership (sic) of Winchester on the grounds that ... (it) was too set in its traditions to lend itself to reform", completely untenable.
359. Edward Penrose Arnold, born October 28, 1826.
360. See note 269 above and the commentary to it. This is the first mention of this solution in the correspondence; see note 254 above.
361. L.229.
362. See commentary to note 270 above.
363. Mrs Arnold's Journals, November 1827. The extant correspondence generally supports Wymer's chronology, op.cit., pp.83-5, which seems

to derive from L.228, L.229, and L.231.

364. Bamford, op.cit., p.17.

365. Stanley, op.cit., p.460, quoting L.242. Whitridge, op.cit., pp.52-3, implies that ordination to the Priesthood was a precondition of the Rugby post, but this was not so.

366. Similar sentiments are expressed in L.214 and L.231.

367. Wymer, op.cit., p.83.

PART TWO

A COMMENTARY ON SELECTED

THEMES FROM THE PERIOD

1828 to 1842

INTRODUCTION

In Part Two of this study, which covers Arnold's years as Headmaster of Rugby School, selected themes have been developed from the letters and related to the biographical and other studies of the period. The reasons for the decision to select particular topics for critical examination, rather than to apply the correspondence generally, have been discussed in the General Introduction. Here, an explanation is given of the themes which have been chosen and the way in which they have been treated.

In his analysis of the methods used by Arnold in his attempt to reform Rugby School, David Newsome identifies five areas in which Arnold's efforts were concentrated: the maintenance of the independence of the Headmaster in all matters of discipline and routine in his relations with the Trustees; the raising of the status and the encouragement of the pastoral role of the assistant masters; the establishment of the idea of the corporate identity of the school; the rigorous application of superannuation and expulsion among the boys; and the emphasis upon the prefectorial system and the Sixth Form.¹ Although so much has been written about Arnold's methods, first-hand evidence of their application and the reaction to them is not extensive. Apart from The Life, which does not dwell upon controversial matters of school-life, and which was, in any case, written by a most untypical member of the school, evidence for incidents in the daily life at Rugby is based almost entirely on a small number of Old Boys' reminiscences² and contemporary newspaper reports, with general background and 'colour' often being supplied by Tom Brown's Schooldays. In these circumstances,

great weight has naturally been attached to that evidence which does exist for specific incidents. Their importance has been recognised, and they have been the subject of close examination and regular quotation as illustrations of Arnold's methods in practice and the realities of life at the school. Clearly, whatever additions can be made to the record of such events will be valuable. The aspects of Arnold's life which have been chosen for examination in Part Two allow the unpublished correspondence to be applied to a selection of these incidents to discover whether the letters provide any new factual information about them and the extent to which they confirm or modify their received interpretation. Incidents have been chosen which relate to some of the areas mentioned at the beginning of the paragraph, though the evidence which is discussed is often applicable to more than the particular area it is being used to illustrate. In addition to examining the evidence for published events, any new information the unpublished correspondence provides on the themes those incidents illustrate is also displayed and discussed. As with Part One, quotations from the unpublished letters are made freely throughout the text.

"What a chaplet of glory encircles thy brow
 Ah! it is not in man not to envy thee now.
 Not thy angry resolves - not thy changing decrees -
 Not thy toadying serfs - nor thy trembling Trustees -
 Nor thy rod clotted thick with an innocent's gore ...
 Not expulsions of children too youthful to reason ..." ³

The preceding lines were directed at Thomas Arnold in 1837 by an angry parent who believed they reflected the way Arnold maintained discipline at Rugby School. They were gleefully printed by the local Tory press, which had been waging a campaign of denigration and abuse against the Headmaster for several years. They provide a convenient introduction to this section of the commentary, which will examine the evidence supplied by the unpublished letters on incidents of indiscipline at the school and the way Arnold handled them; his relations with his assistants and the Trustees; and his treatment of young children as exemplified by the Chancery Court case of 1839.

In 1835 Arnold wrote an article on discipline at Public Schools ⁴ to answer specific criticisms which had been made about his old school, Winchester College. These criticisms were themselves part of a general feeling of disapproval, which lasted for most of the century, about the severity of punishments and other practices that existed in the schools. ⁵ In the article, Arnold dealt with the subject of corporal punishment, a traditional and accepted method of maintaining discipline in the nineteenth century Public School. ⁶

Although Arnold approved of this, he did so with qualifications, for he would not birch indiscriminately. He recognised the need for such a weapon, particularly for the younger boys, but looked upon it as a weapon of last resort, to be used only when persuasion and a sliding-scale of punishments had failed; points he made in a letter written during his first term at Rugby:

"I chastise, at first, by very gentle impositions, which are raised for a repetition of offences - flogging will be only my ratio ultima - and talking I shall try to the utmost. I believe that boys may be governed a great deal by gentle methods and kindness and appealing to their better feelings," (L.264).⁷

Stanley records that the birch was applied for moral offences such as lying, drinking, and habitual idleness;⁸ but that for boys of fifteen years and upwards, Arnold saw little use in flogging as a method of punishment and chose instead to expel persistent transgressors.⁹

Despite that fact that Arnold did not believe in flogging boys as a mere matter of routine, it has been stated that he acquired a "public reputation as a flogger", and that this was a practice "at which he was such a master".¹⁰ This suggests that there was either a great difference between his stated intentions and his actual practice, or that the number of boys receiving the "ratio ultima" was so large, that it raises serious questions about the moral state of the school. It is worthwhile, therefore, examining the evidence on which these statements are based.

In all the studies and biographies that had been written about Arnold from the time of his death in 1842 until 1960, there had been

no suggestion that he was a vicious and excessive wielder of the birch. It was then that Bamford, in his biography, revealed the local press publicity surrounding the apparently brutal beating of one of the boys at Rugby in 1832.¹¹ It was an important and previously unrecorded incident in the history of the Headmastership, and Bamford devoted most of a chapter on flogging to a dramatic account of the affair, an account which has been regularly cited ever since.¹² The matter raised serious questions about Arnold's character, methods, and judgement.

The case of the boy March was discovered in the files of a local, Tory newspaper, the Northampton Herald¹³ (from whose columns the quotation at the head of this section is taken) and was a significant addition to the stock of direct evidence for specific incidents during Arnold's time at Rugby. Of the previous biographers, Whitridge and Wymer had both referred to the attacks upon Arnold made by this paper, over a number of years, but neither mentioned this particular case.¹⁴ Its implications and sensational nature mean that any new evidence concerning the affair merits full consideration.

The bare facts of the story are that Arnold was examining a form in their term's work: one boy, March, claimed he could not translate a passage of Greek because it had not formed part of his classwork. Arnold was assured by the boy's form-master, Mr Bird, that the boy was wrong. March continued to deny this and so received eighteen strokes of the birch for persistent lying. Arnold subsequently discovered that the boy had been right and his form-master wrong. He immediately apologised personally to the boy and then publicly to him in front of the assembled school. The local Tory newspaper the Northampton Herald, undoubtedly receiving "inside" information, then

repeatedly attacked Arnold in its columns, depicting him, among other things, as a cruel, merciless flogger.

In considering the Herald's interpretation of events, however, due weight must be given to the fact that it was a rabid, ultra-Tory organ set up in opposition to the Northampton Mercury, the local Whig paper. Arnold's views on ultra-Toryism were well known, so it was merely a matter of time before he was attacked. As Bamford rightly says, "A celebrity of opposite opinions was always a potential target ...".¹⁵ The opportunity presented by the March case was gleefully accepted, and Arnold, his opinions, and everything for which the Herald believed he stood, was vilified over a period of months in a manner which stands comparison with the excesses of the modern tabloid press. Yet it is entirely on the reports of this paper that Bamford's account is based and takes its colour. The Herald's version of events has been accepted and transmitted to the extent that a recent commentator adduces it as evidence to show that Arnold was, "... rendered ... by temperament singularly unsuited to be the governor of young boys."¹⁶ Even if there were no other evidence available, however, the fact that the received interpretation of the March case is derived from an avowedly hostile source should, in itself, sound a note of caution. Although it seems to have been assumed that the newspaper reports were the sole source for the March case, the fact is that a considerable amount of unpublished material exists, and has been publicly available for many years, in the form of letters and statements written by Arnold, his staff, and the Trustees of the school.¹⁷ Given the significance of the incident, and the serious charge against Arnold's character, these documents are important. They constitute a major, new source of evidence on a controversial

matter. They have, therefore, been compared with the published version of events, to see whether they confirm or modify the received interpretation. At the very least, they fulfil the important task of allowing Arnold to give his side of the affair, and so provide the reader, for the first time, with evidence to judge both sides of the story.

Firstly, therefore, Bamford's factual description of events will be examined in detail against the unpublished material, and his interpretation of those events considered. His account is quoted in full, in the order in which it was presented. Quotations from his account are numbered and lettered thus: "1.(B)".

The incident occurred on a Friday towards the end of term in November 1832 when,

1.(B): "Arnold had decided to examine the boys of the lower forms and note their progress. On such occasions the form master would give him a note of work done, while another member of staff would go along with Arnold to help if necessary. On this occasion he descended on Mr Bird's class and took with him James Prince Lee."¹⁸

Factually, this is not entirely correct, for L.423, written by Arnold, reveals that another master was present throughout the incident,

Algernon Grenfell:

"My co-examiners at the Time were Mr Lee and Mr Grenfell."

The fact of Grenfell's presence, and also that the masters examined in rotation, is independently confirmed by Lee in the detailed statement he made to the Trustees:

"Dr Arnold, Mr Grenfell and myself were employed between 11 & 1 o'Clock in the day in the examination of the fourth form. At about 12 O'Clock it was Dr Arnold's turn to examine March in Greek, ...".¹⁹

This was the annual examination given to each form before the Christmas holidays.²⁰ Each of the masters probably examined a different portion of the form's work, with the boys passing along from one master to the next. Although whether the examination proceeded simultaneously, or whether all the boys were examined in Greek by Arnold alone is not known.

2.(B): "The Doctor looked at the slip of paper recording the work to be tested, and the ordeal began. He called upon a young lad named March to construe a certain passage in Xenophon's Anabasis.".²¹

The unpublished documents both add to this and correct an error of fact, in that Lee's statement says that the passage in question was taken from "Xenophon's Hellenics", not the "Anabasis", (as incorrectly reported in the Herald), while Arnold, in L.443,²² says:

"The passage was the very last paragraph of the second Chapter;".

And, as will be shown below, March was not the first boy to be called; the examination had been proceeding for an hour before his turn arrived.

3.(B): "The boy promptly told the Doctor that this point in the book had not yet been reached. Arnold frowned and checked with his list. There was no doubt that the passage was included in Mr Bird's

note, but on pointing out this fact, the boy still denied that they had done it."²³

This does not accord exactly with the accounts of those present in the room. The differences are important. Arnold says:

"A written account of the amount of the work, drawn up by Mr Bird the Master of the Form was lying before us on the Table. I gave a Boy a passage to construe which he read over aloud without making any remark upon it, and then when he began to construe it, finding himself at a loss he told me that he had not done it in the half year. The passage was the very last paragraph of the second Chapter; and on being pressed again about it the Boy said not that he had not done it, but that Mr Bird had told them they were to begin to be examined at the third Chapter. Mr Bird's written account made them begin at the first Chapter." (L.443).

Lee's account confirms that the passage in question was on Bird's list, he says:

"On Mr Bird's List of the work done in that time being referred to, it stated distinctly that the form had (sic) done that Chapter ...".

The most significant point, however, is that the accounts of Arnold and Lee do not correspond with the received version over the matter of the boy's reactions. They reveal that not only did the boy not "promptly" tell Arnold that the passage "had not yet been reached." by the class, but he even began to translate it, and was so far

successful that he only denied having done the work when he "stuck" in his translation. This is confirmed by Lee:

"The Boy read the passage and attempted to construe it, but finding himself unable after going a little way, ..." (my emphasis);

a point which needs to be set against Bamford's later remark that none of the boys in the form could,

"... possibly have construed the passage either unless he had happened to possess the natural genius of a Butler or a Landor."²⁴

There is a slight discrepancy though between Arnold's account of what happened when the boy could not continue with his construe, for Lee says that March "... stated he had not learnt it during the half year."; whereas Arnold says the boy first declared this, but when pressed, said that Bird had told them the examination was to start with chapter three.²⁵ Not that this affects the main question, which was that Bird's written account stated the form had done that chapter, while the boy maintained he had not. The issue would turn upon Bird's reply when the situation was reported to him.

4.(B): "More frowns, and Mr Lee went along to Bird to check it, and came back with the information that the note was right and the boy was wrong."²⁶

The statements of Arnold and Lee confirm this in detail, particularly the nature of Bird's reply. They record no doubt about the way the masters present understood it. Arnold says:

"Mr Lee went to Mr Bird ... in an adjoining School, to learn ... whether his written Report of the Work done by his Form, which he had previously sent us, was correct. The answer which

I received contained no Expression of Doubt or Uncertainty; it was not only positive but circumstantial, and made it appear not only that the Boy had told a Falsehood, but how it was a Falsehood which he might have hoped to get believed: and it further happened this Explanation coincided with one or two minute Circumstances which I happened to know to be true, and therefore rendered the Matter to my Mind absolutely certain. Nor was this my own Impression only, for I have the Authority of Mr Lee and Mr Grenfell, - of Mr Lee who went to Mr Bird, and of Mr Grenfell who together with myself heard the Answer, - for stating that it left no Doubt on their Minds any more than on my own." (L.423).

There was then no shadow of a doubt in the minds of the three masters present that the boy was lying. Moreover Lee had even warned Bird what would happen to March if he (Bird) was not absolutely accurate about the work his form had done:

"I then mentioned ... March had made the assertion he had not read the passage set; to which Mr Bird repeated the List was right as he had made it out at home. I then said 'be sure as if it is a Case of ψευδος Arnold will flog the boy,' (or words to that effect). Mr Bird again repeated his assertion ...".

There is a point of detail in Lee's account which deserves noticing since it is relevant to what follows. Lee's statement of his conversation with Bird continues thus:

"Mr Bird again repeated his assertion and seemed a moment in consideration as if casting about as to the possibility of an error in what he had said; he then added, as if a new circumstance had struck him, 'Oh yes, because the Boys did History for a fortnight by mistake at the beginning of the half-year, as Dr Arnold will remember, and therefore there will be a difference between what the boys have read who came into the form in the middle of the half-year and the others.' He also mentioned that the boys last admitted into the form began at Chapter 2nd."

This passage contains the "circumstantial" element of Bird's reply to which Arnold refers, and is considered below.

Bird's insistence that his paper was a correct account of the work done by the class put the matter beyond doubt:

"Now as Mr Bird's paper stated that the boys began at the first Chapter, and as his answer which I happen to know to be correct allowed for the Boys having done within the half year even more than was there stated - for he might when drawing out the paper have forgotten the part which had been done separately and by mistake at the beginning of it - it seemed quite certain that the Boy must have read the end of the second Chapter, as he allowed himself that he had read the third ..." (L.443).

It will be recalled that both Lee and Arnold stated that March had first denied he had read in class "... the very last paragraph of the

second Chapter; (L.443), and Arnold added that March had followed this by saying he had been told to prepare from chapter three for the examination.²⁷ Bird's reply to Lee rendered March's assertions untenable. Firstly because only boys who had joined the form in the middle of the half could have done less than Bird's paper stated. Even if March had been one of these (and he was not), he would still have started with the second chapter. Secondly because even if the passage in question had been done out of sequence at the beginning of the term, March would still have done it for he was in the form from the start. And thirdly because Bird declared the form had covered the text from chapter one onwards. And that was stated on his list as the work to be examined. The truth of the matter, which Bird did not discover until the following day, was that the form had actually started from the third chapter. The significance of this in relation to the examination of his form is discussed below.

5.(B): "The atmosphere, which had been tense while they had been waiting for the answer, suddenly became alarming. Arnold, already a terrifying enough figure, was faced with evil in its highest form - persistent telling of lies to authority, even after proof of guilt. He called the boy a liar, repeating 'Liar! Liar! Liar!' And still the lad protested his innocence. This only enraged the Doctor still more, for futile protests of innocence in the face of concrete evidence is the most exasperating situation possible. True innocence has an aura about itself that has to be almost literally torn away in righteous indignation. So it was in this case. The

whole situation had gone past logic and past sense.

The crime was too blatant and tempers too roused for Arnold to think of a simple check with another lad. As it was, poor March came out to meet his fate."²⁹

This interpretation of some of the events which followed Bird's reply will be considered later; particularly the importance which Arnold placed upon honesty, which helps to place his subsequent actions in perspective. It is difficult, however, to see what more Arnold could have done to establish the truth. Why should he repeatedly question Bird's accuracy? Had he done so, it would have appeared to Bird that his integrity was being challenged; and to the boys present, both in Bird's own form and the form he was himself examining, it would have appeared that Arnold had no confidence in his assistant. The man was an experienced master. Arnold had his written list in front of him, and a subsequent check had produced a specific confirmation. Where was the necessity to repeat the question? Who was more likely to be telling the truth? Moreover, as will be shown below, previous knowledge both of the boy and his form only strengthened the case against him. For it is relevant to note that the examination of Bird's form, which began at 11 a.m. and ended at 1 p.m., was being conducted by masters who were aware of the form's failure in a previous examination:

"... I found at the beginning of the examination ...
that his whole form with six exceptions failed
totally in composition ..." (L.443). ;

and that March was not a virtuous, young innocent, but a boy who had been previously reported to Arnold "... as a shuffling boy, ...",

which accorded with Arnold's "... own impression of his manner ..."
(L.443).

At this point, the unpublished documents are chiefly confined to facts. Arnold simply records that the unanimity of his colleagues and all the circumstances warranted the action he took:

"Under these Circumstances I punished the Boy on the Spot; as I have done seldom certainly, but on one or two previous Occasions, when I thought that the Immediateness of the Punishment would provide a striking Effect; and there were then about ten or a dozen Boys in the Room, waiting to be examined. This was about 12 o'Clock; ..." (L.423).

Lee adds that:

"... the boy was flogged in the adjoining Room to that in which Mr Grenfell and myself were examining."

6.(B): "The rod fell on him once, twice, three times, four - eighteen times in all, each one of a kind sufficient to drive out the evil and make the lad repent his ways."³⁰

This passage of the received account is, of course, highly relevant, because the number of strokes the boy received was seized upon by the Northampton Herald and Arnold's "public reputation as a flogger" was founded. The validity of this charge will be considered in due course. At this point, one extremely important piece of information is disclosed by the correspondence Arnold wrote to Lord Denbigh, one of the Trustees, as soon as the first attack upon him appeared in the Herald:

"... the Story professes to relate specific Facts,

and those so discreditable to my Character if true that I feel it due both to the School & to myself to lay the real State of the Case before your Lordship." (L.423).

On the specific point of the number of strokes delivered to the boy, he says:

"I dare say that the Boys in the adjoining Room counted the Strokes very exactly, but they could not know that the Reason why they were so many was simply because the instruments were old & almost worn out, from my punishing the Boy at once with what I found in the Closet, instead of sending as is usual for fresh ones. I am really ashamed to be obliged to write seriously to your Lordship on such a Subject." (L.423) my emphasis.

Arnold's explanation, therefore, reveals the real reason for the number of strokes; whether he was operating with one birch or more than one, "the instruments" were "almost worn out". This raises the question of the comparative difference in effect between an old birch and a new one - a point which will be discussed in detail later. Here, it is important to note that Arnold felt this reason made the newspaper's charge against him ridiculous and completely acquitted him.

7.(B): "At last Arnold's sense of duty was appeased and in deathly silence the lesson proceeded, though we have no record of what happened next, which is a pity, for the next boy could not possibly have construed the passage either ..."³¹ .

Although the unpublished correspondence has nothing which bears directly

on this, it does allow a number of points to be made. It has already been noted that March was not the first boy to be called; the examination had been proceeding for an hour before he was asked to construe. Had the preceding boys acquitted themselves satisfactorily? Lee stated that he and Grenfell continued examining the boys while March was being punished in another room. Arnold, therefore, was not present when "the next boy" was called. It is simply not known whether "the next boy" or any of the others were asked to construe the same passage which March had attempted. And it is worth recalling that March had begun to construe the piece; perhaps another boy might have fared better, assuming he had been given that same piece to translate. Moreover, March had claimed that Bird told the form they would be examined from the third chapter. Perhaps the remaining boys were asked to construe portions of the Greek from that point. In short, it cannot be assumed that any of the "ten or dozen Boys" who followed March were given the same passage to construe as he. Since Bird's final explanation of his error still raises difficulties, the question of how the examination had been conducted is continued below.

8.(B): "Arnold must have had awful suspicions about the truth of the matter before many minutes had passed. The situation was difficult, and without a doubt both Headmaster and boys welcomed the end of the lesson."³²

The first part of this is not supported by the unpublished evidence. Firstly, neither Arnold, Lee, nor Grenfell had any "awful suspicions"; they were perfectly satisfied that the boy was lying to excuse his failure to prepare for the examination. Secondly, if evidence for the assertion that these "suspicions" concerning the real state of the

case "must have" arisen "before many minutes" is based on the assumption that "the next boy could not possibly have construed the passage either", it is untenable, for it begs a very important question. And thirdly, it is known from Lee's statement that the examination continued for an hour after March was punished. Finally, as will be seen from what follows, the boy's "guilt" was not doubted either by Arnold, Lee, Grenfell, or Bird himself until the following morning. There is no question of the unpublished material lending any support to the notion that "awful suspicions" were growing, either in the lesson itself or throughout the day on which the incident happened.

9.(B): "That afternoon young March attended his classes, but stayed away from school in his boarding house for the next two days."³³

This is factually correct:

"The Boy was punished about 12 o'Clock on Friday; he remained in School as usual the whole of that Day, and the next Morning staid out of School ... He staid out of School in this Manner both Saturday and Sunday; ..." (L.423).

10.(B): "When this was reported, it seemed to Arnold a simple case of malingering, for in his opinion the punishment he had given out in the classroom had hardly been sufficient to need convalescence, even if the boy were small and even after eighteen lashes. After all, he had his own personal experience to guide him, for as a boy he had malingered in the sick bay at Winchester over twenty years before. Young March had missed two

days' lessons - it seemed obvious, in common justice, that he should be confined to strict work in extra hours to make up for time lost."³⁴

The significance of the new evidence is shown once more when this passage is considered. The general reader might well believe from this that Arnold's interpretation of the boy's absence was callous, a belief the Herald delighted in fostering, but the evidence shows that the words "seemed" and "opinion" are out of place: Arnold knew the boy was malingering, and this was on the evidence of the boy's own housemaster, Bird. Nor must it be thought that the boy was in a sick-bay, he was not even in bed. The boy's absence from school had been noticed by Arnold:

"... but as several Boys were unwell at the time from colds I made no particular enquiry about it, ..." (L.443),

which confirms that Arnold did not suspect his absence was connected with his punishment. The impression was further confirmed when the routine note was sent to him by the boy's housemaster:

"... in the evening one of the usual notes was sent to me from Mr Bird 'March ill;'" (L.443).

Arnold spoke to Bird about the matter on the Monday morning, since on the previous evening:

"... it was suggested to me whether the boy could be staying out of School in consequence of his punishment. I thought it hardly possible ..." (L.443).

It then transpired that Bird had not even spoken to the boy; he had signed the note, without enquiry, on the strength of a remark that March had made to Bird's house-servant:

"... I found that he had signed the Note merely on his Servant's Report of the Boy's Statement, that he had made no Inquiry about it, and that no medical Man had been sent for; ..." (L.423).

Not only had Bird not followed the established routine in cases of illness, which was particularly culpable in these circumstances, but enquiries revealed that the boy had been behaving quite normally throughout and showing no ill-effects of his punishment or anything else. He was neither in "the sick bay" nor even in bed. Arnold complains:

"... the Boy all the Time going about as usual in his Boarding House, dining with the other Boys, and being just as fit to go into School as if he had never been punished at all. Had Mr Bucknill³⁵ been sent for, he would have sent the Boy into School directly; and it is a general Rule of the School that no Boy shall stay out of School without being seen by the medical Man; but in this case it was not observed, and my character was thus exposed to a most heavy Imputation." (L.423).

In short, the evidence showed that the boy was malingering and that Bird had been grossly negligent in his conduct to the extent that Arnold's character had been seriously impugned. He was justifiably annoyed:

"... I did then speak strongly to Mr Bird, complaining of his negligence, and of the deceit of the Boy ..." (L.443).

The sequence of events has been interrupted by discovering March's absence from his lessons. The received account continues:

11.(B): "It soon transpired that the lad had been right all along, and that Bird had made a mistake, so that the boy had received punishment, been called a liar publicly, and had further injustice piled on him all for nothing, since he had been innocent all the time."³⁶

If the various points are taken in order, the new evidence shows that the real state of the case was not discovered until the day after the punishment:

"... the following morning immediately after prayers Mr Bird asked to speak with me, and told me that he now found that the mistake was his own; ..." (L.443).

It will be recalled that March had claimed Bird had told the form they would be examined from chapter three of their text. After the examination Bird returned to his house and found his boarders incensed at what had happened. He then visited Grenfell and Lee who says:

"At 4 o'Clock in the Afternoon of the same day Mr Bird came to me expressing his regret that March had been flogg'd as it had created a sensation among the boys of his house. He indulged in most intemperate language against Dr Arnold and without assigning any cause for his anger, was most violent in expressing his dissatisfaction at the boy's punishment."

Lee and Bird then went to see Arnold, but it should be noted that the conversation they had with him still left no doubt that March had been lying; Lee says:

"Mr Bird then attempted to extenuate the Boy's conduct, alleging that himself had told the boys to commence the examination at the beginning of the 2nd. Chapter of the Book. Observing he avoided the question of the boy's guilt I then in Dr Arnold's presence asked him to state distinctly whether the boy had read the passage set in the half year or not, to which he replied, 'Yes he had.' On my remarking the boy was (sic) then guilty of falsehood, Mr Bird admitted it, but observed he had not meant (sic) to be so, as he had been told to begin at C.2,".

So on the afternoon of the day that the flogging took place, Bird's testimony is still in conflict with March's in that Bird maintains chapter two was the starting point.³⁷ His reference to March's not having "meant" to lie refers to the fact that Bird maintained the end of that chapter had been read out of sequence, and the boy had probably forgotten this when he came to revise for the examination. The main point, of course, was still the fact that March had done the passage in question, a point which Arnold put directly to Bird in this conversation:

"... I asked Mr Bird 'whether he had really done it.' to which he said, 'yes, he had done it, but I am convinced that he did not deny it intentionally' - or words to that effect." (L.443).

To separate questions from Lee and Arnold, therefore, Bird had declared that March had done the passage presented to him. The question of the

boy's intent was, naturally, a matter of opinion. Arnold felt that, "... the Circumstances satisfied me that it could not have been mere Forgetfulness." (L.423), and he had, moreover, previous knowledge of March's character:

"Mr Anstey who had had him in his form in French had reported him to me some time before as a shuffling boy, and this agreeing with my own impression of his manner, certainly led me to conclude that as Mr Bird again allowed his statement to be incorrect in itself but only argued for the innocence of his motives, I could judge of his motives as correctly as Mr Bird."(L.443).

On the following morning, the day after the flogging, Bird discovered, apparently for the first time, that he had told the form to begin at chapter three after all; in fact, they had started the term's work at that chapter. March was vindicated:

"...he now found that the mistake was his own; that the Form had begun at the beginning of the half year at the third chapter; and that thus the Boy had really stated the fact, when he said that he had not done the end of the second chapter at all." (L.443);

"... that not only was his written Report erroneous, but that his own Book had been marked erroneously, and had completely misled him." (L.423).

At this point, it is convenient to review the various statements which have been made about the conduct of the examination.

The report which the examiners had before them of the work done by

Bird's class stated that they had covered the first three chapters and more of Xenophon's Hellenics. Despite the fact that Bird finally claimed the form had started at chapter three, the inconsistencies in his various explanations are such that the reader may feel that it is now impossible to ascertain exactly what the boys in his form had done. Moreover, Bird's veracity cannot be accepted unquestioningly, for, as will be shown later, there was antipathy between him and Arnold; Bird saw himself as the champion of the Lower School; he was strongly suspected to be the source from which the Herald was deriving its information; and his subsequent conduct towards Arnold and Lee isolated him from the rest of the staff. Since it was his repeated mistakes that had caused the punishment, it is possible that the inconsistencies in his statements reflect an attempt to clear the boy yet disguise his own culpability. Given the nature of the information available, explanations can only be speculative.

If the form did start the term's work at chapter three, questions arise about what the earlier boys had been translating. It is possible that nobody other than March had been asked to construe from the first two chapters of the Hellenics. Perhaps the boys who preceded him had been asked to translate from chapter three onwards. It may be thought more likely that Arnold would have chosen passages later in the prescription to make sure that the pupils he took first had not simply revised the first few pages and nothing more. Had he started at chapter three, this would not of itself have given the boys cause to suppose that he did not know what they had prepared for the examination. If this is correct then it would be just bad-luck, because a succession of failures and protests would undoubtedly have revealed the real truth of the matter. Alternatively, it might be that questions from

the earlier chapters were given to boys who happened to be capable of a reasonable viva voce construe, one at any rate which satisfied the masters' expectations of the form. Either of these possibilities would explain Bamford's query as to why Arnold did not "think of a simple check with another lad.". For if during that first hour they had been coping fairly well, neither Arnold nor the other masters would have had reason to doubt the accuracy of Bird's report of the work done. There would have been no necessity to consult the boys who remained to be examined. And even if those boys suspected something was amiss - assuming that they could hear what was being examined - it is not really surprising that they did not speak out voluntarily. Unless they wanted a birching too, they would certainly not have wanted to argue with Arnold once it was apparently established that they were officially supposed to have done more than they had been told. But even if Bird's final explanation is queried, and his previous statement of why a portion of the work had been covered out of sequence is accepted to show that some, at least, of the earlier chapters had been done, the masters' case is not at all weakened. In such circumstances, it might be that those boys who had been in the form from the beginning of the term had done some, if not all, of the first two chapters, and that because others had joined the class later, Bird told them to prepare for the examination from chapter three because this was a convenient starting point for all. This point he subsequently forgot when preparing the statement of work done. It is possible, therefore, that boys had been examined on the first two chapters, but they happened to be boys who had been in the form from the beginning and so were able to achieve a translation which, even though they might not have prepared it in advance, was of a sufficient standard. It

will be remembered that they were a poor form, so such a translation need not have been of a very high quality, but one which was, nevertheless, acceptable enough not to awaken the masters' suspicions that they had never done the work. These are all possibilities, and they are by no means exhaustive; but lack of evidence makes further speculation fruitless. The one fact is that the whole unfortunate incident was largely caused by the succession of errors made by the form-master, Bird.

Bamford is correct in saying that March had been called a liar and punished unjustly; but had he also "... had further injustice piled on him ..."? This refers to the detention the boy suffered for missing school, a point which derives from the newspaper accounts and which Arnold himself rebutted in the Northampton Mercury of 16 February 1833 along with the allegation that a doctor had been called. Since Bird was negligent and did not call for the doctor, and nobody else apparently thought one was required, all that can be said on the basis of the new evidence is that the impression left by March's activities on the masters who saw him was that he was behaving quite normally. Bird had even said so in front of the assembled school:

"... Mr Bird ... expressed his Belief publicly before the School that the Boy had staid out without Reason, and that he would not allow such a Thing on another Occasion." (L.423).

In completing the sequence of events given by the received account, comment must be made about the alleged reaction of March's family.

12.(B): "At once Arnold was filled with remorse. He told the lad how sorry he was, told the class so as well and even went so far as to apologise to him

in front of the whole School. The apology came too late in one respect at least. The boy's parents took action. Their child was a weak, delicate lad who had suffered a rupture at the age of three. With harsh words at such shocking brutality, they took the boy away, but allowed him to go back only on receiving a full and abject apology in writing. The story broke in the Press on 19 January 1833 with remarkably few exaggerations."³⁸

The first sentence of this - which shows Arnold's moral courage and reflects his character - is true. However, a completely different picture of the events which followed the apology emerges from the unpublished letters. Once Bird's mistake was discovered, Arnold immediately apologised to the boy and to his father:

"All that could be done was to exculpate the Boy in the most public Manner, and to express my sincere Regret at what had happened. This I did before the whole School at a calling over, and I wrote also to the Father of the Boy to the same Effect." (L.423).

On the question of the boy's removal, "the harsh words" from the parents "at such shocking brutality", and their eventual, if reluctant, decision to allow him to return, Arnold says:

"The Paper states that the Boy has been removed by his Parents from the School. I have received no Notice from them to this Effect, but immediately on receiving the Paper, I wrote myself to the Boy's Father, requesting that in any Case he might not

return; stating of Course that I did not mean to expel the Boy, or to attach any Discredit to him; but that his Name having been so made public, he could not be placed without great Inconvenience under my Authority again; as any Punishment which he might incur hereafter would be sure to be misconstrued, and ascribed to a vindictive Recollection of the late Affair." (L.423).

So despite the press speculation about the boy's removal and the parents' attitude, Arnold had not, in fact, received any communication from March's family. This was at the end of January 1833. On 10 February Arnold wrote to Lord Denbigh:

"Your Opinion with Regard to the Boy's Return to the School has of Course great Weight with me. His Friends are very anxious that he should come back, and I have consented accordingly to receive him, ... (L.427, my emphasis).

This puts the actual state of affairs in a completely different light. March's parents were not waiting for a full apology, since they had already had one on the very day on which the mistake was discovered. It appears that Arnold's subsequent letter to them stating that he did not wish their son to return was not received by an outraged household which had already decided not to send the boy back to such a brutal institution. On the contrary, his letter actually caused them distress since they were most anxious that their son should return to his school. Arnold's inclinations had been to refuse, but he eventually consented on Lord Denbigh's advice. As Denbigh himself later wrote:

"... nothing can make your vindication more

Triumphant than the anxiety evinced by the Parents
of the Boy for his return to ye School."^{38A}

The account of events given by Arnold contradicts that of the received version, and radically affects the reader's understanding of the situation. And since March did return to the school, the inherent dangers in an unquestioning acceptance of the version of events chronicled in the columns of a hostile newspaper are quite obvious.

The new evidence provided by the unpublished papers enables the reader to draw his own conclusions on whether the March case was reported "with remarkably few exaggerations" or not.³⁹ It is convenient to summarise the various ways in which the factual basis of the received version of events has been modified. The letters have shown that three masters witnessed the events leading up to March's punishment, not two; that Bird's form was the fourth form; that it had not worked well in a previous examination; that the examination in question lasted for two hours; that it was on Xenophon's Hellenics, not his Anabasis; that March was not the first boy called, others had preceded him; that he did not immediately object when given the passage, but began to construe it then stuck; that it was only then he declared that Bird had told the form the examination was to be from chapter three of the book; that Bird was positive and circumstantial in his reply that the boy was lying; that Bird knew March would be flogged if he (Bird) were wrong about the work done by the form; that the three masters present were unanimous in their understanding of Bird's answer; that added to this, there was previous knowledge of March's "shuffling" behaviour; that the number of strokes given to March was directly related to the fact that "the instruments" used

were old and worn-out; that none of the masters involved doubted that justice had not been done until the following day; that March was not absent from school for two days on account of his injuries; that he was not in the sick-bay nor even in bed; that Arnold apologised unreservedly to March's parents on the day he learned the truth; that they wished their son to return to the school; that Arnold at first was reluctant to have him back; and that the reports on which the received account is based are derived from a prejudiced source hostile to Arnold and coloured accordingly.

Much more information on the March case exists than was previously thought. It is clear that the reader must now take all the evidence into consideration when evaluating the matter, and consider whose interpretation of events is likely to be more accurate and to carry the most authority. But since the source of the received version of the story has coloured its presentation, and it seems to be on this one incident that Arnold's "public reputation as a flogger" is based,⁴⁰ it is only equitable that an interpretation of the case which weighs the facts from his point of view is given, to judge whether such an interpretation is sufficient to repudiate so grave a charge. Yet before this can be done, one essential point has to be examined in more detail: the alleged "severity of the beating"; for it is this aspect of the case which has been most frequently quoted.

March received eighteen strokes of the birch, a number which the Northampton Herald siezed upon as an example of brutality, and out of all proportion to the alleged offence. The received account echoes this view, and claims to find support in the letter sent to the press by the masters⁴¹ in support of Arnold as seeming:

"... to confirm the worst fears that brutality

did exist. If eighteen lashes were given for a moderately minor offence of this kind, and this new letter only confirmed that it was the usual thing ...".⁴²

The claim that Arnold should have waited before punishing March, "so that flogging and passion should not coincide", is also repeated from the press.⁴³

On the question of the letter which "the staff at Rugby" sent to the press, the facts as given in the received account are not entirely accurate. The "letter" was actually a "paper" sent to Arnold in the immediate aftermath of the affair, before the term had ended, and before any mention of the case appeared in the press. Even if there were no other evidence, this would be simply proved by the date it bears, "Dec. 1st. 1832.". It was not sent by the masters as a public response to the attacks on Arnold in the Northampton Herald, for they did not appear until January 1833. The circumstances in which it was drawn up were these. Immediately the mistake was discovered, a dispute arose between Bird and Lee over the nature of the reply Bird gave when Lee asked him whether March was lying about the work he had done in class.⁴⁴ Arnold asked the other masters to investigate the whole March affair:

"As some Parts of this Business involved Mr Bird in rather an unpleasant Manner, I requested the other Assistant Masters to consider the whole Question ... I have their written Opinions on the Subject signed unanimately, ..." (L.423).

The received account draws attention to the fact that Bird had not signed the masters' statement:

"Bird, it will be noticed, did not sign.", which implies that he dissented from the support which the other masters were giving to Arnold. Whatever Bird thought of that document, the plain fact is that it was never intended that he should sign it, since the masters were, inter alia, investigating his own conduct in the affair.

Only a fragment of this paper is quoted in the received account, and that to show that "brutality did exist" at the school:

"... the punishment was no more than such a fault, if really committed, deserved. ...'... (this) seemed to confirm the worst fears that brutality did exist."⁴⁵

But this divorces the quotation from its context, which was the presentation to Arnold of the masters' conclusions after their investigation into the whole affair. The entire business was extraordinary, including the punishment, it was by no means the usual state of things. The complete text shows clearly the circumstances in which it was compiled:

"At a Meeting of the Assistant Masters held on Wednesday, Nov. 28th. it was cordially and unanimously agreed that a Vote of Thanks be presented to Dr. Arnold for his Conduct throughout the distressing Matters which they as mediating Parties had met to investigate. The undersigned Assistant Masters think it due to Dr. Arnold to confirm this Vote, and to express as the Grounds of it their entire Conviction that Dr. Arnold acted in the first

Instance with due Deliberation and on the most satisfactory Evidence, that the Punishment was no more than such a Fault, if really committed, deserved; and subsequently and throughout that Dr. Arnold was influenced by no private Feelings but solely by a Sense of what was due to his own Character as Headmaster and to the general Character and Discipline of the School.

Dec. 1st. 1832.'" (L.427).

The paper had not been drawn up with the intention of sending it to the press, since the matter had not yet appeared in the newspapers. It was a purely internal affair at first. The document was actually sent to the press by Arnold himself, some two months after it had been submitted to him. In a letter to Lord Denbigh, dated 10 February 1833 (L.427), Arnold explains that the masters desired him to use the document as he wished. At that point, the press were not involved, the question chiefly concerned what action Arnold might take against Bird. In fact, he decided not to proceed with the findings of the internal enquiry and had allowed the matter to drop. It was only when the press publicity began that he chose to publish the masters' paper giving their conclusions:

"... I intended to have kept them unpublished, as I wished the whole Thing to go to Rest. For the same Reason I did not intend to trouble your Lordship with it. But this Statement in the Northampton Herald, which I understand is talked of all over Rugby, will oblige me as soon as I return Home to make the Declaration of the Masters'

Opinions as public as possible." (L.423).

The statement was then sent to the Northampton Mercury and appeared in their issue of 16 February 1833, from where it was reproduced by the Herald on 22 February 1833.

The claim that Arnold acted in haste can now be considered. Arnold answered this charge himself:

"I punished the Boy on the Spot; as I have done seldom certainly, but on one or two previous Occasions, when I thought that the Immediateness of the Punishment would produce a striking Effect; and there were then about ten or a dozen Boys in the Room, ..." (L.423).

It will be recalled that he was dealing with a "poor" form - they had already done badly in an earlier examination - and it seems he decided that an "instant" punishment would constitute an effective warning, not only to the boy himself, but to them all. Before he birched March, Arnold had called him a liar, which he believed he was. But though he probably was very angry with March, the fact that he said this does not prove he had completely lost his self-control and was beating the boy unremittingly in a berserk rage.⁴⁶

The newspaper claimed that the number of strokes delivered was excessive and brutal. Arnold rejected this charge completely on the basis of two points: the poor quality of "the instruments" in question, and the subsequent behaviour of the boy. First of all he points out that March spent the rest of the day quite normally in school, and even on the two following days when he was allegedly absent ill, he was not even in bed but was seen behaving just as usual with his friends and showing no sign of discomfort (L.423). No doctor was ever required

and nobody in authority had, at any time, cause to think he was doing anything other than malingering. If his housemaster had only done his duty when he was first notified that the boy was not attending school, the story of March's absence through illness would never have gained credence, and Arnold's own character been,

"... exposed ... to the most gratuitous & most unpleasant Charge of having punished a Boy to an Excess amounting to Cruelty." (L.435).

This evidence alone puts the alleged "severity" of the beating into perspective. It should not be thought that the boy had been so badly thrashed that he was forced to retire to bed for two days while recovering from the serious injuries he had sustained. On the question of the number of strokes, the real crux of the matter, Arnold says:

"... the Reason why they were so many was simply because the Instruments were old & almost worn out, from my punishing the Boy at once with what I found in the Closet, instead of sending as is usual for fresh ones. I am really ashamed to be obliged to write seriously to your Lordship on such a Subject." (L.426).

He freely admits that eighteen strokes was a large number, but says the reason for this was simply because he was using a birch or birches which were worn-out. So the case really turns upon the effects a worn-out birch might have. Although independent evidence for evaluating this defence is not extensive, some does exist.

On the whole question of flogging in the schools the evidence is largely anecdotal. A recent commentator has observed that among the important, though uncertain, factors are the number of strokes

delivered and the quality of the instruments used, and has suggested that by the beginning of the nineteenth century, the number of strokes delivered had become unofficially limited to a maximum of twelve.⁴⁷ In which case, Arnold delivered six strokes over the "maximum" - his justification for so doing, of course, lying in the condition of the birch he used. But practices varied, and many examples exist in the autobiographical literature of the nineteenth century which show this upper limit being matched and exceeded. They also provide evidence for the nature of the offences which incurred such penalties. A convenient source for such information is the literature of Eton College, where:

"The birch and the block loomed large ... as though it were some kind of penal establishment."⁴⁸

Writing about the 1840's, Arthur Lubbock recalls that,

"... for smiling at the faces that one of the masters made in his endeavour to sing in chapel, ... I had, fourteen cuts with two birches."⁴⁹

At a slightly earlier date, Ralph Nevill records that for intoxication, the punishment was "... twelve cuts with two birches, ...";⁵⁰ he also mentions that the Rev J.L. Joynes "... tempered the severity of his floggings according to the offence ...", although he does not reveal "the offence" for which he launched:

"... with a will into a boy ... who ... although he received some thirty-two strokes, administered with two birches (the first one after a time became useless ...), never flinched in the least, ...".⁵¹

Gilbert Coleridge, writing of events in the 1870's, records the

Rev F.L. Durnford's practice of giving "... ten or fourteen cuts ..." if the boy chose to position himself in a way which prevented "... the ends of the birch curling round ..." his body.⁵² Moreover boys could be punished twice or even three times a day; there is an account of fifty cuts being given over two days for repeated impudence.⁵³ Was eighteen strokes with worn-out implements so exceptional; was it as severe as the cumulative effects of, for example, twelve strokes delivered with fresh birches? The significant factor in the March case is the remark that "the instruments" were old and worn-out. Certainly Arnold felt that this rebutted the charge completely. Evidence can be adduced which seems to confirm that a worn-out birch was indeed an ineffective weapon.

From the preceding examples it will be noted that more than one birch was often used when a larger number of strokes was delivered: "... twelve cuts with two birches ...", "... fourteen cuts with two birches.". It can be argued that the reason for this was that a single birch very quickly lost its elasticity and thus its corrective power. An example which confirms this is cited by Wasey Sterry, who records a whole class being flogged for insolence, and

"... soundly flogged too; for it was not the normal five ... but the abnormal two-rod-ten ...".⁵⁴

Take this example with those preceding, and it suggests that a birch rapidly lost its effectiveness after six or seven strokes. This, of course, is the reason why Arnold says it was "usual for fresh ones." to be used when punishing a boy, a fact confirmed by Nevill:

"A dozen new rods were supposed to be at hand in the cupboard every morning, for there was no calculating the number of floggings that

might be inflicted in a day."⁵⁵

And he goes on to record an incident where,

"... there were only three birches available, six boys were to be flogged. The Head flogged three ... and adjourned the others (until fresh birches could be brought)".⁵⁶

If this evidence is accepted, then it confirms Arnold's reason for giving a larger number of strokes than was normal.

March received six strokes more than the alleged maximum. But it was not a new birch that was being used. Even if a new one had been used, it would have been quickly rendered inefficient after six or seven strokes. For ten or more strokes, two birches would normally be used. Arnold delivered eighteen strokes with old, worn-out "instruments". The defective nature of the implements rendered every stroke less and less effective. It might be that he deemed this number of strokes to be equivalent to a lesser number with a fresh birch. That does not convict him of brutality. Naturally the worn-out implements would have had some effect upon the boy, but the point is that Arnold did not feel that the number of strokes was excessive given the condition of these. And from his subsequent behaviour, apparently neither did March. Thus an explanation can be provided which confirms Arnold's opinion and renders the charge of excessive punishment amounting to brutality not proven.

This only leaves the question of the nature of the offence to be considered. Although the Northampton Herald stated that Arnold acted in haste, this can hardly be maintained given the categorical statement made by Bird, which left no doubt on any of the masters who

heard it, that the boy was lying. Arnold not only had a list in Bird's handwriting of the work done by his form, but his particularised confirmation that March was wrong. An explanation has already been given of why there was no need to make a subsequent appeal to the class, and in the circumstances there was no reason for Arnold repeatedly to question Bird's confirmation. The received account speculates on the boy's behaviour at the time:

"True innocence has an aura about itself that has to be almost literally torn away in righteous indignation. So it was in this case. The whole situation had gone past logic and past sense."⁵⁷

which implies that Arnold was acting illogically in a towering rage. But who knows how the boy behaved at the time? He was a boy with a character described as "shuffling". Rather than virtuously protesting his innocence, he may well have been looking anywhere but at Arnold and the other masters. His demeanour may well have strengthened their opinion that he was behaving deceitfully. As for the logic: what more could Arnold have done except to challenge Bird's veracity; and why should he? Who was in a better position to know the work which had been done by that form if not its form-master? Bird continued to believe that he was right and the boy wrong until the following day, despite being questioned again. And the offence was, as Bamford correctly says, "blatant":

"... persistent telling of lies to authority, even after proof of guilt. ... futile protests ... in the face of concrete evidence ... the most exasperating situation possible."⁵⁸

This was no slight offence either, given the importance Arnold attached to honesty. It is known that he abhorred lying - and the school knew it too. His avowed principle was not to assume a boy guilty until proven otherwise, but rather to trust a boy's word implicitly. Stanley makes this point clearly:

"Hence his wish ... of making them respect themselves by the mere respect he showed to them ... Lying, for example, to the masters, he made a great moral offence; placing implicit confidence in a boy's assertion, and then, if a falsehood was discovered, punishing it severely, ... 'If you say so, that is quite enough - of course I believe your word;' and there grew up in consequence a general feeling that 'it was a shame to tell Arnold a lie - he always believes one.'"⁵⁹

March, therefore, appeared to be committing a very serious offence, a fact which explains Arnold's reaction and puts the comment that this was only "a moderately minor offence" in perspective.

If the unpublished material is used to give an account of the March case from Arnold's point of view, a radically different picture emerges from that presented by the received version, which relies upon the second-hand reports of the Northampton Herald. Arnold and two other masters were conducting the examination of a set of boys who had done badly in a previous test. They had a written list of the work the form was to be examined upon. Halfway through the examination, one boy, March, found himself unable to construe more than the beginning

of his portion. This boy was known to have a dubious character. Despite the fact that he had begun to construe the piece, he then denied he had ever done the passage as part of his classwork. A check was made with the form's master, who replied in detail that the boy was wrong, in the full knowledge of the consequences. Those who heard this reply were left in no doubt about its meaning. When faced with seemingly irrefutable evidence, the boy continued to maintain that he was right and the master wrong. Arnold was faced with a boy apparently lying to excuse his laziness in not preparing for the examination. Lying was a crime the school knew to be greatly offensive to Arnold. He gave the boy eighteen strokes of the birch because the implements he used were old and worn-out and therefore inefficient. He gave the punishment immediately because of the nature of the crime and because he wished to impress its gravity upon all the boys. All the masters present agreed that justice had apparently been done. March was not confined to his bed through the punishment, and whenever seen over the two following days was behaving quite normally. His absence from school was found to be a case of malingering. Arnold showed his moral courage and integrity by making a full and public apology, both to the boy and his parents, immediately Bird's mistake was discovered. March's parents did not remove the boy from the school, and actually protested at Arnold's initial decision not to readmit him. The masters who investigated the whole affair supported Arnold's actions unanimously. And finally, the interpretation of events given by the Northampton Herald can be explained on the grounds of political hostility to Arnold. Against all this, the received version gives the view that Arnold acted in haste, without sufficient enquiry, and in a frenzy of moral outrage flogged the boy with such

cruel excess that he was left unfit to return to school for two days.

The imputation of cruelty is a serious charge. Therefore it is essential that all the information that is available be considered before judgement is passed. It is probable that Arnold was angry - but not necessarily beside himself with rage. To the modern eye, eighteen strokes does seem like a large number - but "the instruments" were worn-out, so the number does not necessarily prove that Arnold had lost control. And the boy was not incapacitated. The reader will form his own judgement, but the value of the unpublished correspondence is undoubted because it enables virtually every point in the received account to be refuted or explained in a way which acquits Arnold of the charge of brutality. It directly contradicts much of the previously accepted factual record of the case. Yet apparently on the evidence of one hostile newspaper is based Arnold's "public reputation as a flogger" - and the charge has not been questioned. It has supported a characterisation of Arnold as a flogger of children, "at which he was such a master";⁶⁰ as a man who saw that it provided "the reason and excuse" for driving inherited evil out of them, a taint which "could be driven out by lashing".⁶¹ And it has created a false impression of the punishments he delivered at the school:

"The severest punishments at Rugby were for breaches of trust, such as a lie to a master."⁶²

But all the evidence which has so far been discovered shows that this was an exceptional case. If Arnold was regularly flogging boys to dangerous excess, it is remarkable that some echo of this has not come down to posterity given the scrutiny to which his life at Rugby

has been exposed; if not in the recall of actual incidents, then as a reminiscence of Arnold's character. Yet it was not until the March case was disclosed that any hint that he might have been notorious for such practices was revealed. Nevertheless, the story has been repeated. Working from the received version, the latest commentator says:

"... a brutal abuse of corporal punishment
was discovered - a small, delicate boy, ...
flogged to dangerous excess - the perpetrator
... the enlightened Dr Arnold of tender scruples
and delicate conscience ... Had he been more
careful ... the truth could have been ascertained
at the time ... It was indefensible to inflict
a flogging of such severity upon any small boy
... Arnold had lost control ..." ⁶³

etcetera. This demonstrates the value of the new material, for it enables the reader to judge the validity of such comments, particularly the source from which they derive.

It may fairly be asked if the unpublished letters disclose any other information on the subject of flogging at the school, and if so, whether this might lend support to the view that Arnold was a "master" at the practice.

Although flogging was an accepted part of the nineteenth century educational system,⁶⁴ it has been noted that Arnold went to Rugby with the intention of making the birch a weapon of last resort. Whitridge presumed that Arnold flogged as little as possible;⁶⁵ while Wymer emphasised that the birch was only used reluctantly, and says that Arnold was exceptionally moderate, so that by 1832 "corporal punishment was less in evidence than ever before".⁶⁶ Initially, the evidence shows that Arnold succeeded, for the school he inherited was not in a bad state. Writing in September 1828, in a letter published in The Life, he reports that:

"There has been no flogging yet, (and I hope that there will be none,) ..." (L.264).

This was a promising start, and Arnold recorded the fact with surprise, for he was under no illusions about the task he had undertaken. Although the degree of flogging varied from school to school - at Eton, under Dr Keate for example, it has been estimated that between ten and forty boys a day were flogged -⁶⁷ it would have been unusual had such a state of affairs continued. It has been stated that:

"It was a phase that did not last long, for he soon resorted to the traditional method, although at first it was slight ...".⁶⁸

If "at first" there was very little flogging, the question is what is the evidence which shows that the situation soon deteriorated, to the extent that Arnold acquired "a public reputation" as a flogger. The

statement was made in connection with the March case and the detailed evidence which it provided. It has, however, been demonstrated that the March affair can be explained without depicting Arnold as a merciless flogger. Nevertheless, it has been asserted that the affair was only exceptional in that it publicised⁶⁹ a practice at which Arnold was such a "master". Yet the only other evidence given in support is conjectural. From a detached quotation taken from the statement written by the masters to Arnold:

"... the punishment was no more than such a fault, if really committed, deserved ...",⁷⁰

the inference was made that this:

"... seemed to confirm the worst fears that brutality did exist. If eighteen lashes were given for a moderately minor offence of this kind, and this new letter only confirmed that it was the usual thing, then what on earth did they do to a boy convicted of stealing, ...".⁷¹

But it has been shown that the document in question confirmed no such thing. Eighteen strokes was not "the usual thing", it was exceptional and accounted for by the condition of the "instruments". The emphasis Arnold placed on telling the truth refutes the claim that this was "a moderately minor offence"; for, as David Newsome observes: "To Arnold, falsehood was the disease most likely to corrupt all his work."⁷² Moreover the inference that this was the "usual thing" takes no account of the circumstances in which the document was written: after an investigation of the whole case, which included the condition of "the instruments" used in relation to the number of

strokes given by them. If this one case is recognised for what it is, and excepted, what other evidence supports the charge? Assertion is not proof, and the charge of brutality had never been made previously. Of the published sources, none of the references to flogging in The Life or the autobiographical accounts of the period would lead the reader to the conclusion that Arnold might have had such a well known reputation - let alone deserved it. Therefore can the charge be sustained by the unpublished material, for it does contain some statistical evidence on the subject of flogging?

Bamford remarks correctly that flogging at first,

"... was slight - seven boys only in his first half.",⁷³

information probably derived from Wymer,⁷⁴ who quoted part of a previously unpublished letter (L.282) to Dr Longley, the Headmaster of Harrow, when making the same point. This is not the first reference to flogging in the correspondence, however, for the unpublished L.267, written to Arnold's Oxford friend, Henry Jenkyns, in October 1828, refers to the same subject. One of the "seven boys only" in that first half was a relative of Jenkyns, who,

"... though a clever Boy, & forward in the School, he is one of the most unpromising Characters in it, violent & cruel tempered, & I fear very hard & unprincipled: he is one of the only three Boys that I have yet flogged, and that was for a third Offence, all in Points of Conduct, insulting the Townspeople, etc. I think however that he did not like his Castigation, for I operated

with a special good Rod, & with my best Ability; and I hope that the Recollection of it may do him Good." (L.267).

The fact that this was the third offence the boy had committed presumably confirms that Arnold had tried remonstrating with him on two previous occasions, and since talking had done no good he had finally resorted to the ultima ratio. The example also provides more evidence for the difference in the quality of birches. L.272 and L.282 also contain references to flogging. L.272, written at the end of December 1828, merely records that only seven boys out of the whole 160 have been flogged, that punishment of any kind has been rare, and that no irregular chastisement ("boxing ears") is countenanced. The letter also emphasises that he considers wilful and habitual idleness to be a serious crime.⁷⁵ The tenor of his remarks confirms that the moral state of the school he had taken over was good. The final piece of statistical evidence provided by the correspondence lies in L.282, written in April 1829, and partially reproduced by Wymer.⁷⁶ This again refers to his very first term and confirms that seven boys only were beaten. There is no more statistical information in the letters which sheds light on Arnold's use of the birch, although there are references to specific incidents and disorders which will be considered later.

The evidence so far merely confirms that in his first term at Rugby, he was pursuing the principle of using the birch sparingly, and to that extent had beaten only seven boys. If this were all the information available, then the scale of his floggings at the school would have to be a matter for conjecture. More unpublished statistical evidence exists, however, in the form of two of Arnold's Diaries.

These are mainly concerned with the years 1838 and 1839.⁷⁷ They record, inter alia, the days on which he flogged various boys, their names, the master who had requested the punishment, and sometimes the crime concerned.

Analysis of these books shows that seven boys were flogged between 5 April 1838 and 4 June 1838; five between 18 September 1838 and 12 October 1838; six between 18 March and 10 June 1839; and fourteen between 5 September 1839 and 7 December 1839. Moreover there are no records of any floggings outside these dates (some of which would, of course, include school holidays). Thirteen of the floggings were delivered to boys reported by other masters. The specific crimes mentioned are as follows: "Smith mi. for bullying"; "Flogged Adam for hissing"; "Brooke for forging a note"; Marshall mi. for writing in closet"; "Hammond for a lie"; "Marshall ma. for a lie"; "Parker, Crompton for drinking"; "... Flogged Thursby for copying" - this refers to a Divinity examination; "Holford mi. for smoking". This is interesting new information for it confirms Stanley's catalogue of "lying and drinking" and reveals some of the other "moral" offences for which such a punishment was inflicted: bullying, forgery, smoking, cheating, and rudeness. A note of caution must be sounded about the interpretation of these statistics. With two possible exceptions - "Flogged Conybeare 3. for Buckoll" and Flogged "Bright 3 times for Moorsom's Row."⁷⁸ - the number of strokes delivered is not recorded. Moreover it cannot be stated unequivocally that Arnold recorded every flogging he delivered in these books. On the other hand, they are detailed, systematic, and generally chronological documents. If they do constitute a complete record of all the floggings he delivered each term, then the figures are remarkably low.

In fact their average reflects that of his first term at the school ten years previously. If these unpublished statistics are taken with those from the first term, and the March case is excepted as an abnormal incident, there is simply nothing else on which to indict Arnold as a regular and merciless flogger. On the contrary, the numerical evidence available suggests that he was carrying out his principle of using the birch with moderation. This would support the view of Arnold given by Stanley, Whitridge, and particularly Wymer.

In conclusion, therefore, the following points must be noted. The account which first repeated the claim that Arnold had a public reputation as a flogger offers no evidence other than the March case to support it. For many years in the 1830 s Arnold had to face the snipings of a hostile press eager to seize upon anything in his management of the school which could be used against him. In the case of the boy March, an incident in which it has been possible to check their assertions in detail, discrepancies have been discovered to abound. Apart from the press, no other source had previously been discovered which suggested this charge. It might be expected that such a reputation would be reflected in a reduced number of admissions, yet the number of boys entering the school each year remained fairly constant.⁷⁹ Moreover, Arnold's stated policy on the subject of flogging is corroborated by the evidence relating to the subject contained in his letters and diaries. New information may appear. But the excessive and regular beating of boys is a serious charge. At the very least it detracts from Arnold's reputation as a Christian gentleman and a reformer. Because it is so serious, it needs a stronger basis than the assertions of a hostile press to prove its truth.

In continuing the theme of cases of indiscipline at the school on which the correspondence sheds light, it is convenient to examine the remaining evidence in chronological order. The March affair took place in November 1832, while in May 1833 occurred an incident of trespass on local fishing preserves which resulted in the summary expulsion of several boys and brought Arnold close to an all out revolt. The received version of the story is as follows.⁸⁰

The school rented a number of fields on the Rugby side of the river Avon, in which the boys had bathing places. Fishing was a popular sport and it seems the boys regarded the right to fish there as traditional, notwithstanding the fact that in law, the fishing rights remained with the landowner. A blind-eye was turned to a certain amount of what was, legally, poaching, though there were occasional skirmishes between boys and keepers. Full-scale hostilities, however, broke out when the boys engaged in the systematic netting of the river. In attempting to apprehend a group so engaged, a keeper ended up in the water while the boys escaped. The landowner, Mr Boughton Leigh, demanded that Arnold identify them. Arnold appealed to his Sixth Form to produce the culprits, but such was the feeling in the school that they either could not, or would not, provide Arnold with the names. An identity parade was then held at which the keeper identified a number of the boys, whom Arnold instantly expelled. The school was outraged and rebellion was discussed, but owing chiefly to the personal influence of three of his Praepostors, Vaughan, Lake, and Stanley, wiser counsels finally prevailed. Arnold was in no doubt of the justice of his actions, and characteristically declared to the assembled school that:

"It is not necessary that this should be a school of
three hundred, or one hundred, or of fifty boys; but

it is necessary that it should be a school of Christian gentlemen.'".⁸¹

The incident achieved more than local notice and was mentioned in the London press.⁸² The received accounts rightly stress the feeling in the school and the hostility Arnold encountered, though their attribution of the cause of this, to the boys' loss of ancestral fishing rights, as well as the expulsions, can be qualified by the correspondence.

There is only one reference to the event in the extant letters, but this both adds to and modifies the published accounts. In L.437, written to Lord Denbigh the day after the incident occurred, Arnold refers to:

"... several of the Boys having trespassed on Mr Boughton Leigh's Preserves of Fish at Brownsover; and after resisting his Keeper's Demand for their Net, they were pursued by himself & his Servants, and two of them brought up Prisoners to Rugby. There has been a very great Deal of bad Behaviour on the Part of the Boys, and I have been obliged to send away four of them. Even now there is a great Deal of Irritation existing even in the Minds of some better disposed Boys, on Account of the supposed Affront to the School in two of their Number being dragged up the Street as Prisoners."

The most detailed of the published accounts, which is based on a letter written by Thomas Hughes, refers to the fact that Arnold had to hold an identification parade and says that six boys were recognised and expelled.⁸³ This does not accord with Arnold's letter, which refers to four boys having been sent away. Since Hughes actually names five of the six, his account has authority.⁸⁴ The explanation might be that

only four boys were expelled at the "calling over", while the other two removed were those who had been captured at the time. In addition, Arnold's letter also reveals an important point which is not mentioned in the published accounts: what appears to have been the real cause of the school's anger. It was not simply because their ancient fishing rights had been violated and boys expelled, it was more a question of honour, both the boys' in question and the school's as a whole. Two of their number had been manhandled like common felons and dragged publicly through the streets as prisoners.⁸⁵ Not only was this slight to be unavenged, but the boys - the whole Upper School - had then suffered the further indignity of an identification parade. It could be argued that personal and public humiliation of this sort would better account for the subsequent talk of insurrection than the expulsion of boys for illegal fishing, no matter how popular those boys were. Arnold himself recognised this feeling, though he had no sympathy with it; as far as he was concerned, it was a simple matter of right and wrong. The boys had "... resisted a Keeper's Legal Demand, ..." and were therefore "... properly treated by being taken to Rugby forcibly; and that they had no Right to complain ..." (L.437).⁸⁶

The next incident on which the unpublished papers give more information has also received mention in the published accounts of Arnold's life: the punishment by three Praepostors in November 1835 of Nicholas Marshall.⁸⁷ This was another case which the Tory press, both locally and nationally, seized upon as an example of brutality at the school and high-handedness by Arnold.

Of the biographers, Stanley did not refer to the matter specifically, though he quoted part of a letter which Arnold wrote about the affair, as an example of his reaction to newspaper criticism.⁸⁸ This is the

quotation (L.541) which begins, "I do not choose to discuss the thickness of Præpostors' sticks, ..."; but since Stanley omitted the preceding portion and also the date on which it was written, the context was effectively disguised.⁸⁹ The extract is designed to show Arnold's lofty disdain for newspaper attacks, though the portion which precedes the published text shows that the reason for this was his previous, bitter experience (almost certainly the March case):

"I believe that Price wanted me to answer it, but I have so far learnt wisdom by Experience, & I will answer no more any thing that appears in the newspaper." (L.541).

When the case is examined in detail, this must be remembered, since it provides the reason why Arnold did not choose to reply to the accusations publicly. Wymer and Bamford both discussed the matter, though they came to different conclusions. Wymer, whose account is based in part on a summary of the incident given by A.H. Clough, did not find anything to censure in Arnold's conduct,⁹⁰ while Bamford, who gives the more detailed account, is critical both of Arnold's behaviour and the state of affairs it suggested.⁹¹ Apart from Stanley's quotation, the newspaper accounts have been the main factual source for the story. However, a detailed statement of the case, drawn up by the boy's father has survived.⁹² Since this contains information not present in the biographers' accounts, it can be used as a basis on which to compare their interpretation of events. Quotations from this statement are referred to thus, "(Stat.)".

Nicholas Marshall was a large, powerfully-built boy in the Lower Fifth. On Friday, 13 November 1835, when Arnold and his assistants were engaged in one of their twice-weekly meetings, Marshall asked leave from Wise, a Præpostor, to go out of the school. He received permission, but was involved in some disturbance with other boys at the school door.

This meant that the disturbance was directly underneath the room in which the masters' were meeting.^{92a} Wise then told Marshall that if he did not come back into the school he would be punished ("... I will lick you well." (Stat.)). Bamford says the boy, "... no doubt felt somewhat pompous, ..." and said he would return when ready; though he is unaware that Marshall knew the consequences of refusal in advance. The boy admits this in his statement and also that his reply was offensive:

"Wise ... said, if you don't come in Marshall I will lick you well. Marshall said, very well I will come in presently but as you are going to lick me you may as well let me stay out a little longer. This he did with an air of indifference which probably gave offence." (Stat.).

He was eventually told by Wise to go to the school hall to be punished. Bamford says three prefects were waiting for him; Wymer that Wise was forced to call on two others for help when Marshall resisted.⁹³ This is important because the brutality charges were made in part on the disparity in numbers. The boy's statement only mentions two Praepostors in the hall: Wise, who began to cane him, and Fox, who intervened when Wise was disarmed. The third Praepostor, Cunningham (a boy from Marshall's own boarding-house), does not appear until after they have left the hall. Indeed, the sequence of events given by Marshall, an active participant, and whose account is the most detailed source available, does not accord with the versions given by Wymer and Bamford. Since the differences are important, it is worth summarizing his statement.

Wise began to cane Marshall, who "... wrested it from his hand &

broke it.". Fox then intervened and a general fight started in which Marshall wrested yet another cane from Wise. As the struggle continued, Marshall's brother, a boy in the upper Fifth, climbed through a window and joined in.⁹⁴ By this time the group was in the corridor, where another Praepostor, Cunningham, attempted with Wise to hold Marshall down so that Fox, who had armed himself with a "... knotted Blackthorn Stick of an unusual Size ...", could administer the punishment. Marshall seized this stick as well and carried it off with him.

The received accounts know nothing of the brother's involvement, seeing Marshall's success as being "in spite of the odds.",⁹⁵ and they confuse the number of Praepostors present at the beginning, the manner in which and the reasons why they acted as they did. It was not three against one to start with; it quickly became an equal combat and then three against two. Marshall refused a legitimate punishment; Fox only joined in when Wise's cane was seized and broken; and then Marshall's brother became involved. Cunningham subsequently joined in what was probably becoming a free-fight (and according to Clough, Fox immediately told him not to interfere but to leave Marshall to him), and neither his or Fox's intervention is sinister or surprising. Three sticks were used and Marshall seized them all. The statement confirms that the first two were weighted with lead. Wymer does not mention this at all in connection with the Marshall affray,⁹⁶ and Bamford does not remark upon it as being unusual. Without more evidence, it is simply not possible to say how typical these were, and in any case, it is not certain that the leaded end was used for punishment. The fact that the statement says there were two such suggests that they might not have been uncommon implements. Moreover the boy's testimony does not emphasise the matter,⁹⁷ a point which is surprising if the canes were a significant factor in

his reactions at the time, since it might be expected to form an important part of his defence. Comparatively more emphasis is given to the stick, which is described as,

"... a knotted Blackthorn Stick of an unusual
Size from what the Sixth generally lick the Boys
with ..." (Stat.).

The objection seems to be to the stick's size,⁹⁸ but it must be emphasised that the statement does not dwell upon the nature of any of the instruments used. Despite the newspaper claims of what Marshall had suffered from the three Praepostors, the evidence suggests that he was, at the very least, a match for them: certainly he managed to disarm them all.

Wymer's account does not mention the subsequent criticism which Arnold received; this is to be found in Bamford. He says this was based firstly on his unquestioning acceptance of his Praepostors' version of events; secondly on his summary dismissal of Marshall, which meant he left the school in darkness and had to spend the night at Banbury before reaching his home at Iffley; and thirdly that he refused the appeals of the boy's father and then showed that gentleman the door when he visited him unannounced. A recent commentator, John Chandos, has interpreted these criticisms to show that Arnold's action in expelling Marshall without hearing his version of events was a miscarriage of justice, which was further compounded by an act of gross discourtesy to the boy's father in refusing to see him after he had made the long journey to Rugby.⁹⁹ Was he unjust in not listening to Marshall before expelling him? Did any exchange take place between Arnold and the boy?

The statement says that Arnold,

"... heard the Case for the Prepostors but refused
to hear Marshall but sent him away ... unheard ...", (Stat.)

a point which Bamford repeats:

"His faith in the Sixth was implicit, and Marshall had no opportunity to protest or say anything at all relevant."¹⁰⁰

Wymer, however, quotes A.H. Clough, who says:

"'Arnold came to Ansteys, sent for Marshall, asked him if it was true, and on his confessing it, rang the bell and ordered the chaise.'¹⁰¹

A judgement has to be made on the information available, and without more details of the interview between Arnold and the boy it is not possible to convict the Headmaster unequivocally of a breach of natural justice. Although Arnold's relationship with his Praepostors is well enough known for it to be unsurprising that he should accept their word and uphold their authority, there is, nevertheless, nothing in the available facts of the case to suggest that he was wrong in doing so. Even the boy's own statement admits that he taunted authority, refused a punishment, and then fought with three Praepostors. Moreover he had the right of appeal against the punishment if he had thought it unjust, but his statement makes no mention of this.¹⁰² It appears that Arnold put the facts of the case he had received from his Praepostors to Marshall, asked him if they were correct (and how could they be denied?), and his affirmation settled the matter. Further explanation by Marshall could only have been by way of mitigating circumstances, and Arnold was not prepared to listen to excuses.¹⁰³ It is not surprising that he should think expulsion a necessary penalty, so his decision to place the authority of his Praepostors and the greater good of the school before Marshall's protestations does not have to be construed either as a case of blind loyalty, or an example of hasty, illogical reasoning.

Nevertheless, although the evidence suggests that Marshall might have had no real defence - and to that extent justice was done - more information is required about the nature of the exchange which took place between Arnold and the boy before a definitive judgement can be made on the allegation of unfairness.

How seriously the charge that the boy had to spend the night at Iffley was made is difficult to assess (some new information on the danger from prostitutes is considered later). While allowing for the fact that Marshall's presence in his boarding-house for the night might have been undesirable, it is certainly one aspect of the case on which it appears that Arnold might be criticised. Even if the boy had been provided with money for an overnight stop, it would probably have been better for him to travel home in daylight rather than at night. As it was, no harm came to him. Bamford says the boy's father wrote to Arnold but received no satisfaction, so he then removed his other son. Because this brought no response, he went, without appointment, to see Arnold but was immediately shown the door;¹⁰⁴ hence the previously quoted accusation of gross discourtesy. The statement sheds some light on these matters. This says that the father, on the day of his son's arrival home, wrote to Arnold asking that a full investigation should be made at which he and his son should be present, and that "Dr A. wrote Back, but ... he did not accede to the proposal, ...". It is not known what Arnold said in his reply, but presumably he set forth the facts of the matter at some point so that the father might know why his son had been removed; otherwise it might be expected that this would figure as a major source of complain in the statement. Since the essential facts were not in dispute, Arnold's refusal to reopen the matter is not entirely surprising. Marshall's father then said he would remove his other son on the following

day, and it was in the course of this visit he decided to interview Arnold. It is worth noting that his trip to Rugby was not made especially to see Arnold, it was made primarily to collect his other son, a fact which begins to place the accusation of discourtesy into perspective. "But as soon as he began to open the case Dr A. turn'd him out of his house & would not hear one word." (Stat.), This is very emotive and the writer is not unprejudiced. Exactly what was said is not known. Arnold had already written to the man refusing his request, and it might be that he merely stated there was nothing further to discuss and since he was a busy man, Mr Marshall Hacker should leave. Neither party was likely to have been in a particularly equable frame of mind. The man had arrived unannounced, but nevertheless, Arnold had received him. Had he been grossly discourteous, as alleged, then would he have bothered to see him at all?

The affair ended with Marshall Hacker appealing to the Trustees, but they supported Arnold. It has been stated that, "By this time the majority of the trustees were his docile servants, ..." ¹⁰⁵ and that while this decision avoided "... awkward investigations into the management...of the School ... Hacker was cheated of his rights; of apparent justice there was none at all." ¹⁰⁶ The question of Arnold's relationship with his Trustees will be considered in detail later, at this point it is simply worth observing that within six months of this affair, eight of these "docile servants" divided equally on a motion of censure against him which, if carried, might have led to his resignation. Since Marshall Hacker's own son confirmed that he had been guilty, in that he had disobeyed and behaved truculently towards a Praepostor, resisted lawful punishment, and then fought three Praepostors, Arnold and his Trustees might well have found it difficult to see why justice had not

been done. These facts help to put the opinion that the authorities might not wish to suffer the embarrassment of "awkward investigations" into perspective. Moreover, the press were already in full cry and continued to be so for several months; there was certainly no conspiracy of silence to be maintained.

Neither Wymer nor Bamford have all the details, and to that extent neither of them can be said to provide a trustworthy basis for interpreting the incident. More information is needed before a final verdict can be given, but enough has been considered here to show that unhesitating criticism of Arnold is not the inevitable conclusion from the evidence now available.

The next specific incident of indiscipline to be mentioned in the correspondence occurs in L.637, written to Edward Hawkins on 19 October 1836 and referring to an outbreak of theft which had been discovered in the previous month.¹⁰⁷ Some of the boys had been engaged in what seems to have been systematic stealing from shopkeepers in the town, a discovery which led to the removal of a number of them. Details, however, are slight, the letter simply recording:

"... a sad Scene of Theft in Shops which was detected in early September, and which obliged me to send away three Boys, and to remove four or five more for a Term of two Years ..." (L.637).

The interesting fact that some of the culprits were to be allowed back is discussed below.

That Arnold's loyalty to his Praepostors was not blind is illustrated by the next incident, the hitherto unrecorded case of the expulsion of Francis Mackenzie,¹⁰⁸ a matter which also shows that it would be incorrect to assume that violence offered to a Praepostor would mean automatic

expulsion.

The affair took place in Lee's boarding-house at the end of May 1838, when it was reported to Francis Lushington, a Praepostor and the head of Lee's house, that Mackenzie "... was beating severely one of the Boys ..." (L.674). Mackenzie was seventeen years of age and in the form known as "the Twenty". The name of the boy he was beating and the reason why are not known; it might have been a fag.¹⁰⁹ The incident was reported to Lushington, who said that Mackenzie's conduct "'... was a Shame.'" (L.674). Arnold's account of what happened when Lushington's remark was reported to Mackenzie is taken from the letter he sent to the boy's aunt explaining why he had to be removed:

"When this was told to your Nephew, he went deliberately and struck the Prepostor. This was reported to Mr Lee & myself, and we required of him to make an Apology which should be read before all the Boys of the House. This he has refused to do in any Manner that is satisfactory, and therefore I have no Choice but to send him away immediately. ... his original Offence aggravated by his Refusal to give a satisfactory Apology, leaves me no Alternative." (L.674).

Having left the school, Mackenzie repented and wrote letters of apology to Lee and Lushington. These letters had a striking effect on Arnold, who was impressed and moved by them; moreover the entire Sixth Form appealed to him to reverse his decision and allow Mackenzie to return:

"Your Nephew's Letters both to Mr Lee and to Lushington were so highly creditable to him, and so evidently proceeded from his own natural Feeling,

that they interested me strongly in his Favour.
 Mr Lee, as you may well believe, was equally
 disposed to do every Thing possible, and to Day
 the whole sixth Form have addressed me in your
 Nephew's Behalf." (L.675).

Since Mackenzie was not himself in the Sixth Form, it must be assumed that his apology to Lushington, and perhaps his personal qualities, were such that the Praepostors were happy to accept his expressions of regret and wished to have him reinstated. Arnold was now confronted with a painful dilemma. He was deeply affected by the boy's contrition and the strength of support he was receiving from Lee and the Sixth, yet he was acutely aware that a fundamental principle was at stake. Finally, although he wished it otherwise, he determined that his decision must stand:

"I do not know that I ever wrote a Letter with more Pain than I proceed now to write to you. ... It is very hard and very painful to oppose the united Feelings both of myself and others; for I assure you I do not think that there is any one in the School who would be more glad to see your Nephew return than I should. But it has been an invariable Rule with me, and a Rule which I have acted upon from the strongest Conviction of its' (sic) Benefits, that a Boy once sent from this School must never return to it, unless some new Facts are discovered which alter the Character of the original Fault. ... I am deeply grieved both on his own Account and on the Account of his Friends, that this must be so. I would thank you

to say to him that, personally, his Letters ... have removed from my Mind every painful Feeling towards him, that I should be glad to meet him here or elsewhere hereafter; and that I deeply regret that I cannot consistently with what I think my Duty allow him at once to return to the School. ... I have tried earnestly to find any justifiable Ground of Distinction by which I might take your Nephew's Case out of the Range of our invariable Rule, and it is with the most unfeigned Regret that I feel myself obliged to say that I cannot find any: and that a Sense of Duty forces me most reluctantly to deny what my Inclination would most strongly urge me to grant." (L.675).

The above passage testifies to a remarkable depth of feeling on Arnold's part and shows the care and anxiety with which he had weighed the matter. The expulsion of Mackenzie was no hasty, reflex action. Despite having been guilty of an unprovoked assault on a Praepostor after what seems to have been a relatively innocuous remark:

"I repeated the Expression to him, 'It was a Shame,' and dwelt particularly to him on the Inoffensiveness of it, as making his subsequent Action so unprovoked. He never directly or indirectly objected to this Statement." (L.678),¹¹⁰

he was not removed instantly, but every consideration was shown to him.

He was asked:

"... to make an Apology which should be read before all the Boys of the House. This he has refused to do in any Manner that is satisfactory, ..." (L.674),

and was given ample time to come to his senses:

"Both Mr Lee & myself were anxious to give him every Opportunity of yielding in Time: and I empowered Mr Lee to listen to any Thing which he might have wished to say up to the very last Moment of his Stay in Rugby, ... (L.676)

The Time of Trial has ended & must end, when a Boy is once in the Chaise to leave Rugby.

Feeling this, I said ... up to the last Moment ... I would receive his Apology: in Fact the Chaise was once sent away because he seemed disposed to comply, ... (L.675).

Throughout the whole episode Arnold stresses that he acted in complete harmony with Lee,

"... he felt that we had no Alternative, and I acted in perfect Concert with him in the whole Business." (L.676).

Moreover, Arnold was prepared to interest himself in the boy's future:

"... his Expressions of Regret afterwards did him so much Credit ... that I should be glad to facilitate rather than obstruct his Admission either at another School or at the University." (L.676).

A number of points emerge from the narrative of this incident which give fresh insights into Arnold's character, his relations with his Praepostors, and which provide a counterbalance to the view of him as a stern and ruthless autocrat. Since Lushington was a Praepostor who had been assaulted, the pejorative view of Arnold might lead the reader to expect that the assailant would be dismissed forthwith. But this was

not the case: expulsion for such a crime was not the automatic, unreasoning reaction of a man who would brook no challenge to his Praepostors. Every chance was given to Mackenzie to redeem himself before the decision was taken. There is no suggestion of precipitateness or unreasonableness in Arnold's conduct. Given Arnold's relationship with his Sixth Form, it might be thought that if any appeal was likely to change his mind, it would be one coming from that source. But it was not so in this case. The affair also shows that he was capable of great restraint towards a wrong-doer, for his opinion of Mackenzie did not change until after the boy's written apologies had been sent. At the time he was giving Mackenzie every opportunity to repent, the boy was, in Arnold's eyes, a stubborn malefactor. The incident provides an effective contrast to the pejorative view of his conduct in the March and Marshall cases. It is clear from the letters that there was a great struggle between, on the one hand, his avowed principle, and on the other, his regard for the boy and the entreaties of his Sixth Form. It is a mark of his integrity that he put principle before sentiment; it is a mark of his humanity that he did so most reluctantly. This adherence to principle is not surprising, though it did not pass unchallenged at the time. The boy's family requested the Headmaster of Cheam School, Dr Mayo,¹¹¹ to intercede. It seems that Mayo based his appeal on the hope that Arnold might, on this occasion, relax his principles. In his reply, Arnold shows both their strength, in that he was not prepared to sacrifice them to expediency, and also that his decisions were not irreversible judgements founded on a belief in his own infallibility:

"... it has been my invariable Rule here, not to receive a Boy back after he has once been sent away, unless any Thing came to Light to alter the Character

of the original Fault. Expressions of Regret, however sincere, I have always thought cannot be listened to after a Boy's Removal has once taken Place." (L.676).
 "With Respect to my Judgement of the Offence, and of the Impossibility of readmitting a Boy afterwards, I have acted on the fullest Deliberation, and although very far from pretending to Infallibility, I am still satisfied that my Decision was right.
 ... you can scarcely be as adequate a Judge as I am of what is right and necessary with Regard to the Discipline of this School. ... there are many Circumstances enhancing or diminishing the Character of an Offence, which vary in different Institutions, and I cannot attach so much weight to your Judgement in a Point connected with Rugby School, as to Mr Lee's and my own." (L.678).

In conclusion, therefore, it can be said that as well as providing information about a previously unrecorded incident at the school, the unpublished letters are valuable for the glimpse they give of the compassionate side of Arnold's nature.

Arnold was not exempt from disorders in the house for which he had personal responsibility, the School House. The correspondence provides hitherto unknown details of serious trouble arising there which led to the expulsion of several boys, including Arnold's own nephews, reduced Arnold to complete despair, and contributed directly to his decision to relinquish responsibility for the House.

In discussing Arnold's government of the School House, Stanley chose to emphasise the effect of his presence on the boys at the formal

occasions on which he met them, particularly evening prayers.¹¹² He briefly records that Arnold's usual principle of trust combined with a distaste for intruding upon the privacy of his boarders resulted in his leaving much of the routine management of the House to his Praepostors. In 1838, however, a combination of Arnold's diffidence, a physically weak set of Praepostors (always a weak point in his system of Sixth Form government), and an unregenerate group of boys, led to a state of disorder under his very roof which both amazed and shocked him. It is an incident which provides yet more evidence of the realities of life at Rugby. In describing the affair, notice will be taken of the way in which it was disguised by Stanley, the only one of the biographers who certainly knew about it, and how it affects the received interpretation of Arnold's motives for contemplating giving up responsibility for the School House.

In October 1838, Arnold wrote to his friend, Sir Thomas Pasley, and mentioned that in the course of writing that very letter he had,

"... had some of the Troubles of Schoolkeeping, and one of those Specimens of the evil of Boy Nature, which make me always unwilling to undergo the Responsibility of advising any Man to send his Son to a public School." (L.693).

He goes on to record his discovery of "... a System of Persecution carried on by the bad against the good ..." into which many boys of a generally decent character had been drawn through lack of will-power. Arnold was badly shaken by the state of affairs that had been disclosed, to the extent that,

"... it ... after I have been ten Years fighting against it, is so sickening that it is very hard

not to throw up the Cards in Despair, and upset the Table, and be off." (L.693).

Tantalisingly, the precise nature of the problem is never revealed, although it is clear that it was serious and that many boys were involved; nor, at this stage, is there any specific mention of his own House. The link is made with a long letter he wrote to J.T. Coleridge in November (L.698), in which he expressed his utter weariness at having the "irksome" responsibility for the School House. His natural "strong reluctance" to go about seeing that the boys were not drinking, staying up late, or generally misbehaving had been placing him under great pressure, particularly because of the state of the House in that present half year. He had, therefore, decided to ask the Governors to allow him to relinquish the School House from the summer of 1839. This strongly suggests that the trouble described in L.693 was connected with his own house, particularly when on 1 December 1838 his Diary¹¹³ records:

"Affair of Cunningham¹¹⁴ and the Gang in the School House".

A succession of Diary entries shows that there had been serious disorder in the House resulting in several boys being sent home:

2 Dec : "Writing Letters about the School House Affair".

3 Dec : "Conybeare went away".¹¹⁵

4 Dec : "Speech in School".¹¹⁶

5 Dec : "Writing Letters about Row".

7 Dec : "Bucklands, Nicholson & Cradock went".¹¹⁷

The shock and distress caused by these events is clearly shown in a letter written on 6 Dec 1838 (L.702) to his old pupil, W.C. Lake, in which he anticipates Lake's visit as one from a person:

"... whom I could so dearly love and esteem after the bitter contrast which I have had lately of the vileness and folly of so many of our present generation. But enough and more than enough of this, which has as nearly as possible knocked me up, and would soon, if it went on, either end my life at Rugby or my life altogether. No one can tell how deep the grief and vexation of all this low principle has been to me, ...".

It must not be thought that the boys who had been removed had been expelled on the spot, for a letter written to E. Hawkins in December (L.703) reveals that although many boys had been sent home, their ultimate fate had not yet been decided: Arnold was considering each case carefully. Another unpublished letter, written to T.T. Penrose, in which Arnold sought his advice, shows that even in the following February he was still anxiously considering what to do, his anxiety compounded by the fact that two of those who had been removed were his own nephews, the Bucklands, whose departure had caused a breach in family harmony:

"... in the case of the Bucklands they have involved a very painful difference of opinion between us and them, on a point on which parents, I suppose, are apt to be tender. ... the strong sense which I have of the deep mischief which was daily being done by the boys whose friends are so anxious for them to return; a mischief not done intentionally, but arising from the constant exhibition of low principle, and the total absence of any thing high or good in a set of

boys whose numbers and physical strength gave them unavoidable influence. In this respect the evil done is past remedy: it revives afresh if they return; and if they go it is excited also afresh, by a feeling of sympathy for them as martyrs. For the boys themselves I can make large allowance, and while I wish to remove them from each other and from Rugby, I do it for their own sakes not less than for that of the School, and in the full belief that there is much good in each of them separately, which might be brought to bring forth fruit under a more favourable culture." (L.711).

By the end of February 1839 he had made his decisions, and an unpublished letter to F.C. Blackstone (L.712) announces that eight boys were not returning, of whom two were going of their own accord or being superannuated, six had been expelled, the "the rest" had returned. The air had been cleared though Arnold remained apprehensive, since at the start of the previous term he had never expected such a "succession of Troubles less."

There is no doubt that this event shook Arnold to the core. He was taken completely by surprise. It seems that on the one hand he had not realised how bad was the moral condition of his own boarding-house, while on the other, ten years constant struggle against the realities of boy-nature appeared to him to have achieved virtually nothing. The factors which allowed this situation to develop can be deduced with reasonable certainty from the letters. First was Arnold's own reluctance to become too involved with the personal superintendence of his boarders, a reluctance which stemmed largely from his innate shyness.¹¹⁸ Second

was his confidence in the ability of the Praepostors in his House to maintain discipline and exercise the routine superintendence of the Housemaster.¹¹⁹ On this point his policy with regard to the Sixth Form was always vulnerable.¹²⁰ The intellectual ability of boys who reach that form, thus becoming Praepostors, was not in doubt. When such boys were also natural leaders, they could maintain discipline reasonably well. When they were not, the system tottered. And this was undoubtedly what had happened in the School House, where two brothers, Henry and Theodore Walrond, were in charge:

"Never were there at Rugby better or more noble minded Boys ... they are unhappily scarcely 5'-6" in Height, and are not very strong. One smiles at this Climax, yet it is really a very serious Evil in Practice." (L.711).

In other words it was a sad but desirable necessity that Praepostors should have brawn as well as brain. Moreover Arnold had been aware of this defect in his system well before the School House affair, he had seen the same problem nearly five years earlier in Stanley himself when he was in the Sixth Form, though in Stanley's case,

"... the high Ability ... made up even in the Boys' Notions for his diminutive Size" (L.711).¹²¹

It cannot be said that he was unaware of the risks involved. And third there was the "spirit of low principle" which had spread unchecked among the boys. Now Arnold's views about the unregenerate nature of boyhood are well known, and much has been written about them.¹²² His sermons regularly denounce and his letters frequently lament the evil he sees in boys' characters. Given his knowledge, the shock which the revelations produced may seem paradoxical. The explanation perhaps lies in

his attested principle of trusting the boys, combined with his inherent guilelessness.¹²³ If nothing was seen or heard to be amiss, and his questions were answered satisfactorily, then all had to be well, the system must be working. It has been said that when faced with evidence of a mass of evil existing in the school which had frustrated a master's efforts, his reaction was to censure the public school system itself.¹²⁴ This view is supported by the terms in which he attempts to explain these events:

"... in a good State it is the best possible Education; but if bad, I think it the worst. Now if its good State is only a happy Accident, requiring a Combination of Circumstances which occur only rarely, and if its bad State be the Rule, as I confess my Experience at Rugby seems to show to me, then I think that the System is mischievous ... When I say that the bad State is the Rule, I mean that no possible Care of the Master in our present System can hinder a Spirit of low Principle from prevailing ... and corrupting a Number of new Boys ... unless there be a Combination of leading Qualities for Good among the principal Boys, such as I suppose the Average of human Nature forbids us to hope for often." (L.711).

But in this particular case was Arnold being realistic? Had he, as the master in charge, exercised his best efforts? He knew what a collection of boys were capable of doing. He knew his Praepostors - the essential intermediaries in his system of government - were weak and might not command respect. He knew the moral problems they might encounter. It could be argued that his failure to act effectively on this knowledge -

if only by increased surveillance on his own part - probably allowed the situation to develop. If this is accepted, the incident would provide evidence for those who frequently see a lack of realism in his management of boys.

There is no doubting the seriousness of the affair, and L.693 shows that it was the poor moral state of the School House after the summer of 1838 which played a significant part in Arnold's deciding to give up its management, a decision which the events at the end of that year would only have strengthened. Yet the biographical record fails to make these points. Stanley certainly knew all about the affair, not only does a letter to him survive which refers to the subject (L.713), but he also printed in The Life (though not in the numbered series of the correspondence) extracts from three of the letters (L.693, L.698, L.702) which described the troubles in the School House. He was careful, however, to edit these in such a way that they gave no hint of the affair in question. Moreover the one letter which appeared in the regular, chronological series in The Life was published with all reference to the incident excised (L.712). The way in which Stanley edited these documents will be examined, because it reveals why the events have not been detected before this, even though quotations from the letters discussing them were published; and this in turn gives a further insight into his editorial methods. Whitridge does not mention the troubles at the end of 1838¹²⁵ nor does Bamford. Wymer does not mention the problems either, and ascribes Arnold's intention of leaving the School House to a simple wish for retirement.¹²⁶ The unpublished letters shed new light on this also.

No trace of the disturbance or its bearing on Arnold's decision to give up his House appears in The Life. This was not because Stanley

was unaware of the details, it was simply because of the way in which he edited the material. In a general discussion of Arnold's attitude to the boys at Rugby, Stanley illustrates his despair "... when any thing brought strongly before him any evil in the school.",¹²⁷ by quoting without recipient's name, date, or context a few words from L.702¹²⁸ and an extract from L.693.¹²⁹ These letters are respectively characterised in his Notebooks with the words: "Badness of Rugby (Preface)" and "Badness of Boys ... this might be put in the Preface". Although the quotations do illustrate Arnold's general feelings, the fact is that no hint of the specific context is given - namely a grave disturbance in his very own House - moreover the original text of L.693 has been disguised at one point and deliberately altered at another. Firstly, Stanley carefully advises the reader of the fact that he has introduced two words into the text by placing them in brackets:

"... how to meet this evil I really do not know;
but to find it thus rife after I have been (so many)
years fighting against it, is so sickening ...".

These brackets actually replace the word "ten", so Stanley has prevented the approximate year of the letter from being deduced; his substitution has the further effect of not revealing that a bad state of affairs could still exist even at that late stage of Arnold's Headmastership. And secondly, his deliberate replacement of a comma with a full stop creates an unacknowledged omission which thereby prevents the reader from learning that Arnold was even prepared to mention leaving the school because of the affair. The text in The Life reads:

"... it is very hard not to throw up the cards in
despair, and upset the table. But then ...".

It should read:

"It is very hard not to throw up the cards in despair,
and upset the table, and be off. But then ...".

Likewise in L.698, a long extract from which is given to illustrate his views on the necessity of removing boys who were doing themselves and their fellows no good, there is no clue to the fact that the text refers to the situation in his own boarding-house.¹³⁰ And it is this very letter which explains at length why he has decided to give up the School House, another fact not mentioned by Stanley. The final proof that Stanley had no intention of revealing the affair to the public is provided by L.712, which was published, with omissions, in The Life in the numbered series of letters.¹³¹ Here, the first acknowledged omission excises Arnold's detailed description of the fate of the boys he had removed in December 1838. In Stanley's Notebooks this letter is recorded with the comment: "(omit - School troubles)". There is no doubt that Stanley did not wish to expose the details to public scrutiny, though his motives for this cannot be determined unequivocally. For example, at the time he was writing, many of the participants would still be alive, and there was the added embarrassment of Arnold's family being involved. Nevertheless, the evidence suggests that a desire not to diminish Arnold's stature might also have been a relevant factor in his decision to exclude the affair.

None of the other biographers disclose the troubles in the School House, though Wymer touches on Arnold's decision to quit the post. The context in which he places this intention, however, is at variance with the evidence.¹³² Wymer sees this period as marking the start of real success for Arnold,¹³³ both nationally and at the school, where he refers to his,

"... prefectorial system ... the very foundation-stone

of his policy ... operating so smoothly and happily ...¹³⁴;

and how the inspired housemasters,

"... threw themselves into their ... tasks ... with the same infectious enthusiasm as Arnold displayed in School House, ..."¹³⁵.

Against this is the evidence of flaws in his prefectorial system, the disturbances of 1838 and, as will be shown below, similar trouble in 1839 and 1840. Moreover the unpublished letters disclose his real feelings about the management of a boarding-house.

Wymer quotes the petition which his boarders presented to him urging him not to leave them, and how he yielded to such a "... spontaneous expression of love and loyalty".¹³⁶ While Arnold naturally was moved by their plea, the letters reveal that other factors were involved in his decision to retain his boarders. In L.726, he informed J.T. Coleridge of his change of mind stating that several Old Rugbeans whose opinions he valued had pointed out that the School House, by virtue of its antiquity, size, and government by the Headmaster, was regarded by the school as its heart, the "Palatine Hill" of Rugby. Such arguments would carry great weight with Arnold. His own strong sense of the past and veneration for historical associations are well known¹³⁷ and confirmed by what he says to Coleridge, that given them he would not wish to destroy or change the character of the School House in any way, particularly as the school had so little of such associations. In addition, it can be speculated that he would see a threat to the school's corporate identity in breaking with this tradition. The letters also show that he had not dropped the idea entirely, but merely postponed it. L.729, reproduced by Stanley with

all mention of the School House excised,¹³⁸ confirms this with Arnold anticipating that the objections "... can be reconciled hereafter."

The serious trouble in the School House at the end of 1838, which highlighted the ineffectiveness of Sixth Formers who were not natural leaders, marked the beginning of nearly three years of similar disturbances for Arnold. Although it does not feature in the correspondence, during 1839 there was open hostility between a generally weak Sixth Form and those larger boys in the lower forms whose sporting prowess made them heroes in the eyes of the majority. Arnold was constantly being called upon to support his Praepostors and events culminated in the expulsion of several boys below the Sixth, and the removal of some of that Form at the end of the year, including two Praepostors from his own house, George Hughes and James Mackie. Ironically, these two youths were fine athletes, and Praepostors whose leadership qualities were not in doubt. To Arnold, however, they had failed in their responsibilities by not discovering the offenders in a school row, and, in Hughes' case at least, by generally taking the side of the majority.¹³⁹ The unpublished letters have nothing on these events, but they do contain references to trouble in 1840, again in the School House, and this time connected with a subject which has been called the besetting vice of the school, drunkenness.

It will be recalled that Stanley, a member of the school during the years 1829 to 1834, records that drinking was an offence which merited corporal punishment. In his sermons Arnold regularly denounced it,¹⁴⁰ and the statement has been made that of all the vices to which a boy might be exposed, this was the most prevalent:

"... drinking was the vice of the school, Arnold,

I believe, suspected it, but he never gained

sufficient knowledge to act on."¹⁴¹

The above was written of the years 1833 to 1835. H.H. Dixon, a member of the school from 1836 to 1840, suggests that conditions had improved by his time:

"Gone were the bad old days of its notoriety as the hardest drinking school in England;"¹⁴²

Of the biographers, Wymer says Arnold had great difficulty in eradicating the problem, and that apart from the beer served at meals, he forbade the consumption of liquor in the school and placed a ban on the surrounding public houses. He also records that the Sixth Form took a long time to accept the justice of Arnold's actions, though progress was eventually noticeable, if slow.¹⁴³ Bamford, in demonstrating that conditions for the average boy were variable throughout Arnold's Headmastership, mentions drunkenness as a pervading problem which continued to the end of his rule.¹⁴⁴ The unpublished correspondence has three letters which shed some light on the subject.

There is only one specific reference to the problem of drinking in the extant letters, in L.571, though two others dealing with its consequences have survived, L.854 and L.874. There is also a reference in Arnold's Diary for 1839. In June 1836, Arnold wrote to E. Hawkins (L.571) and mentioned that,

"... a good Deal of Drinking has got into the upper Part of the School and spread to the lower ...".¹⁴⁵

The date of this letter places it at the start of the period of improvement mentioned in Dixon's quotation. The extract also shows that Arnold was well aware of the nature and scale of the problem. Chronologically, the Diary provides the next piece of evidence. Arnold records a masters' meeting held on 3 September 1839 "about the drinking",

an entry which is followed on 4 Sept by a probably not unconnected "Speech to the V1th". If the new evidence tends to suggest that, despite Dixon's optimistic view, the problem was continuing towards the end of Arnold's term, this suggestion is only strengthened by the two remaining letters. L.854 was sent to Thomas Hughes in December 1840. Hughes had returned home for the Christmas vacation and he wrote to Arnold confessing his previously unsuspected involvement in an illegal party at the School House just before the term ended. Drink had been smuggled in, and some of the boys, thoroughly intoxicated, had destroyed library books and damaged furniture.¹⁴⁶ Arnold's letter to Hughes, who was then a Praepostor, is interesting not only for the honourable way in which he refuses to use his confession against him, but also as evidence for his continuing trust in his Sixth Form despite the events of the previous years:

"I did not know nor should I probably ever have known of your share in the business ... Officially therefore, I do not know of it now - for of course it would be utterly out of the question to use your own letter as evidence against you. ... as a man who feels very sincerely interested about yourself I cannot deny that your letter gave me a very great and unexpected shock; for I had no notion that you or any one else in the V1 form was concerned with the party. I have been so accustomed on these points to feel confidence in the V1 Form, that I really am apt to have no suspicion whatever of them in such matters; and I am quite sure that if I am obliged to resign this confidence the School must speedily go to ruin. I think ...

according to my school recollections, good and steady fellows at Winchester would have taken no part in such a business, and it would grieve me very much to think that at Rugby such characters could not equally be depended upon - that companionship or any other motives might lead into mischief those on whom I ought to be able to rely ..." (L.854).

Moreover Arnold was making an exception for Hughes; L.874, written to Sir John Franklin, shows that at least one boy had been expelled for the incident:

"... your Nephew left Rugby ... under circumstances which made me wish him not to return again. There had been a drunken Party ... in the School House ... your Nephew was one of the most to blame; ... he made Statements in Exculpation of himself so utterly untrue, and repeated them not only to his Tutor here, but to his Uncle when he got Home, that when after a very long Investigation the Truth was discovered, I thought that his Conduct had been so bad that he ought not to return here again."

The new letters show that incidents of drinking were still occurring at the end of Arnold's time at Rugby, and among the Sixth Form, and in his own House. More evidence than is provided by these letters would be needed before a definitive judgement could be passed, but such as there is supports Bamford's view that it was a continuing problem, never completely checked.

The superannuation of the two School House Præpostors in December 1839, mentioned previously, is a convenient introduction to another aspect of Arnold's disciplinary procedure, his system of removing boys from the school.

Stanley records that one aid to the reduction of corporal punishment at Rugby was the system of expulsion practised by Arnold.¹⁴⁷ He draws a distinction between the public expulsion of a malefactor, and what has been called the superannuation of unpromising subjects. Arnold's rigorous use of the latter method is well known.¹⁴⁸ It was a device by which he could remove those older boys who were not benefiting from the school or who were, or were likely to become, adverse influences upon their fellows. Such youths were often quietly removed at the end of a half year; no stigma was attached to them, to all intents they had simply been withdrawn by their parents. Although there were frequent complaints, Stanley says that Arnold's judgement that these youths were better off receiving private tuition was often vindicated, and he produced five unattributed extracts from letters to tutors showing Arnold's concern for such boys.¹⁴⁹ As well as allowing one of these to be identified,¹⁵⁰ the extant correspondence also provides some new information on the subject of expulsion - in addition to the cases discussed earlier - in its various forms.

In December 1836, Arnold wrote to F.C. Blackstone (L.601A) asking if he would take as his pupil a Sixth Form boy he was having to remove on account of his "... having contracted a Disorder by an act of Vice ..." during a visit to some friends at Leamington. The boy was hard-working, though no scholar, and after consultation with his assistants it had been decided that because he was "easily led" and "very unstable", he should be placed as an only pupil with a private tutor. Arnold was doing all he could for the boy; he had taken up his case with the Rector of Exeter College and obtained a place for him there subject to a satisfactory tutor's report. If, as seems probable, the "Disorder" refers to a venereal infection, then this letter provides the first

piece of direct evidence for sexual immorality concerning the school that has been discovered about Arnold's period.

Almost nothing is known about the existence of sexual vice at Rugby School. Among the specific evils of school life which Arnold denounced, the nearest reference occurs in a sermon where, under the heading of "sensual wickedness", he refers to "... things forbidden ... in the scriptures.":

"'sensual wickedness, such as drunkenness and
other things forbidden together with drunkenness
in the scriptures.'"¹⁵¹

And this is all that has hitherto been thought to exist as far as Arnold and the subject of sex is concerned. Although discussions of the topic nowadays often view sexual vice in Public Schools in terms of homosexuality, the fact is that no direct evidence for any form of sexual immorality at Rugby under Arnold has been disclosed.¹⁵² Whatever Arnold's inhibitions were about referring to sexual matters before the assembled school, the topic does occur in the unpublished correspondence.

The first reference is in L.142 where Arnold, a passionate man and no prude, expresses his desire for his wife quite openly, wanting:

"... one whom I never longed for so ardently, nor
to whom I could ever make Love so warmly as now.
And that one, if I mistake not, was never so
disposed to welcome my Love as now, and never
would have returned it so affectionately."

In L.185, written to F.C. Blackstone in 1826, Arnold discusses at length a view which has impressed him tracing the origin of "sexual passion" to the story of the Fall in Genesis. Arnold says that while acknowledging the strength of the sexual appetite (mentioning that in some cases it

renders marriage "necessary"), he had previously been puzzled how to reconcile this "... most perplexing part of the actual constitution of things ..." with the boundless misery engendered by an ever increasing population. Arnold himself, therefore, was under no illusions about the force of the sexual imperative, moreover he had examples from his own family to remind him of its abuse.¹⁵³

The third reference occurs in the previously mentioned L.601A. The manner in which Arnold refers to the boy's "Disorder" strongly suggests that this was a venereal infection resulting from a heterosexual encounter. Arnold's sympathetic attitude to the boy and his desire to facilitate his career is noteworthy, an attitude conditioned to some extent perhaps by his own family history as well as his knowledge of the realities of life. The boy was not publicly expelled in disgrace, a fact which might confirm that the affair was heterosexual, although this begs the question of how Arnold would have behaved had the boy's condition been the result of a homosexual encounter. That the Rugby boys were at some risk from prostitutes is shown by the fourth reference, a letter written to Arnold by Lord Denbigh in 1833.¹⁵⁴ As well as providing evidence of such a risk, the letter also reveals that despite discussing the problem with the school's medical attendant and the clerk to the Trustees, Denbigh had not informed Arnold that a boy had contracted a venereal infection and that he was a member of Arnold's own House. All this emerges from Denbigh's letter complaining that the coach proprietors at Dunchurch had delayed two boys there, C.O. and A.R. Kenyon, for ten hours before sending them home, a delay which was contrary to assurances they had previously given that all boys would be forwarded "... without any delay whatsoever.". It was probably because Denbigh feared that boys waiting for a coach might be tempted

by prostitutes that he wished Arnold to act, for, he tells him in confidence, the eldest brother of one of these boys, no longer at the school, had "... returned from Rugby with a Venereal disease.". Whether this was contracted at Rugby or on the road home was not known, since the boy's father:

"... was unwilling to let ye boy know that he was acquainted with ye Circumstances & therefore forebore from making any enquiries whatsoever on ye subject."

Denbigh says he thinks that this was the case of venereal disease involving a boy at the school he had heard about "... a year or two since ..." which had prompted him to enquire whether "... any houses of ill fame or women of bad character ..." were operating in Rugby. Following a discussion of the matter with the school doctor and the Trustees' clerk, he was satisfied that there were not and he decided not to mention the subject to Arnold. Examination of the Rugby School Register shows that the boy who had contracted the infection was William Kenyon, a member of the School House from 1829 to 1833.¹⁵⁵ If he became infected in 1831-2, then the fact that the second case of which we have knowledge does not occur until 1836 (L.601A), might suggest that the problem was not serious. But there is simply not enough evidence on which to speculate.

That public expulsion from the school was not always the end of a boy's career there is shown by L.637, which has been noticed earlier in connection with the removal of boys who were stealing from the Rugby tradesmen. As with other cases which have been considered, Arnold's penalty was not invariable. Despite the crime, only three boys were expelled for good, "five or six more" were removed for two

years, since they were "... so young that they might safely be admitted again by and bye.". This example tends to illustrate an unremarked part of Stanley's narrative on the subject where he observes that superannuation was not always final, it might only be temporary. The difference, however, is that Stanley does not apply this to expulsion which was intended to be "... a punishment and lasting disgrace, ...", which, as a "punishment", the removal of these boys was obviously meant to be.¹⁵⁶

The final example of expulsion which occurs in the unpublished letters is in L.874, where the removal of Sir John Franklin's nephew for his part in the drunken party in the School House at the end of 1840 is described. In this instance, expulsion for the crime was again not the first resort but seems rather to have been inflicted because of the boy's persistent lying in his attempt to exculpate himself.

In summarising the results of the examination of those incidents of indiscipline on which the unpublished correspondence sheds light, a number of points can be made. There is no doubt that the letters have provided much information of significance, which has often substantially modified aspects of the received interpretation of those incidents and revealed the existence of previously unrecorded events. The new evidence for the March case is particularly important, since its application has directly contradicted or explained away so much of the accepted interpretation of that affair. The charge of brutality made against Arnold has been refuted, or at the very least rendered highly equivocal, along with the pejorative assessment of his character which was based on that incident. Moreover the examination of the evidence for other cases of corporal punishment inflicted by Arnold, as well as adding to the catalogue of offences for which it was administered, reveals that there is nothing to support the statement that he was a cruel, merciless, excessive flogger of boys. If he did have such a reputation, there is nothing in the available evidence to show that it was deserved. On the contrary, the picture emerges of a man endeavouring to carry out his avowed principle of moderation in the use of the birch, and a genuine reduction in corporal punishment seems to have been effected - a reform which has been denied to him in recent years.¹⁵⁷ The second of the well-publicised incidents which has been examined, the Marshall case, has also produced new evidence which significantly adds to and corrects the biographical record and casts doubt on the interpretation which deprecates Arnold's conduct in the matter. And in the case of the Boughton Leigh fishing incident, a new reason for the contemplated insurrection has been found.

Although new statistical evidence which allows conclusions to be drawn about the level of corporal punishment under Arnold has been forthcoming, the unpublished material does not enable the same kind of conclusions to be drawn on the question of the number of boys expelled during his Headmastership. The evidence dealing with expulsions has revealed a new example (Mackenzie) and given fresh insights into particular cases (the incidents concerning Mackie, the boys expelled for theft in 1837, and the School House troubles of 1838 and 1840, for example), but the simple fact that many boys were quietly superannuated makes the general expulsion rate under Arnold difficult to assess. The information provided by the correspondence cannot provide a definitive solution to this problem; it depends upon more information than is currently available.¹⁵⁸ If the evidence that does exist is tabulated, it confirms that expulsions occurred in the two broad categories that were previously known. The real value of the new material lies in its application to individual incidents. This has often shown that previously, too much has been asserted on insufficient evidence. It also challenges the view that in some of the penalties he inflicted Arnold's actions were hasty and ill-judged. Rather, it could be maintained that he evaluated each case on its merits; that the circumstances of the particular event were the important factor; that there was no inflexible rule being applied - other than that he would not rescind an expulsion without new evidence being produced - points which have not been sufficiently emphasised in recent assessments of some of these affairs.

This can be simply demonstrated: in the Marshall case, a boy fighting with Praepostors was expelled instantly; in the Mackenzie affair, a boy who struck a Praepostor was given every chance to apologise. The

Præpostors G. Hughes and Mackie were superannuated for dereliction of duty in their office; T. Hughes was involved in a case of drunken vandalism under Arnold's own roof, and was not (though what would have happened had he been detected at the time is another question). In the School House affair of 1838, the decision on who was to be expelled was taken after the winter vacation had been spent in deliberation.

Such generalisations as:

"Without compunction, and even without waiting for an explanation, he expelled boys who resisted authority."¹⁵⁹

require considerable qualification, the more so now that the reliability of so much of the evidence on which they were based has been shown to be questionable.

If the letters largely acquit Arnold of charges of precipitateness and acting through anger rather than reason, they also highlight some character traits which have received comparatively less publicity in recent accounts of him. His integrity in his adherence to principle is clearly revealed: his own relatives suffered in 1838, and he refused the entreaties of his Sixth Form, J.P. Lee, and his own feelings in the Mackenzie affair. His compassion is shown by his attitude to the Sixth Former who contracted a venereal infection, and by his subsequent interest in Mackenzie's future. And then there is his despair, well-illustrated by the incidents in the School House from 1838. Moreover the existence of such disorders over successive years is clear evidence that problems of bad behaviour, drunkenness, and the like still existed in his closing years at the school. And in the case of the School House disturbances, there, is now the additional factor of his own culpability to be considered. Arnold never claimed to have cured Rugby's

problems, and the new evidence supports the view which recognises this, notably Bamford's.¹⁶⁰ As well as revealing the state of affairs under his own roof and the anxiety it engendered, the letters have also disclosed his real feelings about the management of the School House, feelings which upset the traditional view, exemplified by Wymer, of his later years and his government of the House. Similarly the events of these last years offer no support to the notion that once his system of Sixth Form government was established it ran like a well-oiled machine, fulfilling its function without serious disorder. Apart from providing new information about specific events in which members of the Sixth were involved, the correspondence allows critical observations into his relations with the Praepostors to be made.

On the basis of the matters discussed here, it is clear that Arnold's confidence and optimism in his Praepostors was maintained despite examples of its being misplaced. Arnold was a practical man, and yet the evidence suggests that in some cases his implicit confidence in them was not only unrealistic but self-deceiving. For example, his own experience had taught him that intellectual power in his Praepostors was not enough; the possession of character and physical strength was equally important if they were successfully to exercise the supervisory role he intended. Yet despite this knowledge, and despite the disorders of his last years, he removed natural leaders like George Hughes and James Mackie, thereby helping to create the very situation he wished to avoid.

Although Arnold was disturbed by boys whose reputations were based largely upon their physical abilities - such boys were often first-rate games' players - there is no doubt that the superannuation of inspirational characters with leadership qualities debilitated the top

of the school. It might have been better to have made far greater allowances for boys like George Hughes and Mackie and to have done everything in his power to win them around by argument, as he did so successfully with Thomas Hughes.¹⁶¹ Arnold's continual optimism, despite the set-backs, is admirable, and he was bitterly disappointed when members of the Sixth Form failed to achieve his expectations. But it could be argued that this optimism reflects a large degree of misunderstanding of a boy's mind, in that he was asking them to live up to a standard which, given the pressures inherent in a closed community, many adults would have had difficulty attaining.¹⁶² The evidence could support the view that this confident belief in his Sixth Former's ability to maintain such a standard and fulfil the role he set for them shows a fundamental lack of empathy as well as a lack of realism on his part.¹⁶³

In general terms, then, the biographical record has been considerably affected by the unpublished material, both by the addition of new evidence and the reinterpretation of the pejorative view of Arnold's behaviour. If the extent to which this view has been amended is surprising, one answer lies in the fact that sweeping generalisations have frequently been made on the basis of isolated incidents. Often, not only does the specific evidence adduced to support them not withstand critical scrutiny, it is frequently also the only evidence on which a contentious interpretation of Arnold's character and methods is based.

Arnold's Relationship with the Trustees of Rugby School.

The government of Rugby School was vested in twelve Trustees, who administered the founder's charitable trust.¹⁶⁴ They had full responsibility for the appointment and dismissal of the Headmaster and his staff, salaries, pensions, payments of all rates and taxes, maintenance of the buildings etc., and could make whatever rules and regulations for the management of the school they thought fit. In practice, however, the internal government of the school, its management, discipline, and efficiency, were left to the Headmaster, who made periodical reports to the Trustees and advised them of any changes he deemed necessary.¹⁶⁵ Nevertheless, their power over the Headmaster was absolute, and this was one of the chief points which had so exercised Arnold before he applied for the post. Although it was the Trustees' practice not to interfere in the internal running of the school, they had complete authority to do so if they wished.¹⁶⁶ Arnold foresaw problems, particularly with his intention to make a more general use of the weapon of expulsion than was usual: since the Trustees were concerned with finance, they would equate reduction in numbers with reduction in income.¹⁶⁷ He received assurances, however, that the Trustees' customary practice meant what it said; and since the number of admissions quickly increased and remained at a good level, the Trust suffered no diminution in its income from fees, so a clash did not occur. But given their powers, it was clearly necessary for the relationship between Trustees and Headmaster to be harmonious:

"... the working of the system depends wholly on a thoroughly good understanding between the Trustees and the Head Master."¹⁶⁸

To examine the information which the unpublished correspondence provides on this "understanding" is the purpose of this section.

Any consideration of Arnold's relationship with the Trustees of Rugby School must proceed from the basis of two well-established facts: first that Arnold accepted the Headmastership of the school on the understanding that they would respect his authority and independence on matters relating to the discipline and working of the school. If they became dissatisfied, their remedy, as Stanley recorded, "... was not interference, but dismissal."¹⁶⁹ And second, that a fundamental point in his relations with them was his insistence on his right as a private citizen to express himself freely on whatever subject, political or otherwise. This latter point is well attested through the publication in The Life of three letters (L.572, L.574, L.576) he sent to one of the twelve Trustees, Earl Howe, rejecting Howe's right to question him as to his authorship of a controversial article in defence of Dr Hampden which appeared in the Edinburgh Review. This rebuff subsequently led to Howe's moving a vote of censure against him, which was lost through the eight Trustees present dividing equally on the matter.¹⁷⁰ Arnold's insistence on independence of action is not in doubt; the question is to what extent did the Trustees acquiesce in this and what were their feelings towards him. The biographers' opinions vary. Stanley records that relations were usually cordial, but emphasises Arnold's autonomous stance;¹⁷¹ Whitridge says the Trustees were afraid of him;¹⁷² Wymer's account suggests they were open-minded, exercised some restraint over his wishes, and became convinced by the effectiveness of his methods.¹⁷³ Bamford states that they had little control over him since they knew they had no right to interfere in school matters and that, in any case, "... their Headmaster would not agree to direction."¹⁷⁴ Although the

fact of their authority, vested in them by the constitution of the trust, cannot be gainsaid, the tendency of the view taken by Stanley, Whitridge, and Bamford is to suggest that Arnold was without restraint and the Trustees mere ciphers complying with his requests. Indeed, a recent commentator has so far developed this view as to declare that by 1835 most of them "... were his docile servants," with his decisions "... safe from reversal."¹⁷⁵

The difficulty in assessing the validity of these interpretations has lain chiefly in the lack of direct evidence for his relations with them. In terms of the correspondence, the letters to Earl Howe are virtually the only ones published between Arnold and his Trustees.¹⁷⁶ These, of course, not only reflect his strongly independent line, but also, in their consequence, provide evidence that by no means all of them were his "docile servants". However, more information is available. Research among the descendants of Arnold's Trustees has resulted in the location of letters written by him to E.J. Shirley, and to W.B. Percy, the seventh Earl of Denbigh.¹⁷⁷ In addition, some letters written to Denbigh, and also to the Trustees as a body, survive in the archives of Rugby School. An examination of this unpublished material, and other relevant letters, to see what light is shed on the question of Arnold's relationship with them and to consider any new information which it provides on aspects of his management of the school is the purpose of this section. The results will be displayed under two general headings: the Trustees' reactions to his political and religious publications, and matters concerning the administration of the school.

Politically, Arnold has been described as a Radical, even an extremist;¹⁷⁸ but such labels are often far too simplistic, certainly so in Arnold's case, for he was regularly assailed from all sides of the political spectrum. The fluctuation of his views as a young man has been noticed in Part One, and it can be safely said that he was ever against all forms of extremism. Whitridge's estimate is just:

"There was never a more wholehearted reformer than Dr Arnold or a more rabid anti-Jacobin."¹⁷⁹

While Arnold himself ridiculed the idea that he desired revolution in England:

"... with my seven children and good house to lose, (to put it on no other ground,) ...",¹⁸⁰

he was equally hostile to the unthinking Church and King Tories. The result was that:

"... the Tories turn from me as a Liberal, whilst the strong Reformers think me timid ...".¹⁸¹

His refusal to separate religion and politics merely compounded his guilt in many eyes. The fact is that he took his own position:

"There is not a man in England who is less a party man than I am, for ... no party would own me; ...".¹⁸²

He brought to Rugby the reputation of a reformer and his friends feared that his outspokenness would incur hostility, particularly from the local Tory gentry, and adversely affect the school. In the former case they were right, and for much of the 1820 s his political and religious opinions, his Headmastership, and his private life were caricatured and pilloried by the Tory press.¹⁸³ Yet direct evidence for the effect of all this on the Trustees has been limited to the Howe correspondence of 1836, but the new evidence shows their disquiet originated several

years earlier.

Arnold's early letters from Rugby confirm Wymer's view that the Trustees were helpful and encouraging, willing to do all they could to assist him in matters concerning the school.¹⁸⁴ His friends' worry that the expression of his political opinions would cause problems with the Trustees receives its first justification in the correspondence in 1829, with the publication of his pamphlet in support of the Roman Catholic Relief Act.¹⁸⁵ In this he argued that since it was a historical fact that most of the Irish population were Roman Catholics, there was no reason why their civil rights should be circumscribed by the Protestant minority. His mixture of religion and politics caused a minor furore among both Liberals and Tories, and particularly among the clergy, whose ignorance of historical matters, he asserted, rendered them incompetent judges of the question.¹⁸⁶ Arnold's insistence on his liberty to write on the subject is set forth in The Life in L.289 (May, 1829),¹⁸⁷ though the direct reference to the Trustees, in which he shows his awareness of their feelings and gives his views on them, was excised by Stanley. As individuals, Whigs or Tories, the Trustees would approve of his actions or not, but the only circumstances in which he thought they would interfere would be if the school was adversely affected; but in any event he would not relinquish his freedom to write:

"As to the Trustees, to them the proof of the pudding will be in the eating, and they will care little ... if the school goes on well. As individuals, the Tories will naturally dislike it, and the Whigs like it; but as Trustees they would not I believe dream of

meddling about it; nor, to speak the plain truth, should I allow of their interference in such a matter; that is I claim a full right to use my own discretion in writing upon any subject ...".

As long as the school prospered, therefore, he did not envisage that they would intervene. It did,¹⁸⁸ and there is nothing in the unpublished correspondence before 1831 which suggests that the Trustees had attempted to interfere or even mentioned the matter of his writings. But there is evidence from that year which shows that the subject was raised with him, despite the flourishing state of the school. Again it was through his writing on contemporary political issues of great controversy.

Arnold's response to the violent political and social unrest of 1830 and 1831¹⁸⁹ was to publish his own weekly newspaper, The Englishman's Register, in which he sought to relieve his mind by promoting "moral and intellectual reform,"¹⁹⁰ through a series of objective, non-partisan articles on contemporary social and political issues, combined with an exposition of the Book of Genesis. There were nine issues, from 7 May to 2 July 1831, before lack of funds and little support caused its cessation.¹⁹¹ Some of these articles had been copied by the editor of the Sheffield Courant, who invited Arnold to contribute more. The result was thirteen letters on "The Social Condition of the Operative Classes", which appeared during 1831 and 1832.¹⁹² In these Arnold, arguing for reform in a rational, moderate tone, analysed the country's social and economic problems and gave his remedies for them. But the anti and ultra reformers were debating the question in the country in fiercely partisan terms, consequently neither party found his standpoint

congenial, to the extent that,

"If I had two necks, ... I had a very good chance of being hanged by both ...".¹⁹³

Now, apparently for the first time, one of the Trustees raised the matter of his journalistic activities with him.

In October 1831, he received a "very kind letter" from Lord Denbigh which had questioned the desirability of his writing on such matters. Although this letter has not survived, the nature of Arnold's reply (L.374) suggests that Denbigh thought Arnold's political activities might adversely affect the school in two ways: through boys' parents feeling their sons would be indoctrinated, and through his duties as Headmaster being neglected. Denbigh also seems to have suggested that the fact that Arnold's articles were unsigned implied that he was himself aware of being engaged in something unbecoming. Arnold rejected this last point completely, assuring Denbigh that he had never sought deliberate concealment,¹⁹⁴ and he was anxious to give his assurances that parental fears were groundless:

"I feel as strongly as possible that either of these Things would be a gross Dereliction of Duty; but then I feel no Way conscious of ever having been guilty of either of them; and ... I could safely challenge the strictest Inquiry."

As proof of his care, he adds that his scruples were such that he would not even read the history of the French Revolution with the boys when they reached that point in the Modern History course. He dismisses local rumours of his "revolutionary" tendencies, setting the boys revolutionary themes and flaunting a tricolour watch-ribbon, as "not

only false but absolutely ludicrous."¹⁹⁵ On the question of writing being incompatible with his position, he emphasises that he would never, "... write in a Newspaper for mere Objects of Party Politics," but that the question of reform was:

"... of far too great Importance for any Man to affect to take no Part in it."

He stresses that his motives in circulating the Englishman's Register and writing for the Sheffield Courant were for the sole object of doing good:

"... I hold it to be a most urgent and important Duty to every Man who has Opportunity, to endeavour to furnish something of an Antidote to the Quantity of Wickedness and Folly that is circulating through the Country."

Although Arnold's defence of his position was to remain perfectly consistent, the tone of this letter differs considerably from that present in the Howe correspondence five years later. Here, Arnold is most respectful and perfectly willing to explain fully all his activities. He freely acknowledges his proprietorship of the Register and his authorship of the letters; he gives assurances that his political activities do not obtrude on school affairs, and he is anxious that the Trustees will judge him by the effect on the school. While he reserves the right to continue expressing his views, he does so in a manner which is solicitous; he is conciliatory not combative:

"... I confess I am exceedingly glad that you have mentioned the Subject, ... I feel so closely bound by Duty & Affection to this School, that I could do nothing which I conceived in any Degree

capable of injuring its Interests ... I venture most respectfully to hope that the Confidence which your Lordship & the other Trustees have been good enough to place in me, will not be shaken, unless they have cause to think that I am mismanaging the School, or that its Credit & Numbers are Declining. My writing for a Newspaper is certainly for no personal Interest or Gratification whatever; but I hope & believe that what I write may in however humble a Degree do some Good; and I do it exactly with the same Feelings and from the same Motives that led me to request the Trustees to appoint me ... as Chaplain.

I sincerely apologize to your Lordship for trespassing thus unreasonably on your Time ... May I again express my grateful sense of your Kindness on this as on all other Occasions; ...".

Denbigh, it seems, had written in a private capacity, though Arnold's reference to the "Trustees" confidence in him shows his awareness that Denbigh's concern was likely to have been shared by his colleagues. That the matter was of more than personal concern to Denbigh is proved by a letter from Sir Henry Halford, another Trustee, sent to Denbigh four days later.¹⁹⁶ This document shows that Arnold's reply had been communicated immediately to Halford - so the matter had been previously discussed with one other Trustee at least - and that neither Denbigh nor Halford were entirely satisfied with Arnold's response:

"It is candid we must own - but I do not like the thing altogether. When a man once begins, he is apt to wax warm ... However he has given

up the Editorship, it seems, tho' he has not given up his correspondence ... I flatter myself that your Lordship's hint will do good, and I approve of your own answer ...".

Nothing more is known; but since to Denbigh and Hælford at least, the incompatibility of his editing a newspaper while holding his Headmastership had been rectified, and they had his assurances (and evidence) that the school was not suffering, they probably acquiesced. But if they were not entirely happy, it did not prevent Arnold's continuing to write. In 1832 his second volume of sermons, which contained his Essay on the Interpretation of Scripture, was published and in January 1833 his pamphlet on the Principles of Church Reform appeared. Both of these provided ammunition for his critics.¹⁹⁷

The subject of the Trustees' notice of his writings does not occur again in the correspondence until February 1833, when the March case was at its height and Arnold's political and religious opinions were being pilloried as part of the publicity surrounding the affair. Among the Denbigh papers are the heads of a reply¹⁹⁸ he sent in response to Arnold's letter of 28 January 1833 (L.423, a letter concerned entirely with details of the March case). Denbigh dismissed the newspaper criticisms:

"... they are too evidently excited by Political & Party feeling to be of the least importance, ...";

but he rebuked Arnold for allowing the political charges to be made in the first place and warned him of the harm which the school might suffer:

"... but of course as arising from such grounds to be deplor'd as possibly injurious to the general interests of the School. (This is

intended as a slap in the face).".

Arnold wrote back instantly (L.427), but again, not in terms of hostility. He was temperate, and anxious lest his character had suffered in Denbigh's eyes:

"I cannot but feel Pain ... because I fear that you must either imagine me to have been guilty of Imprudencies ... or that ... my Views of my Duty do not meet with your Approbation."

He emphasised that he was not indoctrinating the boys:

"I do not think it possible for any Man to have abstained more carefully from personal and party Politics, above all from ever introducing or alluding to such Topics before the Boys, than I have ever done, and I trust shall ever continue to do."

As for the effects on the school, the local hostility created by the attacks of the Northampton Herald seemed to Arnold to be doing them a positive service in that it might help to reduce the merely local character of the establishment:

"The most that they could do would be to prevent us from receiving so many Boys ... from our own Neighbourhood; a Result which I should regard as any Thing but an Evil, as it would make us so much the less a mere local School."

Although Denbigh accepted that Arnold's conduct in the March case was beyond reproach, he was not convinced by his explanation of his political activities and their likely effects on the school. He acquitted Arnold of introducing politics into school affairs but reminded him that his

very position gave him great influence over the boys. Denbigh's view was that while Arnold had a perfect right to his political opinions, it was unfitting for a man in his position to publicise them in the way he had:

"... no one can blame you for having decided opinions, tho' perhaps the propriety may be questioned of their ever being put unnecessarily forward either thro' ye medium of ye Pulpit, ye Press or any other mode whilst filling ye public & responsible situation in which you are now placed."^{198A}

He completely rejected Arnold's view that the school would benefit from a different type of boy by pointing out that the cumulative effect of Arnold's publications would tend to give a political character to the school which was wholly undesirable for an institution designed for the "... benefit of all parties.". Although in this exchange Denbigh emphasised that he was expressing his personal opinions, it is likely that he was giving voice to reservations shared by his fellow Trustees. Moreover, the fact that he told Arnold he intended to explain individually to each of his colleagues that the attacks made by the press for his handling of the March case were without foundation means that the question of Arnold's writings would inevitably be discussed, since they formed a large portion of the adverse comment. Arnold published nothing controversial in 1834 and 1835¹⁹⁹ and the correspondence provides no more information on this particular subject before the Howe letters of 1836. Stanley ascribes this to his realisation that nothing he was likely to write would do good since it would be overwhelmed by "... the tide of misunderstanding and prejudice with which he was met,"²⁰⁰ It might also be that his awareness of this hostility included a knowledge of the

Trustees' disapprobation.

The Howe correspondence has been often remarked upon and it is not necessary to discuss in detail the scathing attack which Arnold delivered on the Tractarians in the unsigned Edinburgh Review article of 1836 entitled "The Oxford Malignants and Dr Hampden",²⁰¹ in which he denounced their attacks on R.D. Hampden's appointment as Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford.²⁰² One hitherto unknown fact revealed by the correspondence is that Arnold was approached to write the article: he had not written it and then sought an outlet for publication.²⁰³ This is shown by an unpublished letter to Hampden of 28 March 1836:

"I have been asked to write an Article on your
Persecution and on the Judaizing Heretics your
Persecutors in the next Edinburgh Review. I have
consented to do so, ..." (L.555).

Arnold's indignation and sense of injustice was aroused and this was reflected in his language. His vehemence caused such a sensation that Earl Howe, in his capacity of Trustee, demanded to know if he was the author. Arnold denied Howe's right to question him and this led to a motion of censure being brought before the Trustees which was lost through their dividing equally. A number of points can be made about this incident and the way in which the biographers have interpreted it.

Firstly, why did Arnold refuse to give Howe the same kind of information which, as is now known, he had freely given to Denbigh some years before? The letters which Howe wrote to Arnold do not appear to have survived, though it seems from Arnold's replies and Stanley's summaries in The Life that the first two at least were peremptory.²⁰⁴ Stanley notes that Howe was writing officially as a Trustee, but there is little doubt that Arnold was aware that some of his correspondence with Denbigh five years earlier

would have been discussed among them. Although he apparently told Howe that his question was one which only an intimate had the right to put, the fact is that he had been quite willing to give similar information to Denbigh, who was not a close personal friend either. There are a number of points which can be made. Denbigh appears to have been well disposed towards Arnold and seeking to advise him in a friendly manner, writing in a private capacity rather than as a Trustee. Howe, on the other hand, had, in his official capacity, written a brief, interrogative letter in a purely formal tone. And when Arnold is spoken of as "defying" the Trustees over this matter it is interesting that in two of his letters he did, in effect, give Howe the answer he was seeking. From the nature of Arnold's replies, particularly the second one, it seems that he was distinguishing between Howe the Trustee and Howe the man. Arnold's first letter was in fact an answer in the affirmative; but it was not explicit and Howe might not have understood it, certainly he seems to have been offended by Arnold's manner. In his second letter, Arnold made it clear, but again indirectly, that he did write the article. After eight years of his Headmastership, it is not unreasonable to assume that there must have been some "familiarity of acquaintance" between the two of them. Arnold's point was that his principle would not allow him to answer the question "officially" because he did not acknowledge Howe's right "officially as a Trustee" to question him on such a subject. The distinction which Arnold was making might not have been immediately apparent to Howe; and even if it became so, was probably not accepted by him. But the tone of the letters is ambiguous and this must be considered when adducing the Howe correspondence as evidence of defiance.

Howe then moved a motion of censure against Arnold, which, if carried, Stanley says would probably have led to Arnold's resignation.²⁰⁵ The

emphasis which the other biographers give to this varies. Whitridge is brief and does not comment on the question of resignation, setting the affair in the general context of Arnold's refusal to allow the Trustees to interfere in the management of the school.²⁰⁶ But this requires definition. Howe had not written about a matter of the school's internal administration, and the Denbigh correspondence has shown that the Trustees did not accept Arnold's distinction between his Headmastership and his writing on controversial topics. Wymer says the Trustees met to consider intervening which would have meant instant dismissal for Arnold.²⁰⁷ This view is developed by Bamford. He states that the Headmaster's "few supporters" at the meeting argued that the school's prosperity in terms of numbers did not justify "dramatic action", though the others demanded his dismissal; and that because the vote had been such a "very close thing", Arnold was chastened and "took elaborate precautions" over his future behaviour.²⁰⁸ Stanley's and these two latter opinions both assume that Arnold would have lost his position had the motion been carried: Stanley that he would have resigned; Wymer and Bamford that he would have been dismissed. Again these views require qualification, not least because there is no record of just what was said at that meeting.

It must not be thought that the Trustees had met specially to decide this issue. It was their regular summer meeting and several matters were discussed.²⁰⁹ The terms in which the motion of censure was couched are not known, and this is an important point, for Arnold's reaction would surely have been determined by the wording of Howe's proposal. It might be that Stanley had a source other than the correspondence, but the fact is that only one reference to the meeting can be found in the letters (L.581), and the tone of Arnold's comments there does not suggest

he had been on the verge of losing the Headmastership, either by resignation or dismissal.²¹⁰ If he had been really worried about his position he might have been expected to write this letter to Hawkins as soon as he discovered the Trustees' decision. Instead he waited for three weeks to tell him, which might suggest that he did not believe his Headmastership was at stake. Although Stanley says the Trustees were asked to censure him, Arnold seems to have been unaware of the terms of the motion Howe introduced. Of course, the fact that L.581 was written several weeks after the event, when Arnold had no further worries on what was a confidential matter, and was able to see the affair in perspective, might account for the rather dismissive way in which he refers to it. Bamford refers to Arnold's "few supporters", though these actually comprised fifty per cent of those Trustees' present. Moreover this group does not include Sir Henry Halford, whom Bamford says supported Arnold,²¹¹ since he did not attend the meeting.²¹² Had he been present, the motion would probably have been defeated five to four. Although it is not known how the eight Trustees voted, it is noteworthy that but three months earlier, nine of them (including two not present on this occasion) had passed a unanimous vote of confidence in Arnold's management of the school,²¹³ a vote which the eight members at this summer meeting also confirmed unanimously.²¹⁴ Since the terms of the censure motion are not known, it cannot simply be assumed that Arnold's dismissal was being sought. Howe had certainly not been deputed as the Trustees' representative to question Arnold; he was writing in an individual capacity simply as a member of that body. If Arnold had answered him immediately in the affirmative, is it known for certain that he would automatically have moved a censure motion? Whatever course of action he contemplated, and whatever his reasons for it, he had to

convince his fellow Trustees. It might be that he felt aggrieved by Arnold's manner, and an element of personal animus dictated his bringing forward a motion which might otherwise have been talked out. It might have been equally a matter of principle with him as a Trustee that he felt his colleagues should have the opportunity to debate the question of Arnold's writings. But if, as is likely, the Trustees were asked formally to deplore Arnold's conduct in writing the article, it does not follow that they wished to dismiss him. Indeed, some of them might well have agreed with his sentiments. In Arnold's defence, it could be said that the offending article was unsigned, so there was no attempt publicly to advertise his name and, by association, the school's. The controversial title, "The Oxford Malignants", was not given by Arnold, it was added by the editor of the Edinburgh Review.²¹⁵ Bamford is surely correct to say that the flourishing state of the school would have been adduced in his support; and since the Trustees' previous vote of confidence recognised this, does it necessarily follow that they would want to risk losing him? If not, then perhaps the motion of censure was worded accordingly, distinguishing between his political writings and his duties as Headmaster. It may be that Stanley is closest to the truth when he says Arnold would probably have resigned. Certainly he would not have accepted any restriction on his freedom to write. But would the Trustees have demanded this? The whole question turns on the wording of the motion of censure. Since that is not known, serious doubt is cast on the view that the Trustees were seeking his dismissal. As for Arnold's alleged elaborate circumspection in the future: less than twelve months after the vote of censure had failed, he was contributing a series of letters on contemporary political and ecclesiastical issues to the Hertford Reformer newspaper, contributions

which continued until 1840 - though not, of course, in the vituperative style of the "Malignants" article.²¹⁶ These are not the actions of a man chastened and cowed after receiving a salutary lesson.

There is nothing further in the correspondence on the Trustees' reactions to his political and religious writings. The evidence which has been considered shows their concern was made clear to Arnold on at least two occasions (1831 and 1833) before the Howe correspondence in 1836. Since no record of their attempting any official action against him before 1836 has been disclosed, it must be assumed that the sincerity of his motives and the prosperity of the school caused them to acquiesce in the situation, particularly once Arnold had given up what to them must have been the obvious incompatibility of combining his Headmastership with the editorship of a weekly newspaper. It is also reasonable to assume that during this period their views would have been made known to him through private conversations.²¹⁷ The censure motion of 1836, therefore, is not typical of the Trustees' usual reactions, and it has been shown that without the terms of that motion, it is hazardous to assume that Arnold would have been dismissed had it been carried. Arnold's justification of his attitude to writing articles, the distinction he made between the school and his private activities, a distinction they would not accept, along with the general conclusions which emerge from these letters about his relationship with the Trustees is discussed at the end of this section.

Although Arnold was given a relatively free-hand in the internal running of the school, its system and discipline, one important aspect of his relations with the Trustees which is often overlooked is their responsibility for the financial administration of the establishment. This was derived from their control of the Lawrence Sheriff Trust, all expenditure from which had to be sanctioned by them. In itself, this power suggests that the likelihood of their becoming mere ciphers, the tools of their Headmaster, was remote; and the corollary, of course, is that a prudent Headmaster would not wish to provoke the hostility of the authority controlling the purse-strings. For the system to function smoothly, it was necessary for Arnold to keep his Trustees fully informed, and to convince them when he believed expenditure from the trust was desirable. Confirmation of these respective standpoints is provided by the unpublished letters which deal with the subject of expenditure from the charity.

It will be recalled that one of the key measures of Arnold's strategy identified by David Newsome was his elevation of the status of the assistant masters. One of his first acts was to obtain an increase in their salaries to give them a financial stability independent of any curacies they were holding as a means of supplementing their salaries. This enabled him to ask for their resignation from such posts so that their full attention could be devoted to the school.²¹⁸ But the power of increasing their salaries did not lie with Arnold; he had to persuade the Trustees that this was desirable. They agreed with him and by ordering an increase in the fees for both Foundationers and non-Foundationers were able to apply some of the income generated to funding the increase in staff salaries.²¹⁹ This was in 1828. In September 1829 he was anxious to replace the existing French master, M. Delepoux,²²⁰ with

a master of modern languages (French and German), Louis Pons. The correspondence over this post provides a good insight into their relationship. It shows Arnold's care in obtaining their permission for each step he contemplated; how he was obliged to convince the Trustees of the financial viability of his plans for teaching the subject, and how the question of obtaining a pension for Delepoux was entirely in their hands. Once Arnold had learned of Pons' interest he was careful to inform the Trustees and to request their advice before proceeding:

"... I understood it to be the Wish of the Trustees, when I had the Honour of meeting them in July, that I should take some Steps to procure a new Master ... May I then request your Opinion as to the Answer which I should send ... May I apologize for the Liberty I have taken, and request you to favour me with an early Answer ..." (L.298).

As a consequence, he was obliged to send Pons' testimonials to them. They gave their consent to the appointment, but then Arnold decided to retain Delepoux as Pons' assistant, which meant additional expenditure from the trust. Arnold could do nothing until this had been sanctioned by the Trustees. He had to submit a detailed financial scheme which allowed his plans to be adopted at the least possible cost to the trust:

"... every Boy who learns French pays four Guineas a Year for his Instruction in it. Now if every Boy were hereafter to pay £2. 0. 0., the Charge being made compulsory upon all, there would be £300 a Year for M. Pons ... and £100 for his Assistant. By this Arrangement, supposing that

the Trustees paid £2. 0. 0. for each Founder instead of £1. 10. 0. which was the original Idea ... the additional 10s. would not amount to more than £20. 0. 0. a Year, that is the Amount ... which might perhaps have been given to M. Delepoux as a Pension, had he retired ..." (L.299).

Another point which is revealed by all the correspondence over this affair is the respectfulness and deference which Arnold shows in his dealings with the Trustees:

"I mentioned this ... Plan to Mr Grimes,²²¹ ... He recommended that it should be submitted to all the Trustees by Letter, without troubling them to attend a special Meeting; and ... I should apply to you for the Letter ... of M. Pons, which I had the Honour of forwarding to you.

If I should obtain the Sanction of the Trustees to the Plan which I have now ventured to lay before you, ... I fear that I have trespassed unreasonably upon your Indulgence, encouraged by the kind Permission which your Letter has given me. Begging again to repeat my Thanks for the Attention which you have given to this Subject ..." (L.299)

The same combination of qualities is apparent in his request in June 1830 for two more masters, Bonamy Price and J.P. Lee, to be added to the staff. First Arnold had to convince the Trustees that the appointments were necessary:

"Although I hope so soon to have the Honour of meeting ... the ... Trustees at Rugby; yet as I know that

various other Matters will then sufficiently engross your Time, I venture to submit ... one or two Points ... which I should beg earnestly and respectfully to recommend to the Consideration of the Meeting ... An Increase of the Number of Boys renders an Increase of Masters absolutely necessary. Would the Funds of the Charity be able to meet this additional Demand, if the present liberal Scale of Payment be continued: and if it be lowered, shall we not lose our Chance of procuring first rate Masters, ...?" (L.327).

Arnold, therefore, was obliged to make a case. The fact that these early requests were granted confirms Wymer's view that the Trustees were willing to assist him if they could. But as administrators of the charity, they controlled the funds, and it must not be thought they acceded to all his wishes. In 1831 they interfered directly in the internal government of the school by refusing to allow a disciplinary change he wished to make,²²² and in the same year refused to release funds for the appointment of another master, Algernon Grenfell. They did, however, agree to Arnold and his staff financing the post from their own pockets.²²³ Likewise in 1832 the staff had to find the money for an annual scholarship.²²⁴ Both of these actions testify to the spirit Arnold had generated among his assistants. Increases in the staff of the school, therefore, whether funded by the charity or not, had to be sanctioned by the Trustees, and the evidence shows that both they and the Headmaster were well aware of their respective powers. Consultation was not a mere formality. Before considering the cases of those members of staff who lost their places during his term as Headmaster, mention must be made of Arnold's

unpublished observations to the Trustees on why the school had declined under his predecessor, Dr Wooll, for these give an answer to an unresolved problem.

Wooll reigned during a period when many attacks were being made upon the state of the public schools,²²⁵ and there is nothing to show that Rugby under his Headmastership was any better or worse than most of the schools of the period. The old idea that Arnold inherited and transformed a den of iniquity has been shown to be groundless.²²⁶ Precisely why the school's numbers fell during Wooll's time from a high of 381 to a low of 136 when Arnold took over in 1828 has never been satisfactorily explained.²²⁷ Initially, Arnold himself could not account for the reduction in the school's numbers; he was impressed both by Wooll and the school, and there is no record of his ever having criticised his predecessor.²²⁸ But in 1830, after two years experience, he gave the Trustees his opinion on why the school had declined under Wooll: he could ascribe the great fluctuation in admissions under his predecessor's regime to nothing other than the fickleness of prevailing fashion. When the school was in favour, a false prosperity had been created; when the school was not, dramatic decline had been the result. To be at the mercy of such a capricious force alarmed Arnold, particularly since the cycle seemed to be repeating itself with admissions increasing for no apparent reason:

"But if we let it increase without any Check, it is very likely to run up to an unnatural Height within the next Year or two, to create as before a Demand for new Boarding Houses, and to be spoken of as exceedingly flourishing. In a few Years the Fashion will set to some other School; and our Numbers being

above our natural Proportion will begin to diminish: a Sort of Panic then succeeds, a Cry is set up that the School is going down; this Cry soon verifies itself, and the Character of the Masters suffers in the Opinion of the Trustees and of the World on account of a Fluctuation which is really no fault of their's. (sic)

For myself I confess that recollecting my Predecessor's Experience, I quite dread the present rapid Increase of our Numbers.²²⁹ It is all founded on Credit; for no Fruit has yet been produced to justify it; and knowing as I do the real State of the School I fully expect that in two or three Years Time there will be a good Deal of Disappointment felt & expressed; and very unreasonably, because it will be but the Disappointment of exaggerated Expectations. I am quite willing to bear all the Discredit of the Decline of the School, if it proceeds from my Incapacity ... but I own I do not think it fair that I should sustain it, when arising from Causes which I clearly foresee, and am most deeply anxious to obviate." (L.327).

Arnold, therefore, claimed no credit for the rise in the school's fortunes; it was not through anything he had done:

"... the general Standard of Scholarship and Knowledge is so extremely low, ..." (L.327).

If his diagnosis is correct, then a mystery has been solved and Bamford's speculation that,

"It may well be that future research will show that

the difference between the success of Wooll and Arnold in terms of the numbers have nothing to do with scholastic achievements at all, ...",²³⁰

has been proved to be correct.

Arnold's remedy was to appeal to the Trustees to limit the number of non-Foundationers to 260. These along with the Foundationers would give a total of 300 boys in the school, a figure which he thought could be maintained.²³¹ This would reduce the risk of the previous wild fluctuation repeating itself and introduce a level of long-term stability. And equally importantly, a limitation on numbers increased the chances of doing real good to the boys who were in the school. So in conjunction with his request on numbers, Arnold submitted three other proposals for their consideration: the gradual replacement of Dames by classical masters in the boarding-houses, a change which would increase the chances of obtaining "... a Knowledge of each individual Boy's Character;" (L.327) and facilitate the maintenance of order;²³² an increase in the number of teaching staff; and the temporary suspension of the upper age limit for admissions. This last request was so that he might obtain boys at the head of the school who had "come here expressly for the Object of a Sort of finishing Preparation for College." (L.327). This was a device by which he hoped to raise the mediocre level of intellectual attainment which prevailed in the school by giving the boys a standard to aim at.²³³ Arnold was obliged to argue his case at length, firstly because it was not within his power to order any of these matters, and secondly because on the question of restricting admissions, he realised that any attempt to place an upper limit on the number of non-Foundationers was not to the pecuniary advantage of the trust:

"I am aware that on former Occasions the Trustees

have expressed themselves unfavourable to the Plan of limiting the Numbers of the School; ..." (L.327).

In his favour was the fact that he had more than doubled the school's strength during his short term, and his plan did offer the hope of long-term stability, so the limitation he proposed was not unreasonable. The decline had been arrested and a resurgence was taking place, therefore it is not surprising that the Trustees granted all his requests save that of admitting older boys.²³⁴

Two of the points disclosed in L.237, the limitation on numbers and the abolition of Dames' houses, are not items of new biographical information, though the way in which the former has sometimes been discussed can be qualified. Wymer, for example, sees it as Arnold's prudent response to the danger inherent in his policy of using the weapon of expulsion far more widely.²³⁵ Although it cannot be said that there was no realisation of this behind the request, the emphasis in L.327 is squarely upon the potential dangers of catering to an artificial increase in the size of the school, which was based on nothing more than irrational demand.

Although Arnold greatly enhanced the financial standing and personal status²³⁶ of his assistants, he expected much from them in return. Weekly staff meetings for the discussion of school business were introduced; all the boarding-houses were gradually placed under their control;²³⁷ and a much greater degree of personal contact with the boys was expected.²³⁸ He sought lively, gentleman-scholars and eventually created a loyal, diligent staff of considerable ability, many of whom achieved success elsewhere.²³⁹ It has been shown that all additions to the staff were by consent of the Trustees. The unpublished correspondence also provides information on an area in which little has previously been

known - differences of opinion between Arnold and his assistants.²⁴⁰
Specifically, the letters contain new information on those masters who lost their places during his Headmastership and show the extent of the Trustees involvement in those cases.

There are three masters whose names are mentioned by the biographers as those of men Arnold dismissed: Moor, Delepoux, and Bird.²⁴¹

Bamford mentions the view that these were men the Headmaster did not like and so "got rid of", though observing that this is not known for certain.²⁴² In the case of Bird, he says he was removed in 1833 because:

"Undoubtedly his part in the March affair and his obvious disapproval of Arnold's action made relations strained between them. His going was a relief all round, ...".²⁴³

Wymer, however, who does not mention the March case, states that in 1833:

"... Bird resigned after being demoted, somewhat unfairly, for a technical point in his method of teaching.",²⁴⁴

and that he seems to have been the first and last master with whom Arnold ever differed acrimoniously. He mentions two previous resignations from the staff, in 1830 and 1831, which "... were tendered and accepted with perfect good will on both sides;"²⁴⁵, the references being to Delepoux and Moor. The unpublished letters show that most of the foregoing remarks are incorrect. Bird was not dismissed in 1833, Moor's resignation was demanded, and Delepoux was presented with a virtual fait accompli.

The case of M. Delepoux can be read in L.298, L.299, and L.303. He

had been appointed by Dr Wooll in 1815 to teach French to those boys who required it, and by 1829 was "advanced in Years"²⁴⁶ (L.299). Arnold required a man to teach both French and German, the former of which he was to make compulsory for all the boys.²⁴⁷ In 1829 Delepoux was asked to resign his post by Arnold to make way for Pons, a much younger man and thus more suited to teaching the language to over 200 boys as part of the regular curriculum (L.299). Because he asked for Delepoux's resignation, it must not be thought that Arnold was indifferent to his future - on the contrary. His original scheme for a master of modern languages had been formed on the understanding that the Trustees would offer Delepoux suitable terms to induce his resignation.²⁴⁸ When he broached the subject with Delepoux, Arnold was so affected by the man's distress at the prospect of losing his position that he presented the Trustees with a plan by which Delepoux could be retained as Pons' assistant:

"This was one of the more painful Pieces of Duty which it was ever my Lot to perform; and the Manner in which poor M. Delepoux received the Information, ... was really very affecting. But he suggested a Plan which on further Consideration seems to me to relieve us from the painful Necessity of Depriving a most inoffensive Man, now advanced in Years, of the greatest Part of his Income." (L.299).

Arnold then set forth his plans, to which the Trustees agreed (L.303), and Delepoux was able to continue on the staff until he retired with a pension in 1830. Therefore although Delepoux's resignation was sought against his will, Arnold always intended financial provision to be made for him, and in the event was anxious to accommodate the man's own

wishes by allowing him to remain on the staff as assistant for as long as he wished.

The next member of the staff to leave was J.H.C. Moor. Arnold sought his resignation in 1831 on grounds which suggest that Moor was not prepared to enter wholeheartedly into the new spirit Arnold wished to infuse among his assistants:

"... I am bound in Justice ... to state most expressly that ... I have no Charges of Misconduct to bring against him, or of any Thing to affect the high Respectability of his Character. But I find and have found that our Views as to the State & Management of the School are Different, and that there is no cordial Co operation between us." (L.354).

Moor had been on the staff for thirteen years, having been appointed by Wooll's predecessor, Dr Ingles. It is noteworthy that he alone of the masters had not complied with Arnold's requirement that they give up any curacies they held.²⁴⁹ Arnold's remarks suggest that Moor was probably set in his ways and unwilling to change. He had ascertained that Moor's personal circumstances were such that his retirement would not cause hardship or be unseemly:

"At the same Time, were Mr Moor's Circumstances such as could make his Income as Master a Matter of great Importance to him, and had he not been so many Years at the School as to make his Resignation appear in itself natural & becoming, I should have been very unwilling to press for it. But as it is, ... his Circumstances ... are perfectly easy; and his Resignation cannot seem forced or premature; ...

(so) that his Place ... may be filled by a younger Man, and one who may think and act with me more entirely and cordially." (L.354).

The problem was that Moor refused to go, and so Arnold appealed to the Trustees for support (whether he was obliged to do so is discussed below). It is not known what action was taken, but Moor did resign in 1831 and received a pension.

The third member of this trio was Roger Bird, the master whose culpability in the March case has already been noticed. Both Wymer and Bamford say he resigned in 1833 (the year of that case), but this is not so. Bird did not resign until 1840 when, with a pension, he became Vicar of Combe Bissett.²⁵⁰ The error seems to have arisen because Arnold did press for Bird's resignation in 1833 in the aftermath of the March affair. There is much unpublished correspondence on this particular aspect of the affair, giving the arguments and counter-arguments in minute detail.²⁵¹

When Bird finally admitted his errors in the March case,²⁵² which had led to Arnold's character being publicly impugned, he agreed to read before the assembled school a paper drawn up by his fellow masters which exculpated Arnold, Lee, and Grenfell, and cleared the boy's character of the charge of lying. When he read this statement, however, Bird made a significant alteration to the agreed text. Instead of saying that his answer to the question he had received about the passages his form had read during the term,

"... left no Doubt on the Minds of the Masters present; ..." (L.437),

he read out,

"... left no Doubt on the Mind of Dr Arnold." (L.437).²⁵³

This change indulged the impressions of the boys that Bird was their champion, for they greeted his words with spontaneous applause (L.437).²⁵⁴ The other masters promptly held another enquiry and Bird signed an apology to Arnold. Because his character had now been twice exposed to misinterpretation by Bird's conduct, Arnold told him he could feel no confidence in him but would take no action unless the matter was revived. A series of offensive articles then appeared in the Northampton Herald in which Arnold and his assistants, particularly Lee, were abused, and Bird represented as the injured party and likely to suffer for protecting the boy. Despite pleas from his colleagues to do so, Bird refused either to defend Arnold's character or disclaim the role in which he was being cast. This was the last straw for Arnold, who laid the case before the Trustees and asked for Bird's resignation, though as painlessly as possible for the man:

"... I neither press for his immediate Resignation, and I shall feel happy to do any Thing in my Power to lessen the pecuniary Inconvenienc~~e~~s which his leaving Rugby might occasion to him." (L.435).²⁵⁵

At a specially convened meeting on 4 May 1833, the four Trustees present acknowledged Bird's guilt throughout and the propriety of Arnold's behaviour, yet did

"... not come to a final determination as to the dismissal of Mr Bird, but refer it rather to the general meeting ...".²⁵⁶

The general meeting in July 1833, at which five Trustees were present, agreed with the "... principles and spirit of the resolutions ..." passed in May save that they were willing to believe Bird's testimony that his alteration in the agreed wording of the statement had arisen

through "... anxiety and confusion of mind.". Nevertheless they were prepared to support the Headmaster in his demand for Bird's removal.²⁵⁷ Perhaps influenced by the terms of this resolution respecting Bird's mental state, Arnold let it be known he would not now insist on the man's resignation provided he would engage to live on friendly terms in the future. In July, Bird visited Arnold in Westmoreland and a reconciliation took place, though Arnold reserved the right to ask him privately for his resignation after two or three years if he had not rendered himself more suited for his position by private study (L.450).²⁵⁸ Bird, it seems, had learned his lesson, because he remained on the staff until 1840 when he resigned and took a parish.²⁵⁹ This new evidence, therefore, both adds to and corrects the biographical accounts concerning his alleged "dismissal".

These three are the only masters whose resignations have been linked to a failure to co-exist with Arnold, and there is nothing in the correspondence which suggests that those other masters who left the staff during his Headmastership did so with feelings of ill-will.²⁶⁰ The evidence on these three confirms Wymer's view that in the cases of Delepoux and Moor the reason for their removal was an inability to adapt to Arnold's wishes, though his statement that both resignations were tendered with perfect goodwill hardly applies to the circumstances surrounding Moor's resignation: Arnold had to demand it. Whatever his abilities, Delepoux's age rendered him unfit to teach French on the scale Arnold wished it taught, while Moor appears simply to have been unwilling to change, and was thus proving a source of embarrassment and potential disruption.²⁶¹ In the case of Bird, the reason given by Wymer for his "dismissal" is wrong, while that given by Bamford has to be qualified by the new information on the March affair, which places Bird's role in

a different light. Examination of their cases has shown that to regard them as men Arnold did not like and so "got rid of" is not only simplistic but creates a false impression of his character. Wymer is probably correct to see them as representatives of the old regime. They were senior masters, probably unwilling or incapable of changing; and it is noteworthy that the younger members of the teaching staff Arnold inherited remained with him for many years.²⁶² But the correspondence has shown that each of these removals has to be judged on its own merits. Only in the case of Moor can the charge of resignation through incompatibility be sustained. Similarly, it would be equally wrong to view these removals as examples of the alleged ruthless side of Arnold's character. The evidence shows that in each case Arnold was anxious to ensure the financial stability of the master concerned. His dealings with Delepoux reveal that he was even prepared to change his plans to accommodate him, while his decision to reinstate Bird is a remarkable instance of charitable forbearance by any standards. These letters provide no support for a picture of Arnold as an autocratic tyrant callously trampling on those in his path by the arbitrary exercise of his power.

More information on Arnold's relations with his Trustees has also been revealed. Just as he had to consult them over appointments to the staff, a fact which emerges from these incidents is the necessity for him to liaise closely with the Trustees on changes in school routine involving matters of finance. He had to seek their authority for the alteration he wished to make in the teaching of French because this involved fees being levied on all the boys. Likewise his wish to grant Delepoux a pension and his subsequent plan to retain him as Pons' assistant were matters requiring the Trustees' sanction. In his requests

for the removal of Moor and Bird, he chose to explain to them in detail the background of their cases. While prudence and courtesy probably dictated that he should do so - they were both senior masters whom he had not appointed - the correspondence does raise the question of whether he actually possessed the right to dismiss masters without the Trustees' approval, a right which commentators on his Headmastership have probably assumed. Arnold's remarks on this power, along with the Trustees' order on the subject, are not unambiguous. By the terms of the revised constitution of the trust enacted in 1777:

"... all the Masters ... Ushers, and the Writing
masters ... be removable at the Will and
Pleasure of the Trustees, ...".²⁶³

So the fact of the Trustees' supreme power is not in doubt; however, their practice of leaving the Headmaster in charge of the internal management of the school caused them to make the following order in 1779:

"The Trustees ... declare to the Assistants that
they have always considered ... the Dismissal of
any of the Assistants as virtually residing in
the Head Master, whom they hold to be immediately
responsible to them ...".²⁶⁴

The word "virtually" introduces an important qualification. That Arnold himself felt there was a certain ambiguity about this which could limit his authority in such cases, might be suggested by some of his comments in L.354 respecting Moor's situation once he had refused to resign:

"... I have no other Choice but to lay the Matter
before you ... The ... Order of ... 1797, ... leaves
no Doubt, I imagine, as to the Question of Right,
although of Course it does not follow that therefore it

ought to be exercised."

Do the words "I imagine" have an interrogative force thereby implying doubt as to his power; and why, in this same letter, does he quote verbatim for the Trustees' notice, the order of 1797 on which he assumed that power was based if there was no doubt about his authority? Just how Moor's resignation was eventually procured is not known, though in Bird's case much more information is available. Arnold had told Bird he found it impossible to continue working with him (L.435), the implication being, presumably, that Bird must resign. He then told Denbigh he assumed Bird would bring the matter before the Trustees and therefore he too wished to present his own case to them:

"... I shall be happy to lay before you the Particulars of that Part of his Conduct which seemed to me so destructive of Confidence." (L.435).

In other words the Trustees were to consider the evidence and pass judgement. And this is what happened, the Trustees deciding that:

"... they feel it their duty in conformity with the Act of Parliament and the resolution of the Trustees of August 1797 declaratory of the dismissal of the Assistant Masters as virtually residing in the Head Master to remove Mr Bird from his present situation as one of the Ushers of the School."²⁶⁵

It does not appear from this statement that the Trustees were responding to a formal appeal - not that the terms of the trust allowed for one in such a matter;²⁶⁶ the wording of their judgement simply states that they were removing Bird. Therefore did the Headmaster have the power or not? If Arnold did indeed have the right to dismiss him, there is nothing in the correspondence to show he formally exercised it. This does not, of

course, prove he did not possess that right. The fact that Bird's dismissal would inevitably attract considerable hostile publicity might of itself have made Arnold wish to associate the Trustees in the matter. And even if Bird, as a senior master, did not have a formal right of appeal, it might be that Arnold felt he ought to have. Yet there does seem to have been a doubt about his authority, a point which is confirmed by a note in Denbigh's hand on L.435, giving the heads of his reply to that letter. This says:

"(I) apprehend that Dr A. has the power of removing him. Refer him to Mr Harris on that point."

The emphasis Denbigh has placed on the word "apprehend", and his referral of Arnold to the Trustees' clerk, suggests that he at least seemed uncertain of Arnold's ability to dismiss a master. What the clerk's verdict was is not known, all that can be said with certainty is that the Trustees did support Arnold. Indeed for all practical purposes it can be assumed that they would support their Headmaster, which is surely what the resolution of 1797 was meant to convey. The fact that in the cases of Moor and Bird, Arnold chose to state the situation to the Trustees can be viewed as his prudently (and courteously) seeking their support, rather than showing his inability to act autonomously. Whatever his powers, that he did consult them, and the manner in which he did so, shows once more that he neither regarded them as ciphers nor their relationship as a mere formality.

Before the results of this section are assessed, brief notice of the remaining letters written to the Trustees can be made. Those which have so far been examined, indeed the majority which have been traced, date from the first five years of Arnold's Headmastership. It might be thought that growing familiarity might engender a change of attitude, yet on the basis of those which remain, all directed to Lord Denbigh, there is no evidence of a change in Arnold's demeanour; though the subject-matter of these letters is entirely different. L.764 and L.765 are concerned with the visit of the Queen Dowager to the school in 1839. Although this visit is well documented,²⁶⁷ these letters do have interest. Firstly they are examples of the state of excitement generated in Arnold the Radical at the prospect of meeting Royalty, and his desire to be instructed by Denbigh in the correct etiquette. And secondly because they disclose one new point about her visit to the school. It is known that Arnold was anxious to increase the prestige of Rugby School, and as the biographers observe, her visit did just that. What seems not to have been known is that Arnold actually engineered the event. When he learned she was staying at Newnham, he wrote to Denbigh and asked him directly if there was any way in which the school might honour her (L.764). This led to Denbigh asking her to visit. Arnold's desire to obtain public recognition for the school is also displayed in L.868 and part of L.897.²⁶⁸ The rest of this letter (L.897) shows Arnold seeking the Trustees' approval for his actions in delaying the reassembly of the school owing to the approach of cholera to Rugby:

"... I trust that your Lordship both as a Father,
and a Trustee ... will approve of my having done
so. ... I have written ... with regard to the
Foundationers ... expressing my Wish to do whatever

the Trustees should think Right with respect to them."

And with these remaining letters, as with the earlier ones, Arnold's manner is defferential and respectful.

Previous assessments of the relationship between Arnold and his Trustees have been largely dominated by two facts: the knowledge of his desire for independence of action, and his stand against Lord Howe. The one has been seen as a vindication of the other and most of the biographical interpretations are coloured accordingly. This has led to the tendency, noted earlier, to cast the Trustees in a subservient role. But it has been shown that the issue is more complex than this, and a distinction has to be made between the independence Arnold sought as a Headmaster and that which he wished to assert as a private citizen writing on contemporary affairs. The importance of the unpublished letters is that they provide much more information on the realities of this situation and thereby furnish a means of testing the accuracy of the previous judgements.

One fact which has to be appreciated is that the Headmaster governed by the consent of the Trustees. The constitution of the Lawrence Sheriff Trust vested supreme power in them. For practical purposes they left the Headmaster to manage school affairs - this provided the independence Arnold sought - but he was required to keep them informed. This was the point on which the relationship turned. Now if the new evidence showed that this was mere form: that the Trustees were in fact ciphers, totally dominated by Arnold, and that his reports to them on school matters were a simple formality, since they concerned an area in which they had effectively surrendered all rights to involve themselves, then it would support the view of their relationship which sees Arnold as an autocrat,

virtually without restraint. But the unpublished letters do not show this. What they do reveal is Arnold regularly consulting and asking for the Trustees' opinions and support on a variety of school affairs: the appointment and dismissal of masters, the introduction of modern languages, the limitation of school numbers, etc. And relating to these matters, another point to emerge is that the Trustees' financial responsibilities were taken seriously; Arnold was obliged to justify any expenditure from the trust, their acquiescence could not be taken for granted. In submitting his proposals he is always respectful, even deferential, frank and willing to explain his point of view. The tone of his letters is not dismissive, certainly not that of a man conscious of an ability to do virtually as he pleases, nor does it suggest he was dealing with men who were frightened of him. And the reactions of the Trustees to some of his proposals show that such notions would be unrealistic. In school affairs they were prepared to refuse him on financial grounds, and they rejected out of hand his scheme to introduce a system of solitary confinement. On the basis of the available evidence,²⁶⁹ it could be argued that the relationship which emerges is more akin to a partnership. The Trustees were generally sympathetic²⁷⁰ and wished to assist their Headmaster if they could. If they agreed to most of his requests, they did so because they thought them practical and beneficial and not because they had allowed themselves to be relegated to the function of a rubber-stamp. Moreover they had evidence that under his management the school was flourishing, in terms of numbers at least.²⁷¹ Arnold's period of office had coincided with the arrest of the decline and a significant turn-round in the school's fortunes. The effect of this on the Trustees must not be overlooked: to that extent he deserved their confidence.

Arnold had much greater difficulties with them over his writing on controversial subjects, and the evidence shows he was challenged on this issue long before the Howe correspondence in 1836. The years in between were not ones of timid acquiescence by the Trustees. They would not accept his distinction between writing in a private capacity on controversial subjects and his Headmastership. Whatever their personal feelings about his opinions, their objections were based on the effect his writing might have on the school. They not only feared a fall in admissions, but accusations of neglect and indoctrination, and as guardians of the trust would not have a sectarian bias given to the school. Denbigh certainly (and probably Halford) raised the matter with him quite directly, telling him bluntly on one occasion that he had only himself to blame for the hostile publicity he was receiving, and giving him "a slap in the face". The contrast between his replies to Denbigh and those to Howe is remarkable. To Denbigh - and he surely knew Denbigh would communicate his views to the others - Arnold was perfectly willing to explain his position in detail, and he did so in a most respectful and conciliatory manner. The matter appears to have passed over: the Trustees knew the school's numbers were not suffering and it must be assumed they accepted his explanations on neglect and indoctrination.²⁷²

From Arnold's point of view, all that can be said is that the dilemma faced by the holder of a public position of responsibility who has decided opinions on contemporary controversies is neither new nor resolved.²⁷³ Because it is so well known, the Howe correspondence has had undue influence on the interpretation of Arnold's relationship with the Trustees. It lies behind the notion that he "... defied his own Governors ...".²⁷⁴ Yet the correspondence has shown that as examples of their usual relations these letters are most untypical. While not

denying that the Howe correspondence touched a deeply held principle with Arnold, the probability is that it was as much the "tone" of Howe's demands that conditioned his response as that,

"... no one in authority had any right to question him on matters that did not directly affect the welfare of the ... school."²⁷⁵

The new evidence puts the Howe affair and the general claim of "defiance" into perspective, and indeed questions the assumptions that have been made about the censure motion itself. Prior to this incident the Trustees had apparently not felt disposed to take official action against Arnold for his writings, though this need not occasion surprise. It can be explained without the imputation of partisan loyalty or subservience. The votes of confidence in his Headmastership reflect their satisfaction with his management of the school, and the new evidence on the incidents surrounding these votes does not show that blind loyalty to Arnold was the only logical reason for their being passed. Moreover when these votes are combined with the satisfactory state of admissions and the obvious sincerity of his motives, they are sufficient to justify a policy of unofficial restraint. If the Denbigh correspondence is a manifestation of this, then it may well have had some success in 1834 and 1835. And it must be remembered that Howe only managed to convince three of his fellow Trustees that his motion was desirable. This raises the question of Arnold's so-called "supporters" among the governing body.

Three names have been mentioned in this respect: Halford, Skipwith, and Denbigh; but the evidence is entirely speculative.²⁷⁶ The terms in which the correspondence with Denbigh is conducted do not suggest there was an intimate relationship between him and Arnold, added to which there is the impersonal way Arnold is discussed in the letter from Halford

to Denbigh in 1831, where Halford fully approves the rebuke Denbigh has given the Headmaster. There is nothing in the evidence considered here to suggest an organised grouping. Without more information, particularly of the voting patterns in the Trustees' meetings, the influence of such a group must remain unproven.

While in no way denying that he asserted the right of the Headmaster's independence, the evidence provided by the letters has substantially added to and corrected the biographical interpretation of the relationship between Arnold and the Trustees. Whitridge's statement that they were afraid of him because of his independent spirit hardly reflects the evidence, nor does Bamford's view over the extent of his powers and the Trustees' inability to interfere in school affairs. The more extreme notion that they were his "docile servants" is even less tenable. Stanley is correct to emphasise Arnold's desire for freedom in the execution of his magisterial duties, though the evidence shows that this independence must be kept in perspective. The reason why relations were, as he rightly says, habitually cordial, is not that the Trustees were not involved, but that their dealings with the Headmaster were conducted on the basis of a mutual respect for their respective positions. The most accurate picture can be drawn from Wymer. He sees the Trustees as open-minded towards Arnold and their confidence in him growing as he achieved results, although they were quite prepared to exercise restraint if necessary. The price of Arnold's autonomy was achievement. That the results justified the Trustees' increasing confidence, which in turn led to their respecting his independence, and that a lasting cordiality should develop is not surprising. And is it not more likely that a fifteen year relationship, which contained only one open breach, should have been based on respect rather than mere acquiescence?

The Chancery Court Case of 1839.

The concluding theme of this part of the thesis is concerned with an examination of the petition in the Court of Chancery brought against the Trustees of Rugby School in 1839 by two residents of the town, W.F. Wratislaw and H.W.S. Gibb (called hereafter the Wratislaw Case after its moving spirit), in the light of new information provided by the unpublished letters. The Plaintiffs made three complaints: (1) that no discrimination was made in the award of university exhibitions between Foundationers (the sons of residents in the area) and non-Foundationers (the sons of non-residents) - Wratislaw wished all such awards to be confined to Foundationers so long as fit candidates were available; (2) that to qualify for a place on the Foundation, the Trustees had ordered that a boy's parents must have resided in the neighbourhood for two years - Wratislaw thought this unfair, and part of a plot by Arnold; and (3) that young boys were discouraged from entering the school, and obliged to obtain a preparatory education elsewhere to enable them to take their places in the school under its present system of education, all of which was part of Arnold's design to eliminate the Lower School, whose numbers were declining.²⁷⁷

The Wratislaw Case was not completely unknown to readers of The Life, for one letter printed there (L.728, 8 May 1839), though only in part, gave some of Arnold's comments on the Judge's decision. Stanley provided no background to the extract - whether this represents suppression of damaging evidence, as has been claimed,²⁷⁸ or merely reflects his view on the relative significance of the matter, will be considered later - and as an event in Arnold's life it passed completely unremarked for more than a century, until Bamford devoted a chapter of his biography

to an examination of it.²⁷⁹ As with the March affair, his disclosures produced a picture of Arnold which challenged the traditional view and raised disquieting questions about the sort of man he really was. Bamford's account is chiefly concerned with the Plaintiffs' third complaint, the alleged discouragement of young boys in the Lower School and the means by which a reduction in their numbers had been achieved:

"The facts revealed here are astonishing ... The revelations are astonishing ... Arnold deliberately had little boys in his School, slaving away under impossible conditions, knowing very well that the tuition was equally impossible and confirming it by personal visits . These unfortunates were not boys left to him as a legacy from the previous regime, but children he had admitted himself. It opens up a side of Arnold's character that was ruthless. ...

As Arnold well knew, the youngest boys in his care were doomed ..." ²⁸⁰

That Arnold, as a means of discouraging future entrants, should have quite intentionally and systematically over a number of years placed little boys in the hands of incompetent masters to ensure their progress was as difficult as it possibly could be, was indeed a revelation. Not surprisingly, Bamford's account of the Wratislaw Case with its dramatic disclosure of a conspiracy²⁸¹ to destroy the Lower School and the callous means Arnold had employed to do so has been regularly cited ever since.²⁸² The implications for Arnold's character are obvious, "ruthless" is almost an understatement, and a recent commentator has depicted him as little more than a hypocrite:

"We do not know how Arnold, with his tender conscience, contemplated a class of little anxious boys, toiling to achieve what he knew he had himself made it impossible for them to do, by committing them to the charge of men incompetent to teach the subjects required."²⁸³

Moreover, the received account declared that neither the Trustees nor Arnold had any intention of giving effect to the Judge's decision in the case: the Trustees because they could not control Arnold on school affairs; and Arnold because he would not do so - attitudes which made "... nonsense of the law of the land ..." and which had "... all the appearance of contempt for higher authority.". The result was that they accommodated the petitioners' children:

"... and did nothing else ... so, in spite of the court's decision, Arnold had his way."²⁸⁴

These are serious matters.

The evidence on which the received account is based derives from an official record of the case. This exists in two forms, an eleven-page summary and a 340-page transcript of the complete proceedings, the latter of which has been used in what follows.²⁸⁵ Before considering the new evidence, the reader must be clear about the procedure for hearing a case in the Rolls Court of the Chancery Division. In the Wratislaw Case, witnesses for the Plaintiffs and Defendants were not regularly called to give evidence and then cross-examined. The whole matter was heard on the basis of a formal petition and a series of sworn affidavits filed prior to the case starting, which documents then provided the substance for argument by the respective counsels. There were no witnesses present for oral examination - testimony was confined

to the affidavits. There was no jury. The Judge read the affidavits, listened to the counsels' arguments, and eventually came to a verdict. It is important to realise that the proceedings revolved around the previously submitted petition and the affidavits. There could be any number of these latter - in the Wratislaw Case there were sixteen - the Plaintiffs submitted, the Defendants replied, the Plaintiffs responded, and so on until the hearing commenced, always subject to the provision that the Plaintiffs had the right to submit the last reply. It was the responsibility of the solicitors and counsels to ensure they had all the necessary testimony to support their arguments before the case was heard. The Wratislaw Case commenced on Saturday, 12 January 1839 and continued on the 14th and 15th; judgement was given on 4 May 1839.

The received account declares that the Judge, Lord Langdale, "... found the weight of evidence against the Trustees."²⁸⁶, though it passes rather quickly over his verdict on the first two complaints.²⁸⁷ It is, therefore, worth remembering that in each of these instances he found against Wratislaw and Gibb, a rejection of two thirds of the Plaintiffs' case. Since he found for the Plaintiffs on part of their third complaint - and their assertions have, of course, been given great prominence - it is instructive to consider the allegations and testimony he rejected on the first two. The disclosures provide relevant background information on Wratislaw, the prime mover in the case, the tenor of the arguments involved, and enable details in the received version to be expanded and corrected.

On the question of exhibitions to the universities, Wratislaw complained that the Trustees were not confining them to or giving preference to the Foundationers.²⁸⁸ The Trustees were actually awarding

them on merit.²⁸⁹ The received account says that the Judge:

"... took a legal view. While it appeared reasonable that local boys should benefit by the exhibitions, the present situation rested on a decision taken ... in 1806."

and therefore he felt he had no right to reverse past precedent. It quotes part of his decision:

"'If any alteration is to be made in this respect, it must, I think, be by higher authority than mine.' If this was an invitation to Wratislaw to appeal, then he did not take it ..." ²⁹⁰

Now it is worth pointing out that nowhere in his judgement²⁹¹ does Langdale either express or give any support to the opinion that the Plaintiffs' arguments were "reasonable". He simply declares that this whole issue has been argued before, in 1806, and since:

"... it not appearing that any circumstances materially affecting this question now exist which did not exist at (that) time ..." ²⁹²,

he could find no reason to dissent from past precedent. And in reaching this verdict he was following the arguments adduced by the Trustees' counsels.²⁹³ Moreover it is most unlikely that Wratislaw would have wished to appeal, for he had now been twice defeated on this same issue, and in addition, an appeal would have involved the parading of unsavoury details and him being placed in an awkward position; facts which cannot be gleaned from the received account.

Wratislaw was a well known Rugby solicitor and this case was not his first assault on the Trustees, as the received version says:

"On 28 February 1826 the son (Wratislaw) petitioned

both Houses of Parliament about the injustice of local boys having to pay for anything at all at Rugby School. At the same time he wanted a full investigation into the School's finances. ... Rather than argue, the Trustees agreed forthwith to the cancellation of all expenses for local boys, ...".²⁹⁴

The Trustees were the original petitioners, seeking from Parliament²⁹⁵ an act making various changes in the management of the charity. As part of the hearing, Wratislaw had, among other things, petitioned not only to secure freedom from all charges for the Foundationers, but also to secure the exhibitions for them.²⁹⁶ Wratislaw made no reference to this earlier action in his first affidavit but was obliged to in his second because another deponent, E.T. Cardale, had raised the matter.²⁹⁷ Counsel for the Trustees suggested that the reason for his reluctance to refer to his action in 1826 was that every clause in his petition was considered and passed over; the act (7 George 1V, c.28)²⁹⁸ was passed on the basis of the Trustees' petition without amendment.²⁹⁹ Moreover the decision to abolish charges for the Foundationers was the result of a voluntary order made by the Trustees in 1828.³⁰⁰ The statement that the Trustees agreed "forthwith" to cancel these charges "Rather than argue" the point is, therefore, not only factually incorrect, since the whole case was debated and it was two years later that Foundationers' charges were abolished, but also misleading: in that the reader of the received version might think that Wratislaw's petition met with some success in Parliament and that the Trustees felt guilty and relieved to have come off lightly. This previous rebuff was not something Wratislaw wished to raise, since if it was known that on this same question of

exhibitioners Parliament had not accepted his views,

"... that would be a circumstance to weigh
against their present adoption; ... ".³⁰¹

Cardale's deposition produced the damaging admission from Wratislaw that,

"... the said bill of the Trustees did pass
without amendment; ...!",³⁰²

a position which he then attempted to salvage by claiming the only reason the bill was passed was that he had made a private arrangement with the Chairman of the Commons' Committee hearing the case.³⁰³ This man, D.S. Dugdale, M.P., a Trustee of the school, was conveniently dead. The inconceivability of Wratislaw's remarkable assertion was exposed in detail by the Trustees' counsel:

"... this is a most singular statement ... it is
totally inconceivable ... It is giving the power
to an individual to repeal the Act of the
Legislature: ... it amounts to that. That is what
Mr Wratislaw says. He represented the whole of the
people of England; and that, though the Act passed
... it was to have no such effect, but that it was
to have the effect which it would have had if

Mr Wratislaw's clauses had been introduced into it."³⁰⁴

Attention was also drawn to the fact that after his unsuccessful petition in 1826, handbills were circulated in Rugby insinuating that some arrangement had been made despite his apparent failure. To these, the Trustees as a body, including Dugdale, had responded by expressly denying in a formal resolution that any such compact had been made; and they did this before the act reached the statute book.³⁰⁵ Reflecting on this matter, counsel referred to Wratislaw's conception of his own status:

"... this only shews ... he was led by a sense of his own importance ... and ... the great weight that would be given to his representations ... I don't know what foundation there is for that opinion entertained by Mr Wratislaw, that he was of so much importance ... " ³⁰⁶

It is reasonable to speculate from all this that the handbills were a means by which Wratislaw, a local worthy, ³⁰⁷ could save face in Rugby following the complete failure of his petition. Counsel for the Trustees also observed that for thirteen years, from 1826 to September 1838, Wratislaw had not made a single complaint to the Trustees on their allocation of the exhibitions. ³⁰⁸ Therefore the reasons why the Plaintiff did not originally refer to the events of 1826 seem clear enough. This information also suggests that the litigious Mr Wratislaw was no innocent abroad, a point which should be borne in mind throughout. The Judge found nothing to support his claim that the Trustees were behaving irregularly in awarding exhibitions on merit, and rejected the Plaintiffs' demand unequivocally.

The second complaint he rejected concerned the discretionary two-year residential qualification imposed by the Trustees on prospective Foundationers. The received account does not make the point that the limitation was exercised at the discretion of the Trustees and was designed as a protection for the old inhabitants of Rugby. ³⁰⁹ Nor, more importantly, does it state that this complaint was a part of the "conspiracy" claim made by Wratislaw, who deposed that the regulation:

"... was a contrivance of Dr Arnold, and made by the Trustees upon his suggestion without due consideration, and was one of the means used by

the said Dr Arnold for lessening the benefits ...

to those intended to be benefited by the founder ...".³¹⁰

Fortunately for the Trustees, their clerk, G. Harris, had pointed out in his second affidavit that Arnold had nothing at all to do with the regulation; that he himself had proposed it to the Trustees when they expressed anxiety that their action in waiving the Foundationers' charges might provoke a flood of applications from "new" residents wishing to obtain a free education for their sons. Harris also declared that on the passing of this very order, Wratislaw "... expressed to deponent his satisfaction thereat as a measure called for,"³¹¹ and said he wished the Trustees had gone further. Wratislaw's response to the apparent contradiction between his words and his deeds was to say he could not remember this conversation;³¹² so the Judge was left to decide whom he believed. At this distance it does seem very strange that Wratislaw, a long-standing resident of Rugby, should depose that he wished to have the benefits of the Foundation thrown open without restriction to any number of newcomers. This point was not lost on the Trustees' counsel:

"Now it is a little singular to find that this,
which was clearly for the benefit of Rugby ... and
not sacrificing this to strangers ... to find
Mr Wratislaw and Mr Gibb ... objecting to it ..." .³¹³

The suspicion that Wratislaw was being actuated by more than altruism was increased when it was revealed that in none of his correspondence with the Trustees prior to the case being brought did he even mention this as a complaint:

"... for the first time, the complaint is made
in this petition."³¹⁴

Given this evidence, it is not implausible to suggest that Wratislaw's

"complaint" was introduced merely to fuel his "conspiracy" charge against Arnold; nor to suggest there was an element of personal animus involved: as counsel was later to remark:

"... I must say Mr Wratislaw ... has gone rather out of his way for the purpose of hitting at Dr Arnold ".³¹⁵

And as with the first charge, Lord Langdale found nothing to suggest that the Trustees' order in this matter had been abused. In finding that it scarcely appeared to him that any order on his part was required or would be proper, and that the matter might safely be left to the discretion of the Trustees, the Judge was effectively excluding the possibility that it could be connected in any way with a conspiracy to prevent younger boys from entering the Lower School. So on two of the three counts on which the Plaintiffs maintained the Trustees were abusing their privilege by actions detrimental to the Foundationers, the Judge found against them; and on one of these counts, his judgement involved by implication the rejection of a charge of conspiracy against Arnold, a fact not mentioned in the received account.

One reason for the Trustees' success on these first two counts was that the Judge admitted as evidence a number of affidavits on behalf of the Defendants which were only filed on the morning the trial commenced, Saturday 12 January. These affidavits were in reply to the second set of those made by Wratislaw and Gibb, which were themselves a reply to the Defendants' initial response. There was argument about the validity of these affidavits since they were filed so late. The Plaintiffs' counsel claimed they should not be accepted:

"... I have not seen them, and therefore I cannot ... deal with them ... and I hope your

Lordship won't hear them.",³¹⁶

particularly since their own affidavits (the second set), to which they were a reply, had been filed on 8 January. Therefore, it was claimed, the Defendants had had plenty of time to see them and make their response. This raises a matter of legal procedure which has significance for what follows. It will be recalled that the case was heard on the matter contained in affidavits filed prior to its beginning. A consequence of this procedure was that then (as now), one side would create as much inconvenience for the other as it could by delaying the submission of its statements. Moreover, since the Plaintiffs had the right to submit the final affidavit, their justification for adopting such tactics could be on a technical point:

"... the person who makes the first affidavit has a right to make the last: he has no course to pursue but to file his affidavits at such a time that his opponent may not have time to answer them:". ³¹⁷

As a result, counsel claimed, the Defendants' replies of 12 January should be disregarded.³¹⁸ After discussion, however, they were allowed to stand.³¹⁹ From the Trustees' viewpoint this meant that the evidence of the clerk, G. Harris, was admitted.³²⁰ His testimony confirmed that: the resolution of 30 May 1828 respecting the abolition of Foundationalers' charges was a voluntary action of the Trustees; denied that any private arrangement had been made between Dugdale and Wratislaw; stated that the order for a residential qualification was not Arnold's suggestion; and revealed that Wratislaw had, at the time, been highly satisfied by it. Now all this testimony concerned the first two counts and was a direct refutation of Wratislaw's assertions. The Judge had to decide

whom he believed, and on both these counts he ruled against the Plaintiffs. But the Defendants' case would have been made much more difficult if Harris' second affidavit had not been allowed, for the Judge was obliged to decide the issue solely "... upon the evidence before me.", that is, the affidavits and counsels' arguments thereupon. If one side's evidence was incomplete, there was no possibility of rectifying this once the hearing commenced.

The new light which is thrown upon the Wratislaw Case by the unpublished correspondence relates directly to the third complaint, the main theme of the received account. There are seven letters which mention the case (L.703, L.712, L.721, L.726, L.728, L.729, L.734); three of which (L.712, L.728, L.729) appeared in The Life, though only one of them (L.728) was printed without its reference to the affair excised.³²¹ Writing to Sir T.S. Pasley in May 1839 (L.729), after Lord Langdale's judgement had been given, Arnold makes the following complaint:

"... the Master of the Rolls ... has decided the main Part of the Question as I could wish, that namely which relates to the Exhibitions. He talks of the lower School having been discouraged, which is not the Case, and so far I regret that our Counsel allowed the last Affidavits of the Petitioners to go up without Answers; they did not think it worth while to send them to me, so they let the Case come on; and the Master of the Rolls has in Part believed them as he could not help doing; ..." (my emphasis).

This is a revelation, and it has tremendous significance for the received interpretation of the Wratislaw Case. Moreover Arnold's statement is corroborated by the transcript of the proceedings. When the Plaintiffs'

counsel challenged the validity of the affidavits filed by the Defendants on the morning of the trial (12 January), they complained that since they were replies to statements lodged four days previously, the Defence should have replied earlier. The Trustees' counsel attempted to answer this by accusing Wratislaw of sharp practice (in fact he was only taking advantage of the system):

"... my Lord, I ought to mention that Mr Wratislaw's affidavit was sworn on the 3rd and filed on the 8th, and he keeps it in his pocket; and when we apply to Mr Wratislaw, to allow us an opportunity of meeting those affidavits, that is positively refused."³²²

To which Mr Wratislaw's counsel disarmingly replied: "I know nothing of that;"³²³ The crucial point, however, is that the Defence had no affidavits from Arnold (or Skipwith) in response to the detailed allegations made in the Plaintiffs' second set of affidavits:

"... my Lord, this affidavit of Mr Wratislaw, as I said, was sworn on the 3rd and filed on the 8th; ... the consequence is, we have not had time to get Dr Arnold's affidavit in reply, or Sir Grey Skipwith's;"³²⁴

"... we cannot get the affidavits properly in reply, because Dr Arnold is down in Westmoreland."³²⁵

The case, therefore, was heard without them; and on this third complaint, the Trustees' counsel, working from the first set of affidavits, simply did not have the evidence to challenge the Plaintiffs' claims in detail - a point overlooked by the received account. A consequence of this was that the Judge ("... upon the evidence before me,") found against them. The received interpretation of events therefore reflects the virtually

uncontradicted assertions of the Plaintiffs supplemented by their counsels' rhetoric. The account has been written under a fundamental misconception which strikes at its very heart. This new evidence puts a radically different complexion on the affair and, of course, the reader's judgement of Arnold's character. It answers the difficulty which indeed seems to have crossed Bamford's mind, and puts such statements as:

"The facts revealed here are astonishing and show a facet of Arnold's character difficult to understand.";

"It was stated categorically and not denied, ...".

"Arnold and the Trustees did very little to counter this evidence ...";

"At the same time he did not deny any of the actual points raised by the other side. How he reconciled his apparent satisfaction with the facts, as revealed here is difficult to see.";

"They had therefore no real answer to these astonishing revelations.";³²⁶

into their true perspective. The detailed allegations on the third count were not denied by Arnold (or Skipwith) for one very simple reason: he knew nothing about them and was therefore unable to defend himself.

It must be remembered that the defending parties were the Trustees. Arnold himself was not represented - he had no reason to think it necessary, though when he finally discovered what had been alleged against him he regretted it (L.728). When the petition and the first set of affidavits were filed by the Plaintiffs, Arnold was instructed to reply to specific points.³²⁷ Most of his affidavit, which was filed on 17 December 1838,³²⁸ is taken up with a statistical account, chronologically arranged, of the numbers of boys and masters in the forms of the Lower School during his

Headmastership:³²⁹

"The object of Dr Arnold's affidavit was simply this - he is not a party here - but the Trustees required to know from him how the school stood every half year during the time he was there."³³⁰

In this first exchange of affidavits, Arnold made a formal reply to the specific points raised by the Plaintiffs.³³¹ On this third "complaint", these can be summarised to show the great difference between the allegations made in the first and the second set of affidavits and how, in the words of the Judge, the Plaintiffs' later testimony "... brought forward some very particular facts."

Initially, they declared that in 1832 the first form was entrusted to Mr Sale and the second to "... a Swiss gentleman named Pons.", and that neither of these two "... was a person qualified to give a classical education,"; and they were further incapacitated - Sale "... by his avocation as writing master ..." and Pons "... by continued ill-health.". In consequence of their incapacity "...the number of boys in the said two forms rapidly decreased;". The Lower School as presently constituted had just one form and the lessons given in it "... are adapted only to boys of a comparatively advanced age,". Both the Plaintiffs had sons they wished to send but who were "... not sufficiently advanced in learning to be placed in the only form which now exists ... and for whom therefore there is no competent instruction provided;". The "object" of Dr Arnold is "... to prevent young boys from being placed at the said school, and to improve the upper school at the expense of the lower ...".³³²

Arnold's affidavit in response to this stated that Sale's duties as writing master were "... at distinct hours ..." and so did not interfere with his duties in the first form; and given the elementary nature of

the instruction in that form - simple Latin accidence and translation of elementary sentences in the Delectus - he was "... perfectly competent to instruct the boys ..." there. Pons had received a classical education and was "... a very good Latin scholar;" equally competent to teach Latin grammar and translation from Eutropius and the Florilegium. Moreover Arnold had himself examined the boys under their care every month and "... found that the progress of the boys in those respective forms was satisfactory, and manifested they were under the instruction of competent masters.". Although the Lower School was now under the care of one master, the instruction was adapted to the individual boy's requirements. The "form" arrangement was maintained within this system. Arnold declared that as far as he knew he had done nothing "... prejudicial to the interests of the foundationers, or that has rendered the school less valuable than formerly to the inhabitants of Rugby.."; that he had "... never refused or objected to receive any boy, of whatever age or attainments, who was entitled to the benefit of the foundation, and could read in the English language."; and that Gibb, despite having sons at the school, had never complained of any of the "alleged alterations ..." in the Lower School before the petition appeared, nor did Wratislaw "... make any complaint ... relating to his management of the ... Lower School ..." until June 1838, when he said he was writing to the Trustees.³³³ And that is the extent of Arnold's evidence in the Wratislaw Case. As it stands, it is a refutation of the Plaintiffs' assertions. The dramatic revelations of the received account would have found little support from the disclosures in this first exchange; the evidence for any pejorative view of Arnold's behaviour would have been largely speculative. If this had been the extent of the testimony on which counsel argued, the Judge would have had to decide whose case was the most convincing. Since it is now known that

he rejected the "conspiracy" theory, his decision would have rested principally on the weight he attached to the respective opinions relating to the competence of the masters' concerned. Arnold said one thing, Wratislaw another. On such a subject, as counsel for the Trustees remarked,

"Who does your Lordship think is the best judge
of the matter - Dr Arnold or Mr Wratislaw?"³³⁴

Arnold's affidavit was filed on 17 December, therefore the Plaintiffs had plenty of time to reconsider their position. Whether they felt their initial claims had been effectively rebutted is not known, but their rejoinder, which provides most of the substance for the received account, was much more detailed and contentious. After making the claim that he had had a secret agreement with Dugdale, Wratislaw then made a series of allegations against Arnold: He asserted that during conversations in 1835 with Sir Gray Skipwith, a Trustee, on the subject of a talk he (Wratislaw) had previously held with Arnold about the Lower School, the Headmaster had stated that "... no boy had any business whatever at the school under twelve years of age;" to which Skipwith had replied by saying to Wratislaw, "It was certainly too bad;". Skipwith told Wratislaw that Arnold had expressed the same opinion to him also. During a conversation in 1836, Skipwith had allegedly expressed concern about the state of the Lower School to Wratislaw. And on various occasions between 1831 and 1837 Arnold had told Wratislaw himself that no boys under twelve years of age should be at the school. Wratislaw then developed his conspiracy theory at length: He asserted that the residential limitation was part of Arnold's "... plan of getting rid of these lesser foundation boys,;" that Sale's appointment to the first form proved the "... prior determination of said Dr Arnold to get rid of a form so ... adapted to

the foundation boys,"; that in "... pursuance of said plan, and for the purpose of getting rid also of the second form ... Dr Arnold ... appointed to that form ... Mr Pons,"; that to show his contempt of Wratishaw he "... broke up the third form also,"; and that "... Arnold succeeded so well in his plan, that, in 1837, both first and second forms were entirely got rid of ...". Furthermore he asserted, he had been told that on his appointment to the first form, Sale strongly protested his unfitness for the position; that Pons "... mode of speaking English and Latin was such that ... little boys could not understand him," and ill-health prevented him from performing his duties. Finally, he claimed his son, presently in the Lower Remove, had "... his education ... so much neglected at the school ..." that while he was in the lower forms he had "... to obtain ... at considerable expense, extra education in the town to qualify him for advancement ...".³³⁵

Gibb concentrated on the accusation of neglect, saying he had complained about the state of the Lower School to Henry Grimes, another Trustee, and "... to the masters ..." and "... to others,". While his sons had been in the Lower School he was forced to obtain tuition in Rugby for them. In addition, he declared, his eldest son's career had to be changed because he could not obtain an exhibition for him, since he had not received proper instruction in the Lower School and therefore could not compete with boys "... better grounded ..." who came later from other establishments.³³⁶

Because these affidavits were not sent to Arnold (or Skipwith) for reply, none of these detailed and very damaging allegations was challenged. They represented unopposed testimony when the case was heard; and armed with this abundance of detail, Plaintiffs' counsel naturally dilated at length upon it, making the rhetorical point that since none of the allegations were contradicted, they were not denied, and therefore admitted.³³⁷ There

is no doubt that the Trustees' counsels were culpable, either through dilatoriness or lack of awareness. It is possible they simply overlooked the emphasis which would be placed on this aspect of the case, and in this respect, it is notable that Arnold himself had thought the important issue was that relating to the exhibitions. When preparing for the case in December 1838, he had told E. Hawkins:

"I have had to prepare Answers to a Petition ...
for alleged Injustice to the Foundationers in
throwing open the Exhibitions;" (L.703).

While waiting for the judgement in 1839, it remained the question of whether the decision, "... might exclude all but the Foundationers from Benefit of the Exhibitions." (L.712) which exercised him most. And on Langdale's verdict being given, Arnold is relieved about what he considers the great point at issue:

"... to have got a Confirmation of our present
Practice as regards the Exhibitions." (L.734).

His concern, it will be noted, was not with the third count,³³⁸ for on the basis of the first set of affidavits - all he had seen on that aspect - he assumed an adequate response to the Plaintiffs' complaints had been made. On the first two counts, all their assertions had, once G. Harris' second affidavit was admitted, been answered. Assertion had been met with denial and the Judge had decided the Trustees' case was stronger. On this third count, when their assertions were met with virtually nothing in reply, the Judge found in part for the Plaintiffs. As Arnold acknowledged, there was very little else Langdale could have done. Plaintiffs' counsel had used the detailed allegations in the second affidavits to good effect. Pons, for example, was declared to have been ignorant of the English language;³³⁹ since counsel for the Trustees had no means of refuting this

in detail, the only recourse was to treat the assertion with disdain:

"... they say he could not speak English; that I pass over, because I am sure your Lordship will not attend to that."³⁴⁰

no evidence to the contrary was offered. And these points weighed heavily with Langdale when making his decision. On the matter of neglect of the boys in the Lower School, he declared that to him the strongest evidence in its favour was Gibb's claim that he had been:

"... compelled to obtain ... at considerable expense extra instruction in the town, in order to enable them to be advanced in the school."³⁴¹

And in giving his verdict on "the evidence before me," he referred specifically to:

"... the declarations imputed to Dr Arnold and to Sir Gray Skipwith, and not denied, and the masters who have been employed,"

as evidence of the discouragement of boys under twelve years of age.³⁴²

How could the Trustees' counsel refute these specific points convincingly? Gibb's evidence and the remarks ascribed to Arnold and Skipwith were in the unanswered affidavits, as were the detailed allegations about Pons and Sale. They had not secured replies to these and had then found great emphasis placed on them in court. They did their best with the evidence to hand but by then it was too late. Langdale found, in part, against them. Writing to J.T. Coleridge in May 1839, Arnold expressed satisfaction with what he saw as the main issue but,

"... as far as it affects me personally ... It was a Misfortune that I had not my own Counsel and I did not like to meddle with the Trustees' Counsel;

and then the Counsel thought the Charges about the Lower School so frivolous that they did not even send the last Affidavits ... to me but let them appear without any Answer ... they contained rather strong Imputations of Motives to me, as well as Statements as to Matters of Fact which should have been answered." (L.728, my emphasis).

Apparently unaware of the real situation, the received version of the Wratishaw Case accepts and repeats the allegations of the Plaintiffs on the third count and draws its inferences accordingly. Unfortunately, the reader of that version of events does not know that one rather important aspect of the case is largely missing - the case for the Defence.

What Arnold might have said in answer to these assertions can only be conjectured. It will, however, be noted from the previous quotation that he felt he could have answered them. Since Arnold is never usually thought of as being a shameless liar, he must have had some grounds for his statements here and in L.729 where he flatly denies that the Lower School has been discouraged. It is worth considering, therefore, how he might have met the charges, although it must be remembered that any attempt to reconstruct answers will now be speculative. It might be that he was in possession of information, no longer available, which rendered their specific assertions completely untenable. Those points which were highlighted in the received account - the "astonishing revelations" - along with the inferences which were drawn from them are the ones which will be examined now.

It must be emphasised that the received account is generally written from the viewpoint of the counsel for the prosecution, a fact which has to be remembered when reading its assertions. For example, the authority which can be attached to its successive repetitions of "and not denied" has been demonstrated. So at the outset, when it declares that:

"By 1837 it had become quite impossible for any local lad to proceed to and succeed in Rugby School unless he was well versed in the classics."³⁴³,

it assumes as proved a number of contentious allegations. Similarly both its connection of the fall in numbers in the Lower School with Arnold's alleged remark to Skipwith that boys below the age of twelve should not be in a Public School, and the inference that,

"All pretence at providing a complete education for local boys had now gone."³⁴⁴

is all assumed to reflect unanswerable fact. Whatever Arnold's opinion was on the desirability of very young boys being at a public school, an opinion which, as counsel for the Trustees' remarked:

"... I believe nine wise men out of ten entertain,"³⁴⁵,

Lord Langdale himself found it consistent for him to hold that opinion but nevertheless to receive young boys; as he observed Arnold might have said:

"... although that is my opinion, yet it is my duty to receive younger boys, and I will do the best I can with them."³⁴⁶.

And as will be shown, this was precisely the position he adopted. Although Arnold had apparently expressed this opinion quite openly, the contexts in which these remarks were made could well affect their interpretation.

Moreover Arnold denied utterly that he had ever refused admission to such boys when put forward, and no evidence to the contrary could be brought against him. The received account acknowledges this, but qualifies it by saying that,

"... facts of such a nature are difficult to
come by now,"

and refers to one boy whose parent was allegedly discouraged.³⁴⁷ That Arnold did advise parents against sending young boys is shown below, when his motives for so doing are discussed, and that advice would naturally carry great weight; but evidence is not available to contradict his denial. Arnold is portrayed as doing all in his power to destroy the Lower School, firstly by keeping out young boys and secondly, by ensuring that those who were there struggled. The reader is told that Arnold's opinion on under twelves was,

"... tantamount to admitting that the first introduction
to classical learning should be obtained elsewhere,
thereby cutting off town from School."³⁴⁸

Yet while this may be true, Arnold could have pointed to a fact confirmed by the Rugby School Register, that throughout the eight year period he was allegedly destroying the Lower School, he was admitting boys below the age of twelve, both as Foundationers and non-Foundationers, some into his own boarding house. And the number of these boys he admitted was greater than the corresponding intake over the last years of his predecessor's regime. And judging by their career details, they were not too badly handicapped by the treatment they allegedly received under Arnold's rule.³⁴⁹ Such boys or their parents might well have provided testimony to contradict the Plaintiffs. It is interesting to note that among this group were sons of G. Harris, the Trustees' Clerk, and Sir

Gray Skipwith. Moreover two of the boys in this category, A.J. Arbuthnot (a Founder), and the author of Tom Brown's Schooldays, Thomas Hughes, have left reminiscences.³⁵⁰ Nowhere do they suggest they were neglected, or that conditions in the Lower School were notorious. Much was made of the ability of the masters employed, Sale and Pons, whose appointments were allegedly a conspiracy. More information is needed on this issue, for there are just Arnold's assertion of their competence to instruct the two lowest forms, and the Plaintiffs' denials. In their Petition, the Plaintiffs had only alleged that neither was qualified to give a classical education and that they were further incapacitated, Sale through his duties as writing master, and Pons through ill-health. The more detailed assertions came later. With regard to Sale, Arnold declared he was not inconvenienced by these duties for they were at separate hours. The received account refers to Sale's employment of an assistant in 1829 as evidence that he was overworked and therefore had no spare time.³⁵¹ While he may have been in 1829, it does not necessarily follow that he remained so once he had an assistant. It also refers to the contrast the first form must have noticed between Sale and the man he replaced, J.P. Lee, an outstanding master in every way.³⁵² While there can be little argument about their respective abilities to teach the classics, this alteration does not have to be seen as part of a plot by Arnold. Lee had been at the school for a year, he had proved his abilities, why should Arnold waste his talents teaching Latin accident and elementary translation from the Delectus to a first form? Lee was promoted to teach the fifth. Arnold's contention was that Sale was quite capable of teaching Latin accident and translation of "... some of the elementary sentences in the book called 'Delectus;'"³⁵³ It was alleged that Sale had objected to his appointment since he had not had a classical education. Since

these "objections" first appeared in the second set of affidavits, they were, of course, not denied. But Arnold had already made the point that a classical education was not an essential prerequisite to teach the first form. Trustees' counsel observed:

"... he was called upon to teach ... the first easy sentences of Delectus ... we all know what it is to teach ... those sentences, and that they acquire a knowledge of them in a very short time. The power of teaching that may be acquired by a very ordinary education ... many governesses ... teach these very things, and more³⁵⁴

Now learning the basic declensions and conjugations was largely by means of catechesis; much of Sale's time would be spent hearing the boys recite the forms. And the "first easy sentences" in the Delectus in use at Rugby are just that. The first twenty pages of the book are merely exercises on the concords: "Nominative and Verb; Substantive and Adjective; Accusative after the Verb" etc. And of the 156 sentences to construe in the first three pages, 149 consist of two words.³⁵⁵

The received account cannot understand why Pons was ever appointed as a master,³⁵⁶ but L.299 has shown that there is no mystery about this: he was originally employed to teach modern languages,³⁵⁷ there is nothing to suggest that his appointment to the school was the first step in a carefully premeditated plot. He was in poor health and did miss classes, though Arnold claimed he fulfilled his duties by hearing the boys' lessons at his boarding house rather than in the schoolroom. When Pons requested leave of absence in 1836, Arnold replaced him with H. Hill, a classicist and former tutor to Arnold's own children.³⁵⁸

Pons had received a classical education and was apparently a first-rate

Latinist.³⁵⁹ When he first came to England his English was poor, but the counsels' rhetoric on this point must not be allowed to disguise the fact that he remained in charge of a boarding-house for nearly seven years. It is not implausible to suggest that his English might have improved during that period. The received account declares that he did not possess "... the strength of character to overcome these difficulties;";³⁶⁰ but the state of anarchy which would have prevailed in his house, and in his classroom had he been unintelligible, ineffectual, and akin to the comic French master of tradition, makes his tenure of such a post for so long inconceivable. Contemporary reminiscences do not indicate that anarchy reigned, nor do the family backgrounds and subsequent careers of the boys in Pons' house suggest that its inhabitants and products were any different from the majority.³⁶¹ The received account sees "the most telling point" in the fact that the Trustees did not call upon evidence from Sale or Pons:

"... they had therefore no real answer to these astonishing revelations."³⁶²

But this does not follow. The allegations contained in the Plaintiffs' Petition and first set of affidavits had been met by Arnold, and as far as that went the Judge would have had to decide. The "astonishing revelations" were in the second set and not seen by the Defendants, whose counsel considered them too "frivolous" (L.728) to take seriously. What Sale and Pons would have deposed is a matter for speculation. The absence of their testimony proves nothing.

Wratislaw and Gibb further claimed their sons in the lower forms had only been able to progress by means of private tuition hired in Rugby. There are two points deserving consideration here. Firstly, as part of the system in the school the boys had private tutors to help them prepare

their work outside of the lessons. The parents of non-Foundationers were obliged to pay for this tuition, but for Foundationers it was free. By the order of 30 May 1828, which Wratislaw knew all about since he had claimed the credit for its passing, all these tutors' fees for Foundationers were paid out of the charity:

"... that the foundationers should in every respect be put upon the same footing as the other scholars, and that without expense to such foundationer, his parents, relatives or friends, ... thereby ... have provided for them the same assistance and superintendence of the ushers as private tutors as were previously enjoyed by the non-foundationers;"³⁶³

Therefore why had the Plaintiffs not availed themselves of this facility?³⁶⁴ Without a knowledge of the tutors involved, it is not possible to say why, if they had attended them, no benefit was derived. But there is, of course, the possibility that the boys in question were not intellectually distinguished - what was to be done in those circumstances? The received account seems unaware of all this and states confidently that first form boys were "... doomed from the moment Arnold appointed Sale;"; their only hope lying in,

"... extra tuition either in the holidays, or from other masters at the School, or locally in the town ...

Otherwise promotion was quite impossible."³⁶⁵

Yet the "other masters at the School," were there, inter alia, precisely for the purpose of giving tuition to the Foundationers, gratis. Is it to be supposed that from 1831 all the boys who were promoted from the first form only achieved this by means of private tuition hired outside

the school? While more evidence is required on this matter, one fact is clear, boys were passing through both Sale's and Pons' forms; they were being promoted. And there still remains Arnold's own statement that by personal examination each month he satisfied himself that the boys were progressing satisfactorily. The received account infers that this was part of the "plot", and a particularly nasty part:

"Arnold deliberately had little boys ... slaving away under impossible conditions, knowing very well that the tuition was equally impossible and confirming it by personal visits."³⁶⁶

But since the Judge rejected the "design" allegations, why should Arnold's word be doubted here? Against this depiction of "doomed" innocents, "slaving away" under the gaze of the "ruthless" Dr Arnold, can be set Stanley's account of Arnold's visits to these forms:

"With the very little boys, indeed, his manner partook of that playful kindness and tenderness, which always marked his intercourse with children; in examining them in the lower forms, he would sometimes take them on his knee, ..."³⁶⁷

Another assertion by the Petitioners was that the reason for their not presenting their other sons for admission was that there was only one form in the Lower School and the system of tuition there was too advanced. Arnold's response to this was that while, on account of its numbers, the Lower School was under the care of one master, nevertheless, the old form arrangement was maintained; the boys were graded and received tuition adapted to their abilities. The master in charge of the Lower School was R. Bird, admitted by all to be particularly well suited to instruct the younger boys. He had thirty-eight boys to supervise. The Plaintiffs'

own deponent, J.H.C. Moor, a former master, had stated that he could have taught the whole Lower School "... with little difficulty." during his time there, and that when there was twice this number of boys.³⁶⁸

In reaching his verdict on this third count, Lord Langdale found the Plaintiffs' complaint that young boys were being discouraged from entering the school,

"... has some foundation in fact; and that, if the fact be so, it is prejudicial to the interests of the free boys."³⁶⁹

He noted that the proportionate increase in the numbers of the Lower School had been much less than that in the Upper (a point to be discussed later), and he stressed three points particularly: 1) the undenied statements imputed to Arnold and Skipwith; 2) the evidence concerning the masters employed; 3) the discouragement of Arnold's expressed opinion. It is known that Arnold flatly denied ever refusing a young boy who was qualified to enter the school and, what amounts to much the same thing, discouraging the Lower School (L.729), though he never had the chance to answer either this or the other two points in detail. Had he been given the opportunity, he might have put some of the foregoing arguments. The received account is less than candid in its description of the verdict. On the fact that the Judge did not find entirely for the Plaintiffs, it merely says,

"... although not going the whole way with Wratislaw in his allegations of a conspiracy,"³⁷⁰

In fact, Lord Langdale did not go any way with Wratislaw on this; he expressly rejected it:

"... I cannot attribute the state of the school in this respect to the design supposed by

Mr Wratislaw,"³⁷¹

and this was a fundamental part of the Plaintiffs' case. The received account mentions that the Judge declared the costs "... should be borne by the Trustees."³⁷² More accurately, he said they should be "... paid out of the funds of the charity;"³⁷³ but there is no significance in this. The fact that he had found against the Plaintiffs on two of their three "complaints" might occasion the reader surprise at his decision, but the explanation is that the Trustees' counsel did not press for costs:

"My Lord, with regard to the costs of the petition, the Trustees have no animosity against Mr Wratislaw, and I would rather leave that in your Lordship's hands ... I would rather not say anything about the costs."³⁷⁴

Likewise, nor did the Plaintiffs' counsel ask for them:

"... this case is brought forward on both sides with a view to have the substantial interests of the charity regulated; and whatever order your Lordship may make on that subject, I am persuaded it will be satisfactory to all parties."³⁷⁵

The Judge's decision, therefore, seems to reflect the fact that the whole case was to decide how the charity should be regulated rather than confirming the Defendants' guilt.

If doubt has been cast upon the validity of the received account's "astonishing revelations" and the inferences which were drawn from them, the assertions which Bamford went on to make about the reactions of Arnold and the Trustees to the Judge's decision are, while according with the pejorative view of Arnold's character which had been created and reflecting his conception of the relationship which existed between Arnold and the

Trustees, wholly unfounded. Lord Langdale declared that:

"... provision ought to be made for the instruction in the school of the young boys who can read English, and are capable of being instructed in the first elements of grammar.";³⁷⁶

to which the Trustees' counsel replied they would,

"... be very glad to do all in their power to give effect to it in every possible way."³⁷⁷

Bamford asserts that the Trustees knew they could not effect this even if they wished to do so. He says that all they did was to accommodate the Gibb and Wratislaw children,

"... as indeed they had to, and did nothing else. ... Arnold had his way."³⁷⁸

Now there is not a shred of evidence which suggests they would have ever refused the Plaintiffs' children; indeed Arnold had made that very point. Nevertheless, the reasons which he gives for the Trustees' inability to comply are that through their relationship with Arnold, they knew they "... had no right to interfere in School matters.", and they were, moreover, powerless because "... they knew full well that their Headmaster would not agree to direction.". He further declares that by giving assurances to the court which they knew they would not fulfil, they and Arnold were making "... nonsense of the law of the land,", their attitude having "... all the appearance of contempt for higher authority."³⁷⁹

These are damaging assertions and not supported by the facts. They could be rendered extremely doubtful firstly by pointing out that the record of Arnold's entire life up to that point provides not a scrap of evidence that he was a man to break the laws of the land; secondly, as illustrated earlier, by showing that Bamford's notion of the relationship is

misconceived; thirdly, by asking why the Trustees should run the risk of personal prosecution; and fourthly, by doubting that Wratislaw and Gibb, and any other local parents, would have acquiesced in such a gross abuse without returning to the courts for legal remedy. Yet regardless of these observations, his assertions are refuted by the evidence. The school Form Lists show that the first and second forms were reconstituted and continued for the rest of Arnold's career. In December 1839, six boys were in the first form under J. Penrose; four were in the second form under R. Bird; in June 1840 six were in the first form and nine in the second; in December 1840 seven were in the first and five in the second form; in June 1841 two were in the first and twelve in the second; in December 1841 three were in the first and ten in the second form; and in June 1842 five boys were in the first form and eight in the second.³⁸⁰

Of the boys who progressed through these two forms, five were the children of Wratislaw and Gibb, twenty-three were newcomers. And these forms were taught and examined regularly as part of the school routine.³⁸¹ Further evidence on this matter highlights a point Arnold could have made in his defence had he been given the opportunity. Although very little statistical information for his predecessor's regime was presented in the court case, analysis of the Rugby School Register shows that Arnold's rate of admissions of boys under the age of twelve from families resident in Rugby - the people allegedly being kept away - was far in excess of that under Wooll. For his twenty-one years in office Wooll admitted seventy-four boys in this age group and category (an average of 3.5 p.a.); in his fourteen years Arnold admitted 100 (an average of 7.1 p.a.). Even in the period of the alleged conspiracy, 1831 to 1838, he entered forty-eight boys (an average of 6 p.a.), still a significant increase over his predecessor. Moreover from August 1839 to his death in June 1842, the

period dating from the judgement in the Wratislaw Case, and excluding the Wratislaw and Gibb children, Arnold admitted in total forty-seven boys (i.e. sons of residents and non-residents) aged eleven years or under, and of these twenty were from residents of the town. The figure for the corresponding period at the end of Wooll's reign was forty-one with seventeen of them from the town. It is simply untrue to say that after Lord Langdale's decision nothing was done about the first two forms and the admission of young boys.³⁸²

In concluding this investigation of the Wratislaw Case, three questions remain to be considered. First, how valid is the explanation which Arnold suggested for the decline in the number of boys in the Lower School, an explanation which is contained in the unpublished L.721? Second, how does the new evidence affect the various "motives" which have been suggested to explain Arnold's behaviour since the received account was published? And third, how significant is the lack of emphasis placed upon the Chancery Court case in The Life?

The general view of this affair has been that it shows Arnold deliberately excluding the youngest children, particularly those of local inhabitants, as a means of destroying the Lower School. For purposes of clarification, it should be noted that the Lower School comprised four forms: the lower Remove (from 1830), the third, second, and first forms, and its age range was generally thirteen years and below. It should be added that the competence of the masters in charge of the two higher forms here was not in question; also that Wratislaw's complaints were directed principally at forms one and two. In endeavouring to account for Arnold's "motives", commentators have suggested a number of things: a "device" to establish a minimum age limit; to stop the school being swamped by the lower classes; to preserve the school's national character; or simply that he disliked little children.³⁸³

In considering the decline in the number of boys under instruction in the Lower School one point can be made from the outset. The entrance records show that the number of boys aged under twelve whose families lived in Rugby who were admitted under Arnold was much higher than under his predecessor. Therefore the figures do not support the claim that he excluded the young boys from the town. Nevertheless, during the period 1831 to 1838 the numbers in the Lower School did decline while there was

a contemporaneous rise in the numbers of the Upper. When Arnold began in 1828 there were twenty-three boys in the Lower School. Wratislaw's alleged conspiracy dated from 1831, by which time the number had risen to 112. And three years later, in the summer of 1834, it stood at exactly the same figure, though by the end of that year it had fallen to ninety-one. A steady reduction then took place and by 1838, the Lower School, although still in excess of the number Arnold began with, stood at thirty-eight boys with only two in the lower two forms. During the same period, the Upper School had risen from 113 in 1828 to 207 in 1834 and to 240 by 1838.³⁸⁴ Apart from the conspiracy theory, it has been suggested that this decline mirrored the general trend which was affecting all the Public Schools; the hostile publicity directed at Arnold during this decade has also been mentioned.³⁸⁵ In fact, Rugby survived the general depression very well.³⁸⁶ The admission figures show that the school was first affected in 1832, when entrances dropped from 106 to eighty, but the numbers then remained fairly constant until a recovery began in 1839.³⁸⁷ Naturally, this reduction in the total number of entrants had an effect on the Lower School. For example, admissions of boys aged eleven and below tended to fall away from the levels of 1829 to 1831,³⁸⁸ although this trend was not so pronounced among the twelve year old age group, which, as a percentage of the total admissions, tended to increase.³⁸⁹ It can of course be argued that Arnold's expressed opinion on the undesirability of sending boys aged under twelve to the school was a factor here: the tendency of the numbers of eleven year olds and below to decrease could be ascribed to the influence of his opinion, particularly on the parents of non-residents. Unfortunately, this is not something which can be quantified for the evidence is simply not available. Nevertheless, during the period in which the numbers in the Lower School were declining,

there was, statistically, no dramatic decline in the total intake of boys aged twelve and below; the admissions remained reasonably constant, with the twelve year age group being least affected.³⁹⁰ So while there was a gradual reduction of entrants in the lower age groups, this is not in itself sufficient to explain the sharp decline in the numbers being instructed in the Lower School, particularly in the two lowest forms.

Arnold categorically denied that he had discouraged the lower forms:

"He (Lord Langdale) talks of the lower School having been discouraged, which is not the Case, ..."(L.729);

and in a significant unpublished letter (L.721) to the Eton master, Edward Coleridge, written before the Chancery case was heard, he gave his opinion on why the numbers in the Lower School had reduced and the Upper increased:

"... I believe that the Diminution in the Number of Boys in our lower School, while the upper School has gone on increasing, arises from Causes quite independent of my Opinions or Advice ... Boys are brought on so much sooner than they used to be that I do not see how the lower Part of a public School can help falling into Decay, for almost all Boys who come must be placed in the upper School."

In other words there was a general increase in the educational standard of entrant; boys were being presented better prepared and therefore in less need of elementary instruction. Taken in conjunction with the tendency for the numbers in the lowest age groups to decline, an analysis of the Form Lists of the period for boys aged thirteen and below confirms this explanation. The intake of the two lowest forms declined dramatically;

more boys aged below thirteen were being placed in the third form and the lower Remove - and were passing through those forms quicker - than previously; and more thirteen year olds were taking the fourth form. In short, fewer boys were entering the Lower School and more were leaving it, thus the relative proportion of the Lower School was declining. In connection with this trend it is interesting to notice a point made by the Trustees' counsel on this subject:

"... of late years a great number of ... preparatory schools have been established; ... and ... have taken very much ... they are filled with little boys;"³⁹¹

Preparatory schools had developed slowly from about 1770. Although their real growth was from the middle of the nineteenth century, they were having a noticeable effect by the 1830 s. Southey, for example, writing of Westminster School in 1835, recorded that the destruction of its Lower School was due to the preparatory school movement.³⁹² Arnold had first-hand knowledge of them through his connection with John Buckland, who was running a thriving establishment at Laleham.³⁹³ Moreover, two such schools were operating in Rugby.³⁹⁴ The emergence of these schools, then, was having the effect of removing the class of boy who normally entered the Lower School, particularly its lowest forms, and generally sending boys better prepared. And Arnold's opinion on the undesirability of young boys being at a Public School could only strengthen the trend towards these establishments. It could, of course, be argued that Arnold might have exercised his power of veto here, giving preference to those applicants who were better founded; but this is not something which can be determined, for there is no record of unsuccessful applications nor, in the vast majority of cases, is the educational background of entrants aged under thirteen known.³⁹⁵

It has been said that Arnold did not like little boys, and in trying to account for his apparent treatment of them in the Wratishaw Case, Bamford says that,

"... as others have remarked from different premises,
... he had no sympathy with young children."³⁹⁶

But, as Newsome is right to say, it would be rash to attribute his behaviour to a "... loathing of little boys."³⁹⁷ Confirmation of this is found firstly in The Life where Stanley illustrates some of Arnold's feelings towards them:

"'If he should turn out ill,' he said ~~fo~~ a young boy t
... and his voice trembled with emotion ... 'I think it would break my heart.' Nor were any thoughts so bitter to him, as those suggested by the innocent faces of little boys as they first came from home ... when he heard of their being tormented or tempted into evil by their companions. 'It is a most touching thing to me, to receive a new fellow from his father - when I think what an influence their is in this place for evil, as well as for good. I do not know anything which affects me more.'";³⁹⁸

and in L.571 where the reason for his attitude to the admission of under twelves is given. He admits that he does attempt to dissuade parents from sending young boys. But his motive was not dislike: it was the moral risk to which they were exposed that conditioned his attitude:

"Now it is very true with regard to all Boys whose Parents live at a Distance and who therefore are not on the Foundation, I do discourage it, because I think it involves a very great moral Risk to the Boys;"

And he goes on to say that even for the young day-boys, those boys whose families lived in the town, a Public School,

"... cannot be very well fitted, ... although if he lives with his Parents the Risk is, or ought to be, much diminished."

These two extracts confirm that Arnold did attempt to discourage the admission of very young boys, but the emphasis, as he also remarked in L.728, was on the children of non-Foundationers, those from families not resident in the town; Foundationers he believed to be at less risk.

This might well have relevance for the preponderance of "residents" in the entrance numbers of the lower age groups in the school.³⁹⁹ Arnold's "advice" to parents, particularly those living at a distance from Rugby, was having effect, though it does not, of course, follow that those boys who were admitted were neglected. There is nothing in the extracts from L.571 to support the pejorative view of Arnold and the admission of young boys. That letter does not suggest there was a "master plan" behind the decline in numbers of the Lower School, rather that it was mere inevitability.

Finally, on the view that Arnold was motivated by a desire to keep the lower ranks out of the school: there may be a misconception here. The term "local children" (i.e. the Foundationers) is often taken to mean the children of the lower classes, and Arnold's actions have been seen as a device to keep such a group out of Rugby School, thus breaking faith with the Founder.⁴⁰⁰ But it would be incorrect to assume that the Foundationers sprang from such a social class. From the turn of the century Rugby's entrants as a whole were drawn partly from the middle but principally from the upper classes;⁴⁰¹ as Bamford says:

"In the first thirty years of the century, 1800-1829,

only eighty-six middle-class children were admitted, less than three a year ... No lower-class child entered the School except as a servant.

By 1800, the ideal of the founder had already been lost ...";⁴⁰²

and even those middle-class parents were wealthy.⁴⁰³ This was, therefore, no creation of Arnold: by 1800 Rugby was a school serving the upper classes with the emphasis on the boarders. The intake figures for Found-
ationers quoted earlier, although showing that Arnold admitted more young "local" children than Wooll, disguise the fact that these "local" boys came largely from the professional ranks of the town. They were mainly the sons of clergymen, solicitors, bankers, doctors, agents, and the children of military men. And in addition to the truly "local" families, from 1821 middle-class parents had begun to move into the area to take advantage of the Foundation, though the Trustees' discretionary two-year residential qualification was always a potential check on their numbers.⁴⁰⁴

The needs of the lower classes in the area were met by two local schools, which educated just over half their children, the others presumably not bothering or simply attending the Sunday schools.⁴⁰⁵ Certainly from 1828, a free education at Rugby School was, in theory, open to the son of any resident;⁴⁰⁶ but on the evidence of the statistics, there was no rush by the "local" populace, lower class or otherwise, to avail themselves of it either then or after the court's decision in the Wratishaw Case over ten years later. In practice, there is little doubt that recognition of the "type" of school Rugby had become was long-established. When considering the question of the lower forms, therefore, it is important to realise that from 1800 at least, they had never been flooded with the

sons of the town, lower or middle-class.⁴⁰⁷ By this time the original intention of the Founder, that it should be a local "grammar" school, had gone. In reality, there was probably not much of a "problem" for Arnold on this issue.⁴⁰⁸

Undoubtedly the correspondence provides evidence to support the notion that he was anxious to improve the "national" character of the school. He had this in mind in 1830 (L.327) when he was encouraging the Trustees to make changes in the management of the school enabling it to maintain its national character as a "... great School."; and in 1833 (L.427) he remarked to Denbigh that more boys entering from outside the area would make Rugby much less a "... mere local School.". But given the circumstances, none of this has to be at the expense of those local boys who were admitted.

Was the Chancery Court case suppressed by Stanley in The Life? Bamford remarked on the letter which mentioned it, that the contents were,

"... quite unintelligible to the reader without a background that was not given.";⁴⁰⁹

and he later states that the contest with Wratislaw was among the events in Arnold's life which were "... deliberately buried,".⁴¹⁰ It is, of course, true that before Bamford there had been no attention given to the incident.

Of those letters which mention the case at all, analysis of Stanley's Notebooks shows that he had definitely read five: L.712, L.726, L.728, L.729, L.734. Two of these, L.712, L.729, he reproduced with acknowledged omissions which included the references to this case. The one letter he printed which did give the reader some details, L.728, only had a portion of the text reproduced, part of the acknowledged omission contained

further references to the affair. A summary of the information Stanley chose to omit can be given. The excision in L.712 was relatively innocuous, a mere reference to the fact that the case was pending and it might exclude all but the Foundationers from the exhibitions. In L.729 the omission was that of Arnold's detailed comment on the verdict: satisfaction over the exhibitions; but denial of the Lower School's being discouraged; complaints about the inefficiency of the counsel; and speculation that Langdale might have thought he had a pecuniary interest in diminishing the Foundationers. The excision from L.728 was that of Arnold's complaints about a press misquotation of Langdale's judgement which suggested the Judge had agreed with the Plaintiffs on the conspiracy charge. Arnold also complained about the vagueness of Langdale's wording, and repeated his dissatisfaction about the counsel, saying that the Plaintiffs' assertions should have been answered. He went on to repeat his impression that Langdale might have believed he lost money by the Foundationers, a subject which introduced the extract printed in The Life showing that this was not so.⁴¹¹ Of the two letters Stanley read but did not use, L.726 was written before the judgement and again is concerned with the exhibitions, while L.734, written after it, expresses satisfaction about them but complains about aspects of the press' reporting.

Stanley, therefore, chose to defend Arnold's character by reproducing part of a letter in which Arnold exposed the fallacy in thinking he had been motivated by money. This was not an entirely unbalanced view for Stanley to take because in two of the other letters he had read, Arnold expressed similar concern. The fact that Arnold's real anxiety about the Wratislaw Case was over the fate of the exhibitions; that he thought the counsel inefficient, and that he could have answered that part of the

case which was receiving press coverage, are all items unknown to a reader of the letter in The Life. This does not have to be construed as deliberate suppression to protect Arnold's feelings of guilt, for Arnold did not feel guilty. Had Stanley entered into the background of the case, he would have had to do so at length. Even if he had known all the facts, he might have concluded that the matter was too personal in its nature if Arnold's case was to be put strongly. It is also possible that by reproducing the extract he did, he was responding retrospectively, for the benefit of those with long memories, to an aspect of the case which had been current at the time. And as Bamford says, the affair was soon forgotten. If Stanley had really wished to suppress the matter, he was not obliged to mention it at all. It was not recalled in the aftermath of Arnold's death. Whether any of the other biographers pursued the case is not known, so they cannot be accused of suppression. It could be argued that the aspect of the affair on which emphasis has been placed since 1960 did not have the same impact at the time. The extract from L.728 reveals once again the problem faced by the reader of a letter in The Life. Bamford, reading the printed portion, assumes Arnold's reaction was chiefly concerned with the monetary aspect - not at all the side of the case he found significant.⁴¹² If he had read the preceding part of the letter, he would have discovered Arnold's views on those other aspects. Among these was the revelation about the second set of affidavits. Had he read this, it might well have influenced the way he interpreted the Wratishlaw Case.

NOTES

1. Newsome, op.cit., pp.40-41. Honey, op.cit., p.7, accepts these, though qualifying Arnold's conception of the school's corporate identity, and also emphasises Arnold's combination of the roles of Headmaster and Chaplain, and the new spirit which was infused into the curriculum.

2. T.W. Bamford, 'Discipline at Rugby Under Arnold', Educational Review, vol.10 (London, 1957-8), pp.18-21 - hereafter called, 'Discipline at Rugby ...' - lists seventeen published accounts. To these can be added, C.H. Pearson, Memorials (New York, 1900); F.L. Mulhauser, The Correspondence of Arthur Hugh Clough (Oxford, 1957), 2 vols. As Bamford observes, there are occasional remarks on the school to be found in books elsewhere; references to some of these will be found below.

3. Extract from a poem printed in the Northampton Herald, 25 November 1837; first quoted by Bamford, op.cit., p.125.

4. 'On the Discipline of Public Schools', The Quarterly Journal of Education, vol.1X, No.XV111 (London, 1835), pp.281-92. The article was reprinted in the posthumous, The Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Arnold (London, 1858), pp.363-79 - hereafter called Miscellaneous Works

5. For the early period, see, for example, J. Gathorne Hardy, The

Public School Phenomenon (London, 1977), ch.3; E.C. Mack, Public Schools and British Opinion, 1780 to 1860 (London, 1938), pp.143-66, for flogging, pp.164-6; John Chandos, Boys Together, English Public Schools 1800-1864 (London, 1984), pp.229-30; Newsome, op.cit., pp.3-5. See also note 225 below.

6. See Honey, op.cit., p.196.
7. L.264 was partially published, including this extract, by Stanley, op.cit., pp.190-91. For Arnold's general views, see 'On the Discipline of Public Schools', passim.
8. Stanley, op.cit., pp.90-91.
9. 'On the Discipline of Public Schools', passim; Stanley, op.cit., pp.96-98; and Bamford, 'Discipline at Rugby ...', pp.21-3.
10. Bamford, op.cit., p.132, p.110.
11. Bamford first mentioned the incident in his 'Discipline at Rugby ...', p.22, though briefly and without drawing pejorative conclusions.
12. See Newsome, op.cit., p.47; Honey, op.cit., p.196; Percival, op.cit., p.98; Chandos, op.cit., pp.257-8, for example.
13. Various issues from January to March 1833: see Bamford, op.cit., p.216 for his references. He does not, however, mention the issue of the Northampton Mercury of 16 February 1833 in which

Arnold answered the original allegations.

14. Stanley, op.cit., pp.264-5, mentions the local press attacks upon him, though without going into details; Whitridge, op.cit., p.144, note 1, and Wymer, op.cit., p.167, also refer to the matter; though none of them mention the March case.
15. Bamford, op.cit., p.49.
16. Chandos, op.cit., p.258.
17. In the Warwickshire County Record Office and the archives of Rugby School.
18. Bamford, op.cit., pp.49-50.
19. Statement of J.P. Lee to the Trustees of Rugby School: Warwickshire County Record Office, Ref. CR2017/C413/19. The references to Lee which follow are derived from this document.
20. See Arnold's Miscellaneous Works ..., pp.344-6 for details of each form's work, and p.347 for the examination.
21. Bamford, op.cit., p.50.
22. Written in the hand of an amanuensis. The particular book of the Hellenics is not known. The timetable of the work done at Rugby School, given in Arnold's Miscellaneous Works ... , p.345, merely records "Part of Xenophon's Hellenics".

23. Bamford, op.cit., p.50.
24. ibid., pp.50-51.
25. The detailed statements made to the Trustees by Lee, and Arnold (L.443), along with a similar document from Grenfell (Warwickshire County Record Office, Ref. CR2017/C413/6ff), were not made until several months after the event, a fact which probably explains some of the discrepancies in close detail. Arnold's letter to Lord Denbigh (L.423), however, was written as soon as the case broke in the Northampton Herald on 19 January 1833, and is, therefore, the document written nearest to the actual event.
26. Bamford, op.cit., p.50.
27. A remark which Arnold might have interpreted as being deliberately ambiguous - particularly in the light of his previous knowledge of the boy's "shuffling" character (see below).
28. Bamford, op.cit., p.50.
29. ibid.
30. ibid.
31. ibid.
32. ibid., p.51.

33. ibid.
34. ibid.
35. The school doctor.
36. Bamford, op.cit., p.51.
37. Although his written account of the work the form had done stated that chapter one was the starting point (L.443); so it would seem he admitted to one error at this time.
38. Bamford, op.cit., pp.51-2.
- 38A. See note 154.
39. Of course, the new evidence is written by Arnold and the others in defence of their position, and this must be taken into account.
40. Bamford stresses Arnold's reputation as a flogger, but gives no other evidence apart from the March affair.
41. Bamford, op.cit., p.52. In fact "the staff" did not send the letter to the press, as will be seen from what follows.
42. ibid.

43. ibid.
44. A lengthy account of this matter can be found in Lee's statement. The impression created by this document is that Bird was trying to exculpate himself by shifting the responsibility on to others.
45. Bamford, op.cit., p.52.
46. Chandos, op.cit., p.257 assumes the boy was beaten in front of the class, but this is wrong. Nor is it known that Arnold administered the punishment crying, "'Liar! Liar! Liar!'", ibid., derived from Bamford, op.cit., p.50, since the Northampton Herald of 19 January 1833 simply says: "Dr Arnold called March a 'Liar,' frequently repeating the appellation and made preparations for flogging him."
47. Chandos, op.cit., p.222, pp.225-6.
48. R. Ollard, An English Education (London, 1982), p.46. The "block" was the flogging block on which a boy knelt to receive his punishment.
49. A. Lubbock, Memories of Eton and Etonians (London, 1899), p.96.
50. R. Nevill, Floreat Etona (London, 1911), p.85.
51. ibid., p.97.

52. G. Coleridge, Eton in The 'Seventies (London, 1912), pp.18-9.
53. Chandos, op.cit., p.226. See also, Wasey Sterry, Annals of The King's College Of Our Lady Of Eton Beside Windsor (London, 1898), "... twice in a day was common ...", p.214; L. Cust, A History of Eton College (London, 1899), "It was even possible for a boy to be flogged three times in one day.", p.160.
54. Sterry, op.cit., p.217.
55. Nevill, op.cit., p.90.
56. ibid.
57. Bamford, op.cit., p.50.
58. ibid.
59. Stanley, op.cit., p.89.
60. Bamford, op.cit., p.110. No evidence is given for the assertion, and it is presumably made on the basis of the March case and a subjective view of Arnold's character; see the text to the next note.
61. ibid.

62. 'The Ideal of Manliness' by N. Vance, in The Victorian Public School, ed. B. Simon and I. Bradley, (London, 1975), p.119.
 In assessing all the information which the unpublished documents provide, mention must be made of a single sentence in Lee's statement where he says: "The flogging was not particularly severe, nor so much as others I have seen.". The problem with this sentence lies in its evaluation. According to the evidence, Lee was not an eye-witness to the punishment, which took place in the room adjoining that in which he and Grenfell were continuing with the examination of the form. At that time, therefore, he could not have seen the effects of the birching. It might be, of course, that his remark is based upon the lack of reaction from March, both during and after the punishment. But might he simply have made this statement out of loyalty to Arnold? If, however, it is factually correct, then it raises more questions. Does the reference to severe floggings refer to a larger number of strokes but with new birches? Does he mean floggings by Arnold, by other masters, or even by Praepostors? Does it refer to Rugby School or is it a reminiscence of Lee's own youth?
63. Chandos, op.cit., pp.257-8.
64. For a general description see ibid., ch.11; Honey, op.cit., pp.196-203.
65. Whitridge, op.cit., p.145.

66. Wymer, op.cit., pp.119-21, p.123. Arnold was not the only person invested with the power to flog. His assistants had that right (see Bamford, 'Discipline at Rugby ...', p.23, quoting T. Mackay, The Reminiscences of Albert Pell [London, 1908].), as did his Praepostors (Wymer, op.cit., p.121). Moreover the Marshall case (discussed later) shows that Praepostors could beat boys over fifteen years of age.
67. Chandos, op.cit., p.221.
68. Bamford, op.cit., p.49.
69. ibid., p.53; see also note 40 above.
70. ibid., p.52.
71. ibid. An answer to the question of "stealing" is provided by L.637, discussed later, which shows Arnold removing the culprits from the school, though not, in every case, for good.
72. Newsome, op.cit., p.47.
73. Bamford, op.cit., p.49.
74. Wymer, op.cit., p.120, quoting L.282.
75. Perhaps further justification of his reaction to March's failure to construe, in that the boy had apparently been wilfully idle

in not preparing properly for the examination.

76. Wymer, op.cit., p.120.
77. Both in the Brotherton Library, Leeds. The first of these Diaries/Notebooks is headed "Rugby and Fox How 1837-1839". The Diary runs from 26 December 1837 to 13 April 1839. The second covers the period 14 April 1839 to 7 February 1840, though the Diary is preceded by notes on school matters.
78. In the case of Bright, the question is what does "3 times" mean: three strokes of the birch, three times the usual sequence of strokes, or three separate occasions? The reference to "Moorsom's Row" suggests the offence probably concerned the railway at Rugby, where Moorsom was an official (L.667). It had opened on 17 September 1838, the boy was flogged on 4 October and expelled on 6 October. Although there were a number of boys at the school with the surname Conybeare, there were only two in residence when this flogging took place, so "3." does not mean Tertius. The same questions, therefore, apply to the record of the flogging of Conybeare.
79. Apart from 113 in 1830 and 106 in 1831, the number remained fairly constant for the next seven years; see note 387 below.
80. Accounts written by participants can be read in W.E. Oswell, William Cotton Oswell (London, 1900) - W.C. Oswell was the one boy not to be identified - and Prothero and Bradley, op.cit.,

vol.1, p.69. Bamford, op.cit., pp.71-3, brings together the various accounts. Of the other biographers, Stanley, Whitridge, and Wymer do not mention the incident specifically (see note 81 below).

81. Stanley, op.cit., p.90; though he only refers to the incident in general terms.

82. The Times mentioned the affair in its issues of 15 and 16 May 1833.

83. W.E. Oswell, op.cit., p.54.

84. "Cox, Price, Torkington, Wynniatt, Peters," ibid. Chandos, op.cit., p.150, suggests Gaisford as the sixth name, which is plausible - the Librarian of Rugby School informs me that his name does not appear in the Form Lists after this date.

85. Readers of Tom Brown's Schooldays (An Old Boy, Tom Brown's Schooldays [London, 1874], new edition) will recognise this incident with Boughton Leigh depicted in chapter nine. In fact, Hughes' account there corresponds almost exactly with the details given in his letter reproduced by Oswell, op.cit., p.54, save that no boys are taken prisoner and the culprits only "... flogged and kept in bounds, ...", Tom Brown's Schooldays, pp.194-5. An echo of the boys' dislike of being manhandled is also found in the novel: when "Tom" agrees to surrender to the keeper he says, "'... but hands off, you know ... no collaring or that sort of thing.'",

ibid., p.200.

86. It appears from what follows that one cause of complaint had been that the boys were not first asked to give up their names, a point which Arnold dismissed as "... immaterial to the Question." (L.437).
87. His father later assumed the surname Hacker: see A.T. Mitchell, Rugby School Register From April, 1675 to April, 1842 (Rugby, 1901), p.259. This work is called hereafter: Rugby School Register.
88. Stanley, op.cit., pp.100-101.
89. Stanley's text probably derives from the transcription in The Records. The letter was written to Algernon Grenfell and is clearly dated 16 January 1836.
90. Wymer, op.cit., pp.167-8. The Clough letter may be read in F.L. Mulhauser, op.cit., vol.1, pp.29-30.
91. Bamford, op.cit., pp.84-6. He gives a list of the newspapers who covered the story on p.218.
92. A two-page document which the writer discovered among the papers of E.J. Shirley, a Trustee of Rugby School at the time. It was drawn up by the boy's father, the Rev.E. Marshall Hacker, and presented to Shirley in his capacity as Trustee. Hacker wished

to have the affair investigated and he submitted this statement after interviewing both his sons, "... cautioning (them) to State nothing but real Facts & to conceal nothing.". This document, and other papers, remains in the possession of the Shirley family, and the writer wishes to acknowledge their kindness in making them freely available.

- 92A. A.J. Arbuthnot, Memories of Rugby and India (London, 1910), p.49, states that these meetings took place in the Sixth Form Room, which was above the main entrance to the school.
93. Bamford, op.cit., pp.84-5; Wymer, op.cit., p.168. Clough says that Wise had taken the precaution of asking Fox and Cunningham to stand by in case of trouble, Mulhauser, op.cit., vol.1, pp.29-30.
94. The writer of the statement seems uncomfortably aware that the brother's actions might have been misunderstood by the Praepostors, but that all he was really trying to do was to push them away from the fireplace, he says.
95. Bamford, op.cit., p.85. Clough's account makes the fight a single one between Fox and Marshall, "a regular encounter" once Wise's cane had been broken, saying that Fox insisted on Cunningham's withdrawing from the contest. Clough makes no mention of Marshall's brother either. See Mulhauser, op.cit., vol.1, pp.29-30.
96. Wymer, op.cit., p.168, mentions such implements but does not

link them directly to the Marshall incident. He does not mention the Blackthorn stick either.

97. After describing the fighting, the statement merely says, "The Canes had leaden heads.". Clough's account shows that the leaden head might never have come into contact with a victim's body. His statement mentions only one leaded cane and that Arnold questioned Fox about it, which might suggest that such an implement was not usual. Fox asserted that the lead was in the handle and that end was never used for beating; if Marshall had claimed otherwise he was lying. Mulhauser, op.cit., pp.29-30.
98. Bamford, op.cit., p.85 and in his 'Discipline at Rugby ...', pp.23-4 sees this stick as an exception, used "... to add variety." or "... when canes were obviously inadequate.". Yet these comments are hardly appropriate in the particular context of the Marshall affray. But as with the weighted canes, there is simply not enough evidence available on which to pass judgement. Where this particular stick came from, and how typical it was, is not known. It might have been brought in as supplementary weaponry, but equally it might have been lying in the hall or the corridor for some other purpose. And what exactly does the statement mean? Is it that Blackthorn sticks were usually used by the Praepostors or simply that smaller sticks than this one were normal? Arnold's own reference to the matter, "I do not choose to discuss the thickness of Praepostors' sticks, ..." (L.541), sheds no light on his feelings. If he did have reservations, then presumably these were expressed in his conversation with Fox and any other

meeting he had with the Praepostors. Clough says Arnold's opinion was that they should have reported the matter to him as soon as Marshall broke the first stick; this would, presumably, have prevented their being drawn into a general fight.

99. Chandos, op.cit., p.256. Bamford, op.cit., p.86, also assumes that the sole purpose of this visit was to see Arnold, that the father "... had had his long and uncomfortable journey for nothing."; but this was not so, as will be shown.
100. Bamford, op.cit., p.85.
101. Wymer, op.cit., p.168.
102. Arnold had instituted a scale of punishments which limited Praepostors to a maximum of six strokes (three on average) with an automatic right of appeal against such a punishment: see ibid., p.121.
103. It is difficult to see what Marshall could have said that would alter the main facts. Had the matter turned on the canes, it would be expected that the statement would dilate at length upon this - but on the contrary. It admits the main facts, offers no excuses for Marshall's conduct, and grounds its complaint on the boy's being unheard. Presumably, therefore, the objection was to the sentence of expulsion; the father thought the offence did not merit this, Arnold did.

104. Bamford, op.cit., pp.85-6.
105. Chandos, op.cit., p.256.
106. Bamford, op.cit., p.86.
107. Wymer, op.cit., p.177, mentions the incident without giving the numbers involved or the fact that they were not all sentenced to indefinite expulsion.
108. The affair is dealt with in a number of letters written by Arnold to Mackenzie's aunt, and the Headmaster of Cheam School, Dr Mayo. They are all unpublished and are now deposited in the Scottish Record Office: Ref.GD46/15/59/15-24.
109. The Twenty was the group of boys just below the Sixth Form. Mackenzie was not a Praepostor nor was he a house prefect. House prefects were only created when a house did not contain a member of the Sixth Form (see: A Member of the School [i.e. W. Gover], 'Memories of Arnold and Rugby Sixty Years Ago', The Parents Review, [London, 1895-6], p.833). In Lee's house, Lushington, though younger than Mackenzie, was a Sixth Form Praepostor and head of the house.
110. Arnold also points out that "... at least ten Minutes must have elapsed;" between the remark being made and Mackenzie's hitting Lushington, which Arnold construed as showing that the act was premeditated and not done on the spur of the moment. Mackenzie

did not deny this, Arnold "... received not the slightest Intimation from him that it was otherwise."

111. Mayo was a follower of the Pestalozzi system and became an admirer of Arnold: see Honey, op.cit., p.8.
112. Stanley, op.cit., pp.133-4.
113. See note 77 above.
114. George Cunningham: see Rugby School Register, p.283.
115. C.R. Conybeare. See ibid., p.277.
116. Perhaps a speech concerning the troubles.
117. M.H. Buckland, W.A. Buckland, S.F. Cradock, J. Nicholson: see Rugby School Register, pp.284, 272, 276, 288. All the boys mentioned in notes 114-117 were members of the School House. There is a further Diary entry for 5 December, "Bernard went", but no boy with this surname (if surname it be) has been traced. That more boys than this were removed is shown by L.712 below.
118. See Stanley, op.cit., p.2, p.138. His literary and general commitments would create additional pressures.
119. ibid., p.133.

120. Arnold's close relationship with his Sixth Form and his view of their role in the school is well known. He taught them, held frequent meetings with them about school affairs, dined regularly with them, and encouraged them to speak freely with him. Much was expected in return. For general discussions, see: ibid., pp.92-6, p.134; Wymer, op.cit., pp.107-110; Newsome, op.cit., pp.41-2; Honey, op.cit., pp.11-12, p.23; Mack, op.cit., pp.272-3, 277-9.
121. In 1837 he had said to J.T. Coleridge:
- "... I am baffled continually by the utter Mediocrity of Character, ... and what to do when you get a Number of such Characters near the Head of a School together, passes all my Wit to discover." (L.624).
122. For a good general discussion, see Newsome, op.cit., pp.50-55. See also: Mack, op.cit., pp.251-6; Chandos, op.cit., pp.252-4; and Stanley, op.cit., pp.96-7 quoting L.698.
123. See Stanley, op.cit., p.133; Whitridge, op.cit., pp.96-7.
124. Honey, op.cit., p.22.
125. He does record Arnold's intention of resigning the School House in 1839 but without comment: Whitridge, op.cit., p.97.
126. Wymer, op.cit., p.187.

127. Stanley, op.cit., p.136.
128. ibid., pp.136-7: "'If this goes on ... Roman History?'".
129. ibid., p.137.
130. ibid., pp.96-7.
131. ibid., pp.469-70.
132. It is not known whether he read the letters concerning the troubles, though much of the Hawkins' correspondence was available to him - he quoted from L.637, for example, see Wymer, op.cit., p.177, where he refers to the outbreak of theft in 1837 - so he might have seen L.703.
133. Wymer, op.cit., pp.173-88.
134. ibid., p.173.
135. ibid., p.175.
136. ibid., p.187.
137. See, for example, Stanley, op.cit., pp.86-7, p.415; Mack, op.cit., p.263-4; Bamford, op.cit., p.209.
138. Stanley, op.cit., pp.475-6.

139. See T. Hughes, Memoir of a Brother (London, 1873), pp.32-3; A.J. Arbuthnot, op.cit., p.49. Of the biographers, Whitridge, op.cit., pp.138-9 and Wymer, op.cit., p.151 mention the expulsion of Hughes, though neither record the problems between the school and the Sixth nor the fact that several boys were expelled. Bamford, op.cit., p.147 sets the event in its proper context.
140. See Honey, op.cit., p.25 and his notes 97, 98.
141. W.E. Oswell, op.cit., p.143.
142. J.B. Booth, Bits of Character - A Life of Henry Hall Dixon (London, 1936), p.23.
143. Wymer, op.cit., p.119.
144. Bamford, 'Discipline at Rugby ...', p.19 and p.24.
145. No more of the letter, or its present location is known. This quotation was taken from an autograph dealer's catalogue: see the letter summary. Stanley, op.cit., p.129, note a, refers to a scene when Arnold condemned the amount of drinking which was taking place in the school, but he gives no date.
146. See E.C. Mack and W.H.G. Armytage, Thomas Hughes: The Life of the Author of 'Tom Brown's Schooldays' (London, 1952), p.23; and also the Rugby School magazine, The Meteor for 25 June 1892, from which the subsequently quoted text of L.854 derives.

147. Stanley, op.cit., p.100.
148. See, for example, ibid., pp.96-100; Wymer, op.cit., pp.121-3; Newsome, op.cit., p.41.
149. Stanley, op.cit., pp.99-100.
150. See the summary of L.567 in Appendix Three.
151. Quoted by Newsome, op.cit., p.43.
152. For general discussions see: Chandos, op.cit., ch.14; Bamford, Thomas Arnold on Education, pp.9-10; Newsome, op.cit., pp.43-6; Honey, op.cit., pp.25-6, 194-6; Percival, op.cit., p.116. Chandos, op.cit., p.290, suggests there was a hint of paederasty in the practice of "'taking up'" younger boys as described by Hughes in Tom Brown's Schooldays.
153. His father had an illegitimate child and his elder brother married a prostitute. See Wymer, op.cit., p.12, pp.18-19. In his Miscellaneous Works ..., pp.161-2, Arnold reproduces the idea that "the dominion of the animal appetite." provides a theological explanation of the cause of overpopulation through "the corruption of our nature;" by the Fall.
154. Warwickshire County Record Office Ref. CR2017/C413/13. The letter is undated, but internal evidence suggests that it was written in reply to one sent by Arnold on 10 February 1833 (L.427).

155. See Rugby School Register, p.237.
156. Stanley, op.cit., pp.98-9.
157. "Unfortunately for the legend, ... the reduction of flogging ... had nothing to do with Arnold;": Bamford, op.cit., p.189.
158. A study of the Form Lists published each half for Arnold's years would disclose the names of boys who had left the school at the end of the previous term; but this would not provide the reason why each one had left.
159. Bamford, op.cit., p.151.
160. ibid., p.179. Arnold's own views on the moral state of the school fluctuated. Several letters give his general observations on its condition: L.414, L.598, L.713, for example.
161. Mack and Armytage, op.cit., p.24.
162. As David Newsome says, op.cit., pp.41-2, Arnold's system of Sixth Form government could only work if his Praepostors were capable of bearing "... the weight of excessive moral responsibility ..." which was placed upon them.
163. This raises the larger question of whether he ever really understood schoolboys, a question which is beyond the scope of

this study; but see Newsome, op.cit., pp.50-55; Chandos op.cit., pp.252-4; Mack, op.cit., pp.253-6, p.298; Bamford, op.cit., p.141. The narratives of Stanley, Whitridge, and Wymer, would suggest that though he had blind spots, he understood boy-nature well enough.

164. Their official title was "The Trustees of the Rugby Charity, founded by Lawrence Sheriff, Grocer of London": Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Revenues and Management of Certain Colleges and Schools and the Studies pursued and Instruction Given therein, 4 vols. (London, 1864), vol.2, p.297; hereafter called Public Schools Commission For an account of the founder see W.H.D. Rouse, A History Of Rugby School (London, 1898), ch.1, and for the progress of the trust, see Bamford, op.cit., pp.128-31. Rouse, op.cit., pp.121-8 summarises the revised constitution of the school which was enacted in 1777.
165. Public Schools Commission ..., vol.2, pp.298-9.
166. "Regulations framed by the Trustees for the internal management of the School have been very rare: this management they have in practice delegated to the Head Master, with the reserve of a power to rescind what he may have done, and to refuse their sanction, if they shall think fit, to any alteration of the existing system which he may propose to carry out.", ibid., vol.1, p.231.

167. Stanley, op.cit., p.66 (L.228), for example.
168. Public Schools Commission ... , vol.4, p.245.
169. Stanley, op.cit., p.81.
170. ibid., pp.382-4.
171. ibid., p.81.
172. Whitridge, op.cit., p.3: "... at Rugby he was for many years a lonely figure, ... feared by the trustees on account of his independent spirit."
173. Wymer, op.cit., p.107, p.115, p.168, p.172.
174. Bamford, op.cit., p.140. The comment was made in the context of the Wratishlaw Case, which is discussed later. He also says: "He defied his own Governors and developed such an independent line for headmasters that they have become almost omnipotent. (ibid., p.189) ... a doctrine that relegates ... the governing body to a rubber stamp."; ibid., p.140.
175. Chandos, op.cit., p.256.
176. Stanley printed brief, undated extracts from two more as footnotes on pp.107-8 (regarding the teaching of French) and p.126 (on Arnold's wish to assume the school Chaplaincy) in The Life.

See also Honey, op.cit., pp.8-9.

177. E.J. Shirley of Eatington Hall, Stratford-on-Avon, Trustee 1827 to 1856. Lord Denbigh of Newnham Padox, Trustee 1823 to 1865. The Shirley papers remain in private hands. The extensive archive of Denbigh letters and family papers is now deposited in the Warwickshire County Record Office.
178. Bamford, op.cit., p.27.
179. Whitridge, op.cit., p.187.
180. Stanley, op.cit., p.215, partially quoting L.335, a letter incorrectly dated in The Life: see Appendix One.
181. Stanley, op.cit., p.235, partially quoting L.357.
182. Stanley, op.cit., p.216. See note 180 above. Good general assessments of Arnold's position and the reactions to it can be found in Whitridge, op.cit., ch.1X, and Wymer, op.cit., pp.156-67.
183. All the biographers have something on this, particularly Bamford.
184. Wymer, op.cit., pp.89-90. See also L.247, L.256, for example.
185. T. Arnold, The Christian Duty of granting the claims of the Roman Catholics with A Postscript in answer to The Letters Of The Rev. E.S. Faber (Oxford, 1829). Reprinted by Stanley in

Arnold's Miscellaneous Works ... , pp.1-78.

186. Stanley, op.cit., pp.187-9; Wymer, op.cit., pp.163-4; Bamford, op.cit., pp.28-9.
187. Stanley, op.cit., pp.196-7.
188. Bamford, op.cit., p.29, p.155 gives admission figures.
189. In November 1830 he wrote that he was living "ten lives in one every day.", Stanley, op.cit., p.226 (L.338).
190. ibid., p.234 (L.355).
191. ibid., p.220.
192. The letters were reprinted in Arnold's Miscellaneous Works ... , pp.169-248. For general discussions of his writing at this time, see: Whitridge, op.cit., pp.180-8; Wymer, op.cit., pp.155-7; Bamford, op.cit., pp.37-8.
193. Stanley, op.cit., p.223 (L.336).
194. Although Arnold does not enlarge on this, more information can be found in L.347 and L.355. It seems that originally he wished to have the various contributions signed, or at least have the contributors' names standing at the head of the paper, but he was eventually dissuaded. His own articles were signed "A".

195. L.374.
196. In the Warwickshire County Record Office, Ref.CR2017/C343/6.
197. See Stanley, op.cit., pp.261-6, and Bamford, op.cit., pp.61-8.
The Principles of Church Reform was reprinted in Arnold's
Miscellaneous Works ... , pp.257-338.
198. In the Warwickshire County Record Office, Ref.CR2017/C413/20.
- 198A. ibid., Ref.CR2017/C413/13.
199. The third volume of his Sermons in 1834; the third volume of his
Thucydides in 1835; and articles on 'Rugby School' and 'On the
Discipline of Public Schools' in the Quarterly Journal of Education
for 1834-5. These two articles were reprinted in Arnold's
Miscellaneous Works ... , pp.339-79.
200. Stanley, op.cit., pp.267-8.
201. 'The Oxford Malignants And Dr Hampden', Edinburgh Review, vol.LX111,
April 1836, pp.225-39.
202. See Stanley, op.cit., p.354; Whitridge, op.cit., pp.167-72 and
p.192; Wymer, op.cit., p.165, p.168; and Bamford, op.cit.,
pp.99-103.
203. Which qualifies Bamford's comment that "He could no longer contain

himself and gave vent to his feelings ...", op.cit., p.99.

Not that he was averse to writing it, of course. It was simply that he was expecting Hampden to be defended from Oxford:

"What is Hawkins doing, or Macbride, or Cardwell, or Shuttleworth? There must surely be some left in Oxford capable of making Head against the Outbreak of a Sort of Stygian Pool, which 'obducto late tenet omnia Limo'." (L.547).

204. Stanley, op.cit., pp.382-3. Although Stanley probably had access to more information about this affair, it is worth noting that our interpretation of Arnold's replies is coloured by Stanley's observations on the correspondence. If Stanley never saw the Howe letters, he might have felt his interpretation was a reasonable deduction based on Arnold's three letters to Howe and L.581, written to Hawkins, ibid., pp.384-5.

205. ibid., p.382.

206. Whitridge, op.cit., p.192.

207. Wymer, op.cit., p.168.

208. Bamford, op.cit., pp.102-3.

209. The Trustees Order Books at Rugby School merely give the resolutions they had entered into respecting various matters.

Among these, they ordered that the vote of confidence in Arnold's management of the school passed at an extraordinary meeting the previous March be confirmed. There is no mention anywhere of a vote of censure being moved or defeated. Any discussion that did take place was not recorded here.

210. Stanley, op.cit., pp.384-5.
211. Bamford, op.cit., p.103.
212. The Trustees Order Books record the names of the eight members present: Denbigh, Howe, Biddulph, Lawley, Wise, Skipwith, Aylesford, and Dugdale. The meeting took place on 6 July 1836.
213. The meeting was held on 23 March 1836. The two Trustees who were not present at the summer meeting were Halford and Wise: see the Trustees Order Books.
214. There is no contradiction here, they were clearly distinguishing between his writings and his Headmastership.
215. Stanley, op.cit., p.354.
216. Stanley reprinted these letters in Arnold's Miscellaneous Works ... , pp.431-519. The first is dated 30 May 1837, the last 21 August 1841. All the articles were written anonymously, most of them under the initials "F.H." (Fox How - Arnold's home in Westmoreland). For Arnold's comments on these letters, see Stanley, op.cit., p.429

(L.644) and pp.509-10 (L.793).

217. The letter from Halford to Denbigh (see note 196 above) closes with Halford's promising to report his next conversation with Arnold.
218. Stanley, op.cit., p.82, who also records that he obtained the Bishop's acknowledgement of their situations as titles for orders, ibid., p.83.
219. Rouse, op.cit., p.235.
220. This is Arnold's spelling (L.298): the Rugby School Register has De la Poux.
221. Abraham Grimes, Trustee 1783 to 1832.
222. He wished to introduce a system of solitary confinement as a punishment, but the Trustees would not allow it; see Trustees Order Books, 25 October 1831, also quoted by Rouse, op.cit., p.228. This was probably the only occasion on which the Trustees did interfere directly with the internal running of the school: see the evidence of Mr Hefford, Clerk to the Trustees, given in 1864, Public Schools Commission ... , vol.4, p.245, who recalled this as the one time they exercised their right to override the Headmaster on such a matter.
223. Rouse, op.cit., p.237.

224. Wymer, op.cit., p.107.
225. The fact is well documented in the Educational Histories: see B. Simon, Studies in the History of Education 1780-1870 (London, 1964), pp.98-102; H.C. Barnard, A Short History of English Education from 1760-1944 (London, 1949), pp.14-23; see also note 5 above.
226. Bamford, op.cit., pp.23-6; Percival, op.cit., pp.113-4; Newsome, op.cit. p.38. The old notion is conveniently illustrated by Wymer, op.cit., pp.99-102. His account depreciates Wooll and his school, to demonstrate the greatness of Arnold's reforms. Rouse, op.cit., pp.208-210, gives an impressive list of the achievements of Wooll's scholars. Bamford, op.cit., pp.179-80, in showing that, "... Arnold did nothing that Wooll did not try to do.", mentions that Arnold's one contribution to the school chapel was stained-glass windows, ibid., p.180. In fact Arnold caused the burial vault to be opened. His letter arguing the case, for he wished the trust to finance the project, has survived (L.450). This provides another example of his view of the school's communal and corporate identity.
227. Bamford, op.cit., p.23, gives a figure of 123 when Arnold took over, but see note 271 below. In his book, Rise of the Public Schools (London, 1967), he discusses the problem of intake fluctuation in various schools during the nineteenth century but can find no common solution for the general decline in the 1830 s. He shows that Rugby's decline and prosperity under the Head-

masterships of Wooll and Arnold was based largely on a fluctuation in admissions of boys living more than fifty miles from the school, and suggests that nationwide publicity (of any kind) might be the answer here; op.cit., ch.1, passim. For a comprehensive examination see his 'The Prosperity of Public Schools, 1801-1850' The Durham Research Review (Univ. of Durham), vol.111, no.12, September 1961, pp.85-96.

228. Stanley, op.cit., p.190 (L.264), p.143; Bamford, op.cit., p.26.
229. Bamford, op.cit., p.29 gives the admission figures for these years -
1828 : 67; 1829 : 96; 1830 : 113.
230. ibid., pp.158-9; for his general discussion, see pp.155-9;
see also note 227 above.
231. "I think that we may fairly hope to keep up to 300 including
Foundationers: but beyond this we cannot rise permanently,
because other Schools are doing their Duty also, and ... every
Year ... will therefore be more formidable Rivals." (L.327).
In fact, the school eventually became so popular that this limit
was far exceeded: see Wymer, op.cit., p.188; Bamford, op.cit.,
pp.156-7.
232. A direct step towards establishing the pastoral role of the
housemaster. See also note 237 below.
233. "... the Boys here would learn to feel how much they are behind-

hand ... and would be more inclined to believe me when I tell them that they are so. As it is, there is a great Danger of their believing me unreasonable, and straining Things too high, simply because they have no Standard by which they can judge of their own Deficiencies." (L.327).

234. The Rugby School Register shows no intake of boys of an age which suggests they were to be coached for university entrance. Probably the Trustees felt the character of the school would be altered by such a change. How such boys would have been regarded by the mass of the school, and the implications for Arnold's ideas of communal identity, is a matter for speculation.
235. Wymer, op.cit., p.122.
236. In June 1830 Arnold raised the question of the "... very wide & marked Distinction made between them & the Head Master." directly with the Trustees, since his assistants felt their position was "... one of Degradation, and is so considered by People in general.". Arnold wished for them to be considered equally with himself "... in Society, and in general Estimation," so that "... a Gentleman of independent Mind (might not) feel himself lowered by accepting an Assistant Mastership here." (L.327).
237. A change which also enhanced their salaries through boarders' fees, Honey, op.cit., p.11; though there is no mention of this in L.327.

238. For a general discussion see Wymer, op.cit., 103-7, with the following qualifications: p.104, R. Bird did not resign in 1833; p.106, the ruling over Dames' houses was made by the Trustees in 1830; p.106, the resignations of 1830 and 1831 were not tendered "with perfect good will"; p.107, J.P. Lee was appointed in 1830 not 1831. The question of resignations from the staff is discussed below.
239. Stanley, op.cit., pp.83-4 prints two unattributed extracts which give Arnold's requirements for a master. That on p.83 is taken from L.316. See also L.444 and the unacknowledged omission from L.847. Bamford's, Thomas Arnold on Education, pp.94-105, is a convenient source for a selection of Arnold's views on "The Role, Character And Duties Of A Headmaster And Staff" derived from his published correspondence. In addition, see also Arnold's Miscellaneous Works ..., pp.226-235, "Education of the Middle Classes". J.P. Lee, G.E.L. Cotton, and H. Hill all became Headmasters, as did J. Penrose: see Newsome, op.cit., pp.56-7, ch.2; Honey, op.cit., pp.29-32. Bonamy Price became Professor of Political Economy at Oxford.
240. Bamford, op.cit., p.175.
241. Rev. J.H.C. Moor, assistant master 1800-1831; M. Delepoux, 1815-1830; Rev. R. Bird, 1828-1840. See Rugby School Register, pp.XV11, XV111.
242. Bamford, op.cit., p.175. He emphasises that most of the staff

enjoyed working for Arnold: "If he was a tyrant then his subjects seemed to like it,".

243. ibid., p.73.
244. Wymer, op.cit., p.104.
245. ibid., p.106.
246. His precise age is not known.
247. L.299. Stanley discusses Arnold's introduction of modern languages into the curriculum, op.cit., pp.107-8. See also Whitridge, op.cit., pp.114-18 and Wymer, op.cit., pp.124-6, though noting that initially French was to be taught by a single master, L. Pons, appointed in 1830 and his assistant (L.299, L.303). Bamford, op.cit., pp.136-7, mentions the teaching of French by Pons when examining the Wratishaw Case (discussed later). Here it should be noted that his statement that Pons "... was not employed in teaching modern languages ...", ibid., p.136, requires qualification. He was originally employed to teach French to the whole school, but his continual ill-health resulted in Arnold's deciding to share the teaching of the subject among the classical masters.
248. L.298. A retirement pension: see letter from G. Harris, Clerk to the Trustees, to Lord Denbigh 10 September 1829. Warwickshire County Record Office, Ref. CR2017/C344/5.

249. He was "Curate and Vicar" of Clifton-on-Dunsmore until 1831, then Vicar of Donnington Wood from 1832. See Rugby School Register, p.XV11.
250. Independently of the unpublished correspondence, the Rugby School Register, p.XV111 gives the information on his resignation.
251. See L.435, L.437, L.440, L.443, L.448, L.450; the Trustees Order Books for 4 May and 9 July 1833; letter from R. Bird to Lord Denbigh, 7 May 1833, Warwickshire County Record Office Ref.CR2017/C413/16; undated statement from A. Grenfell to the Trustees, Ref.CR2017/C413/6; letter and certificate from A. Grenfell to J.P. Lee, 9 May 1833, Ref.CR2017/C413/14, 15. The account which follows in the text is derived from L.443 unless otherwise stated.
252. Mistaking the text his form had read and allowing March to stay out of school without enquiry.
253. The actual wording and precisely what was agreed became subjects for dispute; this can be followed in the letters etc. quoted in note 251 above.
254. "... Mr Bird is very popular amongst the younger Boys of the Lower School, and is looked upon as their Champion." (L.423).
255. See L.435, L.437, L.443, passim for details of the newspaper attacks and Bird's reactions.

256. Trustees Order Books, 4 May 1833. Those present were: Denbigh, Howe, Skipwith, and Halford.
257. ibid., 9 July 1833. Those present were: Denbigh, Skipwith, Aylesford, Biddulph, and Lawley.
258. "Mr Bird's literary Deficiencies have been long known to me, and have been often very inconvenient." (L.435). William Gover, op.cit., p.644 (see note 109 above), entered Bird's house in 1835 and records that it had then a low intellectual standing.
259. L.829 records Arnold's seeking a replacement.
260. There were six others: two went on to Headmasterships; three retired; and one died. See the Rugby School Register, pp.XV111, X1X.
261. He was a senior master whose attitude was proving to be, "... a great practical Inconvenience, especially as it is a Fact of which the Boys themselves are fully aware." (L.354).
262. H.J. Buckoll, on the staff 1827-1871; P.W. Powlett, 1828-1840; C.A. Anstey, 1819-1854: see the Rugby School Register, pp.XV111, X1X, and the Trustees Order Books (recording their pensions).
263. Schedule attached to the Act of Parliament, 17 George 111, cap.71, 1777; also quoted by Rouse, op.cit., p.124.

264. Trustees Order Books, 1 August 1797.
265. ibid., 9 July 1833. The Act of Parliament to which they refer is that establishing the revised constitution of the trust - see note 263 above.
266. Indeed the only source of appeal against a Trustees' decision was through the Court of Chancery.
267. See Wymer, op.cit., pp.181-2; Bamford, op.cit., p.145, p.187, for example.
268. L.868 records his anxiety that Rugby, unlike other Public Schools, has not been granted a holiday to mark the birth of the Princess Royal, and he wishes to know how this invidious exception can be overcome. L.897 is partly concerned with his approach to the government for some Royal Foundation for Rugby School.
269. Most of the correspondence which has been traced dates from the first five years of Arnold's Headmastership, so a complete picture is not available. It could be argued that these were years in which he was making his way and this conditioned his attitude to the Trustees. Nevertheless, it was a stormy period for Arnold and he must have been grateful for their support, which was given throughout the 1830 s - though not least because the school was doing well. When the tide turned for him nationally and the school prospered even more, the likelihood of discontent arising was further reduced. And, of course, as

Arnold and individual Trustees began to know each other better, it is likely that consultation took place on a more informal basis with each side developing an awareness of the others reactions to particular circumstances.

270. A trait detected by Newsome, op.cit., p.4.
271. The number of boys at the school during the period 1828 to 1833 is as follows. The census was taken at midsummer apart from 1832 when the figure given is for October: 1828 (the school Arnold inherited) = 136; 1829 = 190; 1830 = 251; 1831 = 297; 1832 = 312; 1833 = 314; see Report Of The Proceedings Respecting Rugby School, Before The Right Hon. Lord Langdale, Master Of The Rolls, With His lordship's Judgement Thereon (Rugby, 1839), pp.31-36. Hereafter, this report is styled: Report of the Proceedings
272. He had at least given up the editorship of the Englishman's Register. Arnold always vehemently denied the charge of indoctrination. Bamford, op.cit., pp.68-9 adduces evidence showing that some members of his Sixth Forms were well aware of his views. During the period 1830-6, apart from his writings, the boys in general could hardly have been unaware of the local hostility to their Headmaster, fuelled by the press attacks. Arnold himself was not circumspect in his behaviour in Rugby: see, for example, his organisation of a celebratory dinner to mark the passing of the Reform Bill, and the row over the newspapers in the Rugby Reading Room, ibid., p.47, pp.73-4, and L.403. It is also possible that the "Liberals versus Conservatives" football match

played by the boys, which ended in a mass brawl the masters had to stop dates from this period and owes something to Arnold's sympathies: see the school magazine, The New Rugbeian (Rugby, 1860), vol.2, no.6, April 1860. Certainly some boys were familiar with his opinions, both through his writings and his conversation, but there is little reason to disbelieve Arnold's denial of indoctrination. There is no evidence to convict him of attempting systematically to influence the boys with his views.

273. See Bamford, Thomas Arnold on Education, p.27, for a discussion on this.
274. Bamford, op.cit., p.189.
275. Bamford, Thomas Arnold on Education, p.27.
276. See Bamford, op.cit., p.103, p.21 and its note on p.215, and p.145, who notes a family connection between the Hawkins, of whom Edward Hawkins, the Provost of Oriel, was one of Arnold's close friends, the Halfords and the Denbighs, though the degree of intimacy is unknown.
- Any such connection has relevance for Arnold's appointment to the Headmastership of Rugby School, which has always been a little mysterious since his application was very late and he was successful in the face of considerable opposition. Hawkins' testimonial predicting that Arnold, if elected, would change the face of Public School education in England is well known as having

greatly influenced the Trustees. Arnold records in L.237, quoted by Stanley, op.cit., pp.67-8, that Halford had mentioned the effect of this statement. Alicia Percival, op.cit., pp.122-5, while acknowledging that this prediction "... has inevitably been repeated in all lives of Arnold and all histories of Education where he is mentioned.", ibid., p.122, investigates the statement at length, questioning whether a) it was of any real help to Arnold in obtaining the post, and b) whether it has been interpreted correctly. But apart from this testimonial, nothing more about the election is known for certain. Bamford, op.cit., p.21, says that apart from Hawkins' letter, at least six of those in competition with Arnold were far superior to him: "... in everything else Arnold was inferior - in experience, in age, in the quality of his scholarship, in the eminence of his referees ...". But since no record of the testimonials has survived, the last point is pure speculation, and the preceding one is debatable. Percival, op.cit., p.122, suggests that given the depressed state of Rugby School, the Trustees' main consideration would be to appoint someone capable of attracting boys. This seems very plausible. Arnold's connection with Buckland's preparatory school at Laleham might have been a factor weighing heavily in his favour. Her speculation receives confirmation from an unpublished letter written by one of the candidates, J.H. Macauley, to his uncle, General A. Macauley, M.P., asking him if he would use his influence on his behalf with the Trustees. In this letter he reports it is said by many that "... a colony of Boys will be after all the greatest recommendation ...": Leicestershire County Record Office Ref.DG.24/977/1.

277. Report of the Proceedings pp.323-4, p.15, p.18, p.19.
There were (from 1830) four forms in the Lower School: the lower Remove, the third, second, and first forms. Throughout these forms numbers were declining (a point discussed later), but Wratislaw's allegations were directed chiefly at forms one and two. He claimed it was the inefficiency of the masters, J. Sale and L. Pons, which had emptied them of boys.
278. Bamford, op.cit., p.142, p.212.
279. ibid., pp.128-42.
280. ibid., p.135, pp.140-1, p.136.
281. ibid., p.135.
282. See for example: Chandos, op.cit., p.252; Honey, op.cit., p.15; J. Gathorne Hardy, op.cit., p.74; Percival, op.cit., p.110, p.223; Newsome, op.cit., p.51.
283. Chandos, op.cit., p.252. D. Leinster Mackay, 'Old School Ties ...', British Journal of Educational Studies (London), February, 1984, vol.32, no.1, pp.78-83, refers to the evidence the case provides for Arnold's ill-treatment of young boys. Bamford, in his book, Rise of the Public Schools, p.158, sees the Wratislaw Case as evidence to threaten "... the very foundations of any claim to headmasterly status."

284. Bamford, op.cit., p.140.
285. The summary can be read in C. Beavan, Report of Cases in Chancery argued in the Rolls Court, ... (London, 1840), vol.1, pp.457-67. The full transcript is in Report of the Proceedings ... (both are cited by Bamford, op.cit., p.220). Although specific references to the transcript are given, the case must be read in its entirety to appreciate fully the arguments used, particularly to assess the rhetoric of the counsel for the Plaintiffs, since this has coloured the presentation of the received account.
286. Bamford, op.cit., p.139.
287. ibid., pp.134-5.
288. Report of the Proceedings ..., p.15, p.19.
289. ibid., p.28.
290. Bamford, op.cit., p.134.
291. Report of the Proceedings ..., pp.324-6.
292. ibid., p.326. This quotation from Langdale's judgement is the portion which immediately precedes that quoted by Bamford. This is the actual verdict: that nothing exists now which did not exist previously, therefore

293. ibid., pp.261-4, for example.
294. Bamford, op.cit., pp.130-31.
295. Report of the Proceedings ..., p.215.
296. His petition is given in full in ibid., pp.330-40.
297. ibid., p.46.
298. ibid., pp.44-7.
299. ibid., p.218.
300. ibid., pp.28-9, p.77.
301. ibid., p.285.
302. ibid.
303. ibid., pp.53-4, pp.75-7.
304. ibid., pp.285-6.
305. ibid., pp.285-7.
306. ibid., pp.287-8.

307. Wratislaw, in part of an affidavit, speaks as if he sees himself as championing the people of Rugby: "... the inhabitants of Rugby have no knowledge of any application by the Trustees ..."; ibid., p.52. Bamford, Rise of the Public Schools, p.200, note 1, speaks of the family as having "... a great deal to do with agitation about the school and local matters until the end of the century."
308. Report of the Proceedings..., p.214.
309. ibid., pp.29-30, pp.247-8.
310. ibid., p.62.
311. ibid., p.78.
312. Harris had been specific about the conversation, adding that Wratislaw had declared, "... that the Trustees would have done well to have gone to the extent of the Bedford Charity Trustees in this respect, or words to that effect.", ibid.
313. ibid., p.214.
314. ibid., my emphasis.
315. ibid., p.227. Bamford, op.cit., p.133, mentions the possibility of a "political" quarrel.

316. Report of the Proceedings ..., p.136.
317. ibid., p.150. Lord Langdale acknowledged that the system was suspect: "Up to this time the Court has never been able to meet the difficulty ... in getting a rule which would prevent the mischief.", ibid., p.151.
318. In fact, Wratislaw himself filed a reply to these on the same morning, ibid., pp.85-7.
319. ibid., pp.249-50.
320. ibid., pp.73-82.
321. Even then not all the reference was included. This whole point is discussed further below.
322. Report of the Proceedings ..., p.150.
323. ibid.
324. ibid., p.242.
325. ibid., p.151.
326. Bamford, op.cit., pp.135-8.
327. He even says in L.728, "... I did not like to meddle with the

Trustees' Counsel;".

328. Report of the Proceedings ..., p.270.
329. ibid., pp.31-43.
330. ibid., p.227.
331. These were contained in the Plaintiffs' Petition, ibid., pp.1-20; their affidavits which supported the Petition were a mere "... echo of the petition before set out.", ibid., p.21.
332. All taken from the Plaintiffs' Petition, ibid., pp.17-18.
333. All taken from Arnold's affidavit in reply to the Plaintiffs' Petition, ibid., pp.34-43.
334. ibid., p.237.
335. All taken from Wratislaw's second affidavit, ibid., pp.50-67.
336. All taken from Gibbs second affidavit, ibid., pp.69-70.
337. See ibid., p.117, p.153, p.295, p.305, for example.
338. Bamford's remark that he must have dreaded the approach of 1839 because "... his name must then appear before a court of law to face charges ... and in his heart he must have felt none

too certain of the outcome.", op.cit., p.127, does not reflect his correspondence. He certainly did not "dread" the Plaintiffs' third complaint as he knew it. The statement is coloured by the writer's subsequent interpretation of the case.

339. Report of the Proceedings..., p.161.
340. ibid., p.239.
341. ibid., p.306.
342. ibid., p.328.
343. Bamford, op.cit., p.132.
344. ibid.
345. Report of the Proceedings ..., p.227.
346. ibid., p.271.
347. Bamford, op.cit., p.138. The boy was a son of Sir Gray Skipwith and the allegation was made by Wratislaw: Report of the Proceedings ..., pp.55-6. Yet in both 1831 and 1837, before the court case, Arnold had admitted sons of Skipwith who were below the age of twelve: see Rugby School Register, p.255, p.289.
348. Bamford, op.cit., p.138.

349. The data is taken from the Rugby School Register, in which entrance and other details are preserved. From 1831, the year the "conspiracy" is alleged to have begun, to 1838, 108 boys below the age of twelve were admitted. The youngest of these was aged six (1831), but eight and nine year olds appear throughout. From 1820 to 1827, 90 boys were admitted, the youngest again being aged six (1823). See also note 382 below. A discussion of the social class of the "local boys" will be found below: they were not lower class children; neither was Wratislaw arguing on behalf of the lower classes.
350. Arbuthnot entered the school in 1832, aged nine; Hughes in 1834, aged eleven. See the Rugby School Register, p.259, p.271.
351. Bamford, op.cit., p.136.
352. ibid.
353. Report of the Proceedings ..., pp.40-41.
354. ibid., pp.230-1.
355. I am obliged to the late N.C. Kittermaster, sometime Librarian of Rugby School, for the information that the Delectus in use at the period was: R. Valpy, Delectus Sententiarum et Historiarum ad usum tironum accommodatus (London, 1800), though there were many reprints and editions throughout the century. Page one begins: "Ego amo; tu mones; Rex regit" etc.

356. Bamford, op.cit., p.137.
357. See note 247 above.
358. Report of the Proceedings ..., p.38.
359. How insuperable the problem of pronunciation would have been, a later source of complaint by the Plaintiffs, is difficult to estimate. All that can be said is that Arnold examined Pons' form regularly and was satisfied.
360. Bamford, op.cit., p.137.
361. See the Rugby School Register. In size of building, Pons' was the smallest of the boarding houses. One of his boarders, C.T. Arnold, later returned to the school as a master.
362. Bamford, op.cit., p.138.
363. Report of the Proceedings ..., pp.28-9.
364. The reminiscences of the Founder, A.J. Arbuthnot, op.cit., p.29, contain a letter from him in which he refers to his tutor, J.P. Lee, "'... we have not been to private tutor yet for Mr Lee has not been well from inflammation (sic) in his eyes ...'".
365. Bamford, op.cit., p.136.

366. ibid., pp.140-41.
367. Stanley, op.cit., p.138.
368. Report of the Proceedings ..., p.88, p.247, p.274.
369. ibid., p.328.
370. Bamford, op.cit., p.139.
371. Report of the Proceedings ..., p.329.
372. Bamford, op.cit., p.140.
373. Report of the Proceedings ..., p.329.
374. ibid., p.249.
375. ibid., p.289.
376. ibid., p.329.
377. ibid.
378. Bamford, op.cit., p.140.
379. ibid.

380. The figures are taken from the Form Lists in the library at Rugby School.
381. Arnold's Diaries (see note 77 above) for the period contain lists of their names, examination marks etc.
382. The figures which have been given for Arnold's Headmastership can be further illustrated by an analysis of the admissions in each age group. The year 1839 is divided: the admissions from August 1839 to 1842 represent the period from the judgement in the Wratislaw Case (five of the boys in this period were from the Gibb and Wratislaw families). The figures in brackets represent the number of boys included in the total whose families resided in Rugby.

	<u>Age: 11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>
1828 (June)	2(1)	0	0	3(3)	0	0
1829	8	6(1)	2(1)	2(2)	4(4)	1(1)
1830	10(1)	6(3)	3(3)	2(2)	2(2)	0
1831	12(1)	2(1)	5(2)	4(4)	1(1)	1(1)
1832	5	5(2)	2(2)	2(2)	0	0
1833	6(1)	1(1)	2(2)	4(4)	0	0
1834	6	2(1)	2(1)	3(3)	0	0
1835	2	1(1)	3(3)	3(1)	0	0
1836	3(1)	7(3)	1(1)	3(2)	0	0
1837	7(1)	2(2)	2	0	0	0
1838	5	3(3)	1(1)	0	0	0
1839	1(1)	1(1)	1(1)	0	0	0
1839 (August)	3	3(2)	0	2(2)	1(1)	1(1)
1840	10(1)	5(4)	2(1)	1(1)	0	0
1841	10(2)	0	1(1)	4(4)	1(1)	0
1842	<u>5(1)</u>	<u>1(1)</u>	<u>1(1)</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1(1)</u>	<u>0</u>
	<u>95(11)</u>	<u>45(26)</u>	<u>28(20)</u>	<u>33(30)</u>	<u>10(10)</u>	<u>3(3)</u>

383. See Honey, op.cit., p.15; Percival, op.cit., p.110, p.223;
 Newsome, op.cit., p.51; Gathorne Hardy, op.cit., p.74;
 Chandos, op.cit., pp.252-3; Bamford, op.cit., p.141.

384. In his affidavit Arnold gave the figures for the Upper and Lower
 Schools and also the numbers in each of the forms in the Lower
 School: see Report of the Proceedings ..., pp.31-40.

Note: The total number of boys at the end of each year are given
 in the following columns:

1. Column A = the total number in the Upper School.
2. Column B = the total number in the Lower School.
3. Column C = the total number in the 3rd form and lower Remove.
4. Column D = the total number in the 1st and 2nd forms.

	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>
1828	120	40	21	19
1829	156	55	34	21
1830	169	107	71	36
1831	197	112	73	39
1832	217	95	55	40
1833	219	95	73	22
1834	207	91	72	19
1835	221	68	56	12
1836	227	53	44	9
1837	237	36	36	0
1838	240	38	36	2

Notes:

- a) Arnold began with 23 boys in the Lower School and 113 in
 the Upper (Summer 1828), these are included in the figures
 for 1828.
- b) The lower Remove was only constituted in 1830.

385. Bamford, op.cit., p.135; though in his Rise of the Public Schools, p.5, he suggests that any publicity might have been good for the school (see note 227 above). The general decline which affected the Public Schools in the 1830 s is mentioned in most educational histories: see, for example, note 225 above, and Gathorne Hardy, op.cit., pp.69-70; Vivian Ogilvie, The English Public School (London, 1957) p.129; R.L. Archer, Secondary Education In The Nineteenth Century (Cambridge, 1937), pp.59-60. The most detailed study, however, will be found in T.W. Bamford, 'The Prosperity of Public Schools, 1801-1850', loc.cit.

386. Bamford, loc.cit., p.90.

387. The total number of boys admitted each year is as follows (the figures are derived from The Rugby School Register):

1828 (from June)	=	42
1829	=	96
1830	=	113
1831	=	106
1832	=	80
1833	=	89
1834	=	70
1835	=	75
1836	=	76
1837	=	78
1838	=	80
1839	=	111
1840	=	121
1841	=	125
1842 (to June)	=	145

388. See note 382 above.

389. The number of twelve year olds entered each year along with the percentage of the total admissions they represent is as follows. Virtually all these boys came from families not resident in Rugby, a trend which applied throughout his predecessor's Headmastership (the figures are derived from The Rugby School Register):

1829	=	15	(15.6%)
1830	=	21	(18.6%)
1831	=	16	(15.1%)
1832	=	14	(17.5%)
1833	=	12	(13.5%)
1834	=	16	(22.8%)
1835	=	12	(16.0%)
1836	=	15	(19.7%)
1837	=	16	(20.5%)
1838	=	9	(11.2%)

390. The number of boys admitted aged twelve and below in the years of decline is as follows:

1832	=	28
1833	=	25
1834	=	29
1835	=	21
1836	=	29
1837	=	27
1838	=	18

391. Report of the Proceedings ..., p.237; see also p.275.

392. See Gathorne Hardy, op.cit., p.36, who quotes Southey's remark.

393. He sent nine year old Matthew Arnold there; Wymer, op.cit., p.139.
394. Report of the Proceedings ..., p.67. Bamford in his 'Public Schools And Social Class, 1801-1850', The British Journal Of Sociology, vol.12 (London, 1961), pp.224-235, when discussing the education of the 50% of the children of the upper classes whose sons were not educated in the Public Schools, observes that the effects of schools like Buckland's "... have been largely overlooked.", loc.cit., p.232.
395. Or even that of older boys. A register of unsuccessful applicants giving the reasons for their rejection would, for any school, be illuminating.
396. Bamford, op.cit., p.141.
397. Newsome, op.cit., p.51.
398. Stanley, op.cit., p.136.
399. See note 382 above.
400. See, for example, Gathorne Hardy, op.cit., p.74; Honey, op.cit., p.15.
401. Particularly from the clergy and the minor landed-gentry. For a detailed survey see 'Public Schools And Social Class, 1801-1850', passim, and for a general account, Bamford, op.cit., pp.128-130.

402. Bamford, op.cit., p.129.
403. ibid. In his 'Public Schools And Social Class, 1801-1850', Bamford defines the "middle-class" as merchants, shopkeepers, traders, and farmers; loc.cit., p.224.
404. These people eventually became known as "sojourners". Bamford discusses this group in his 'Public School Town In The Nineteenth Century', British Journal of Educational Studies, vol.6, no.1, (London, 1957), pp.27-9; he says their sons represented ten of the intake in Arnold's first year, and seven in the second.
405. loc.cit., p.35.
406. Bamford, op.cit., pp.130-31. In theory it always had been, but incidental expenses for all the scholars had grown, ibid., p.130. These were abolished for Foundationers in 1828 (not 1826), see Report of the Proceedings ..., pp.28-9.
407. For the sons of the labouring classes, and even for those of local shopkeepers, farmers, traders, and the like, the "classical" education the school provided would be of little use if they were to pursue the family occupation.
408. As previously noted, Arnold saw the real danger in the Wratishaw Case in reserving the exhibitions for the Foundationers. If they had been made a non-competitive sinecure, there might well have been a greater influx from the town. Throughout the century

the trend towards the national character of the school continued unabated. The need for a school geared to the requirements of the townspeople in accordance with the Founder's original intention was eventually met by the foundation of the Lawrence Sheriff school, administered by the Trustees and financed from the original bequest: see Percival, op.cit., p.171.

409. Bamford, op.cit., p.142.

410. ibid., p.212.

411. Stanley, op.cit., pp.474-5.

412. In fairness to Stanley, he did precede the printed text with a note: "(After speaking of a decision respecting the Foundationers in Rugby School.)", which might have sounded a note of caution. But how was the reader to judge?

GENERAL CONCLUSION

In assessing the results of this examination of aspects of Thomas Arnold's life in the light of the unpublished correspondence, it can be said unequivocally that much new information has emerged from the letters and that this has often significantly affected the interpretations and judgements passed upon particular periods and incidents in his life. In addition, the preliminary studies referred to in the General Introduction (pp.4-5) provided new insights into both the texts of the letters published in numbered series in The Life and Stanley's treatment of the correspondence as a source. The main conclusions arising from these initial studies can be given here.

The investigation of the letters published by Stanley revealed a number of previously unknown facts about the texts printed in his biography. Firstly, it was discovered that these did not all derive from the original manuscripts; transcriptions, which were themselves often partial, provided the source for some of the correspondence he reproduced. Secondly, the fact that many of the published letters, despite frequently displaying formal marks of excision, contained omissions and textual alterations which would not be known to a reader of The Life was proved. Thirdly, many inconsistencies in reproduction, and the various means by which Arnold's words were altered to effect unacknowledged omissions were revealed. And fourthly, it was established that while some of the unacknowledged omissions, especially those in which the text had been altered, were the results of carelessness or reliance upon a transcription, others were undoubtedly acts of intentional concealment. The systematic exposition of all the omissions revealed that of the 163 published letters which could be correlated with an independent source, 47% contained omissions which would be unknown to a reader of The Life.

These were unacknowledged omissions. If the acknowledged omissions were included, then 83% of these letters contained excised material. An assessment of all the omissions showed they could be arranged under five general headings: depersonalisation, the moderation of Arnold's language, his private and family life, school business, and the duplication of material. This is an area which could undoubtedly be developed, particularly if the texts in The Records of those letters Stanley read but did not use, and the abbreviated summaries of the letters which appear in his Notebooks were included. In addition, the extent of Stanley's omissions through reticence, through unawareness, and how much he deliberately suppressed are all points which could be usefully considered.

The cursory treatment afforded to Arnold's boyhood in The Life and Stanley's total disregard of that side of the juvenile correspondence which showed his hero as an unregenerate schoolboy has been discussed in Part One. His main concern was with those aspects of the boy which foreshadowed the mature character. Although a thorough investigation of his editorial methods applied comprehensively to The Life is beyond the scope of this study, some general observations can be made on his biography, and also on the letters as a whole based on the results which have emerged from this investigation and the preliminary studies.

A point which appears clearly from reading the entire correspondence is how closely Arnold's letters mirror his character. There is a simplicity and directness about them which testifies to his innate sincerity. The cast of his mind was not dramatic or metaphysical, a fact which is reflected in the subject-matter and the way in which it is expressed. His temperament was historical and political rather than speculative or poetical; thus the concrete is preferred to the abstract, the practical to the philosophical. A consequence of this, perhaps not

surprisingly, is the reader's awareness of a general lack of subtlety in his mode of expression, which would lend support to those who see in Arnold an inability to appreciate an opponent's point of view. The prevailing tone is one of hope and endurance: there is nothing of self-pity. In his last few years the correspondence suggests a gradual slowing-down. The incisive calligraphy becomes looser, less emphatic. The cheerful vigour and enthusiasm for work begins to be replaced by references to excessive work-loads and anticipations of retirement. The scale of his correspondence in the midst of his numerous avocations is remarkable. It is clear that he looked upon letter-writing as a duty, which explains the systematic nature of so many of them; though it could be speculated that the regular letters to his closest friends also fulfilled a psychological need, in that they provided an outlet for the unreserved expression of his hopes and fears which could not be found at Rugby. To his particular friends, Arnold's letters are often regular accounts of all that has passed since their last contact. A different spirit can at times be discerned in the contents of the letters to this group which perhaps gives an insight into the nature of their relationships. For example, to Coleridge and Whateley there is a combination of intimacy and deference; Hawkins is frequently applied to as the judicious adviser; with Cornish he is often at his most light-hearted; with Bunsen he is open and in full-sympathy. And in addition to these names, the warm and intimate friendship which the Pasley correspondence reveals shows that he too must be ranked among Arnold's closest friends. It is also worth stating that in the many hundreds of letters examined no evidence of any "skeletons" has been found.

Stanley's relationship to Arnold, the "almost filial" standpoint from which he was writing has been discussed in Part One. His portrait

of Arnold is that of the great Headmaster fighting against evil. The emphasis is on Arnold's liberalism and uncompromising moral earnestness; the general tone is adulatory. Wide-ranging though his influential biography has been, it does not, as frequently remarked, provide a complete picture of Arnold because the effect is achieved by understating other aspects of his life. It is one-sided, for example, because Stanley knew little about the realities of school-life. He was not concerned with giving an account of the day-to-day running of the school, nor did he wish to dwell upon the disciplinary troubles which beset Arnold to the end of his Headmastership, even in his own house. There is no doubt that he played down the controversial aspects of Arnold's career and personality; his swift passage over the period of Arnold's religious doubts is a particular example of this. There is little in the way of anecdote and incident given in The Life. Arnold's private and family life are treated superficially. Stanley does not attempt to judge, hence the letters are given mainly without comment. The criticisms he does make are not prominent; they are understated and do not affect the eulogistic tone of the book as a whole and they can easily be overlooked by the general reader. On the other hand, Stanley acknowledged that there were aspects of the correspondence he felt obliged to omit and the limitations inherent in his treatment are foreshadowed by the general disclaimer included in his preface, which could embrace many of the preceding reservations. In many cases, the decision to exclude would have been a matter of delicacy since to include some of the most vivid, illustrative material would inevitably have introduced personalities. Offence could have been caused or privacy invaded. How this affects the evaluation of The Life as a work of biography is a separate issue. Here it can be said that many of the omissions in the

published texts revealed by the preliminary studies reflected the areas of criticism just mentioned. Had Stanley felt free to publish this material, the reader's assessment of Arnold would often have been affected. Similarly, his decision to omit or play down certain areas would also explain the exclusion of some letters to which it is known he had access. Examples from two of these categories illustrate how Stanley underplayed aspects of Arnold's character.

It has been shown in Part One how Stanley's depiction of Arnold's schooldays was one-sided. In his portrayal he chose from the outset to emphasise the serious, earnest side of Arnold's nature to the exclusion of the lighter, more "animal" part of his character, although this aspect can be found throughout the correspondence. A consequence of this is that the picture of Arnold the man becomes distorted. The essential vigour and boisterousness, which is a feature of many of the letters, is to a great extent suppressed. For example, the earnest, young Arnold of The Life is the selfsame youth who jokes with his aunt about turning the family's privy into a summer-house (L.36), and who regales his sister Frances with a minute account of his brother's preference, when in Spain, for defecating in the street (L.57). The same young man was frequently "... under the influence of the tender passion" (L.58). The stern Headmaster of Rugby School is the same person who is extremely fond of cricket (L.515, L.531); who loves "sparring and spearing" with Bonamy Price; who regrets he cannot take the boys out "skirmishing" with him, and that so many of his assistants do not share his fondness for "sheer play" for they fear they are susceptible to colds after the age of twenty-five (L.342)! The serious-minded man who condemned the reading of novels (though he expected the Rugby boys to understand his regular allusions in class to the standard works of

the genre) is found, aged forty-two, reading "Pickwick" to his wife in a coaching inn to recreate their honeymoon (L.639). Examples from the correspondence could be multiplied, but the point is they represent an aspect of Arnold not delineated with sufficient force in The Life, the more human, colourful side of his personality.

Another feature which pervades the letters but which is the subject of regular excision by Stanley is the vehemence of Arnold's language, a trait which was with him from an early age. This is part of his attempt to minimise the controversial side of Arnold's life and character. For instance, he omits all reference to his writing political articles while still an undergraduate. He does not fully bring-out the extent and bitterness of the public controversies in which he was engaged in the 1830's. And he disguises the fact that there were serious disorders in the school towards the end of his Headmastership. This reticence is seen most graphically in Stanley's treatment of Arnold's struggle with the Tractarians. Because he felt Arnold had been uncharitable, that he had misunderstood Newman's real character, Stanley is uncomfortable in writing about the violent passions which were aroused. He is faithful to Arnold's position, but his treatment of his attitude is emollient. The virulent language of the "Oxford Malignants" article of 1836 is described as a "temporary production"; and in his general discussion of Arnold's remarks about the Newmanites he endeavours to establish that Arnold directed his wrath at principles and not individuals. While it is true that Arnold did not usually adopt an ad hominem tone in his criticisms on any subject, the extant correspondence shows that Newman was the great exception. More vituperative language than that used in the "Malignants" article can be found in his letters, and all applied personally to Newman. The reader of The Life (or the other biographies) knows nothing of this because

Stanley either excised or rewrote such descriptions of Newman which implied he was the Devil's Imp and a jackal (L.597), a knave (L.565), and an impostor who deserved hanging (L.919). And on this topic, more prominence needs to be given to how deeply Arnold had been stung in 1833 by Newman's apparently guileless query of whether Arnold actually was a Christian (L.458)! On grounds of taste alone, it might not be surprising that Stanley should exclude such language, but there can be no doubt that it gives a much more accurate insight into Arnold's character and feelings than his suggestion that the personal animus of the article was an extraordinary manifestation.

It was to remedy some of the defects in Stanley's account that the other biographies which have been considered in this study were written. Frequently drawing upon unpublished material, they aimed to give a more balanced picture of Arnold or to explore in detail particular areas of his work, the emphasis usually being placed on his years at Rugby School. Not only has the unpublished correspondence revealed much information which adds to the received accounts of Arnold's life and character, it has also provided a means by which the accuracy and judgements of aspects of the work of these later writers can be critically evaluated. The results of this exercise have been displayed in Parts One and Two, where the detailed discussion of specific points and the ways in which the letters modify the received biographical accounts are displayed. Here, a summary of the principal results and conclusions which have emerged from this investigation can be given.

In Part One, the unpublished letters from Arnold's schooldays have been shown to be the principal source for the record of his boyhood. In the case of Warminster School they have proved of particular significance, for they not only confute the received interpretation of the nature of that establishment and challenge the majority view of Arnold's

character during his formative years there, but they allow a much fuller and more accurate picture of both Arnold and the school to emerge than heretofore. It has been shown that Wymer, the principal biographer of this period, seriously misunderstood the nature of the institution in which Thomas had been placed: it was certainly no rustic academy to which he had been sent. Bamford's depreciative remarks upon the young Arnold's character are hardly supported by an impartial assessment of the evidence: the boy was no rebellious eccentric. And the circumstances of his removal to Winchester College are capable of explanation on grounds other than that he had exhausted the course of instruction that Warminster could provide, or that his character rendered him unmanageable. The examination of the correspondence from these years has shown that, of the biographers, Whitridge's verdict on the eleven year old boy comes closest to the truth: that he was neither genius nor oddity, merely "a perfectly normal little boy."

The letters from Winchester College have also proved to be of significance in reassessing the biographical accounts. They have provided details of the transient but intense friendship that existed between Arnold and Charles Lipscomb, details which give so fascinating a glimpse into the young Arnold's emotions. Likewise the letters have revealed the extraordinary effort he made to advance his position in the school during his first year. Apart from additions to the factual record, however, the general significance of the unpublished Winchester correspondence lies chiefly, perhaps, in the evidence it provides for the existence of characteristics which were to become features of the mature man: his resolution, tenacity, passion, and a streak of impatience.

In considering the biographical treatment of his schooldays generally, the extant letters have shown that many of the judgements which have been

passed on this period are, if not entirely erroneous, then in need of considerable qualification. It has been demonstrated that a reader of the principal biographies must constantly question the accuracy of the representation being offered, and inquire to what extent it is founded upon evidence rather than conjecture. The art of biography is, of course, more than the mere recital of evidence: facts have to be weighed and interpreted. While no selection can account for everything, it is nevertheless clear that many of the pictures his biographers have created bear little relation to the portrait presented by the correspondence as a whole. It is easy enough to go through his letters isolating extracts to lend authority to a particular point of view, but this has frequently led to a misrepresentation of the evidence. For example, it is true that the young Arnold had serious interests, but superciliousness and conceit are not their inevitable concomitants. It has been shown that the distortion of his schoolboy character has arisen from incautious speculation, itself often the result of relying upon partial, detached quotations from the letters. With the exception of Whitridge, the biographers' knowledge of what the schoolboy was to become has frequently coloured their presentation of him. The portrait which emerges from the extant correspondence is not that of a freak, but rather of an enthusiastic boy who took seriously both his work and his play - and it is worth emphasising that there is far more space devoted to "play" in the letters than work. Perhaps the chief conclusion to emerge from these letters is that a comprehensive understanding of Arnold the schoolboy can only come from reading the entire correspondence.

The letters which have survived from Arnold's undergraduate

days have proved particularly important in that they have provided a basis for revealing some significant errors of fact and interpretation in the published accounts of his life. The most striking errors of fact would seem to be the pejorative views of his failure to enter New College, and his election to an Oriel Fellowship. While among the more noticeable errors of interpretation are the questioning (if not, in one case, the belittling) of his intellectual ability both at matriculation and before his Fellowship, and the portrayal of his character as one-sided, either as scholarly recluse or prude. At the same time, the correspondence has been a source of much new information both about Arnold the student and about university life in nineteenth century Oxford. Perhaps neither the extent to which he "relaxed" during his undergraduate years, nor the fluidity of his outlook towards ordination and a career after graduation has been sufficiently emphasised in the biographies. The letters have shown how early he was engaged in literary activities, and provide the new information that he, Coleridge, and Keble were planning with J.H. Parker the publication of a journal, an "Oxford Review". Much new light on the academic routine of an undergraduate of the period has been shed and the extent of his coaching activities during his Fellowship years has been evaluated more accurately. This, with the details of the course of reading which Arnold undertook for the honours Schools, has significance beyond the study of Arnold's life. The information which is contained in these letters is an important and untapped source for a neglected part of Oxford history, and includes insights of particular historical interest into the origins of that famous institution, the Oxford Union.

As with the earlier periods, unpublished correspondence from the

years Arnold spent at Laleham has provided new biographical information, clarification of several factual points, and correction of matters of interpretation arising from the biographies. On the subject of Arnold's religious "doubts", the letters have not only provided a complete chronology of the affair, but also revealed the precise nature of his misgivings and their effect upon him. To a reader of the biographies much of the detail revealed by the letters here is new, particularly the fact that his intended marriage was threatened by them, and the extent to which they hindered his capacity for advancement. Similarly, the correspondence has clarified a number of factual points surrounding his ordination to the Diaconate, in particular exposing as false the notion that he was ordained to that office in a spirit of compromise. Finally, it has been shown that Stanley deliberately minimised the importance of Arnold's religious "doubts" in his treatment of the subject in The Life, and that, with the exception of Whitridge, the depth of this crisis has been underestimated by all his biographers.

The examination of the correspondence which relates to Arnold's years at Laleham from the standpoint of his financial position has provided fresh insights into his time there. The account which the letters have provided of the management of his teaching partnership with Buckland has revealed Arnold's poor financial situation, both before and after his partnership, and its significance in relation to his writing activities and interest in other positions. Another point which has been established is the most probable reason for his separation from Buckland: Arnold preferred to teach youths rather than boys, and the severance of their union only confirmed a situation which had applied for some years. New biographical information on the literary work in which he engaged has been found, and also the existence of a pamphlet hitherto unrecorded in

the list of his published writings. On the subject of his career, evidence from the letters contests the view that when he left Oxford he had turned to teaching as a last resort; rather it shows that he had always intended teaching to be a part of his life. Detailed information on the other posts he considered during these years has been found, including the fact that he was offered the position of Vice-Principal at St. Alban Hall under Whateley. Finally the correspondence has shown that he might well have obtained the Professorship at the London University if the Rugby vacancy had not arisen, and that it was the economic motive which was the main reason for his applying for the Headmastership of Rugby School. Arnold would have preferred to remain at Laleham and hold the Professorship if the financial situation had been different.

In Part Two, the information provided by the unpublished correspondence on selected themes from the Rugby years - incidents of indiscipline at the school; Arnold's relations with his Trustees; and the Chancery Court Case of 1839 - has provided much new evidence on the realities of life at the school and has often considerably affected the biographical interpretation of these topics. Full appreciation of the extent to which the received version of such events as the March affair or the Wratishaw Case have been qualified by the application of new evidence can only be gained by reading the accounts in Part Two; here just the principal results are displayed.

In the case of the flogging of the boy March, with its pejorative implications for Arnold's character, methods, and judgement, the letters have been shown to constitute a major new source of information. The detailed investigation of them has resulted in each point in the received account being rejected or explained in a way which acquits

Arnold of, or renders unproven, the accusations made against him. The inadequacy of the evidence for the assertion that he was a cruel, immoderate wielder of the birch has been demonstrated. Indeed on the topic of corporal punishment in general, an examination of the new information on the subject suggests that his policy might well have led to a reduction in the amount of flogging. New evidence on incidents of expulsion has been found which questions the view that Arnold often acted hastily and illogically, particularly when members of the Sixth Form were involved in a disturbance. The correspondence has also shown clearly that disciplinary problems beset the school throughout his Headmastership, and that there is nothing to suggest he transformed it in this respect. The unpublished revelations about the disorders in Arnold's own house (with their implications for his own culpability), the real reason for his proposal to resign responsibility for it, and his true feelings about its management, all testify to this. Arnold's relations with his Sixth Form have also been the subject of new information, from which the conclusion emerges that his implicit confidence in their ability to uphold discipline was frequently maintained in the face of evidence to the contrary. Apart from providing new information, therefore, the real value of the unpublished correspondence has been shown to lie in its capacity to provide a basis for evaluating the received version of specific incidents. The conclusion which emerges here is just how vulnerable so much of the evidence on which a disparaging interpretation of Arnold's character and conduct has been based really is.

The second topic to which the letters have been applied is Arnold's relations with his Trustees. In the face of conflicting biographical assessments, they have provided a means of clarifying that relationship

and once again corrected the received accounts. The results of the examination challenge the biographical tendency to view Arnold in an excessively autocratic light in his dealings with the Trustees. The new evidence has revealed a respectful tone in his transactions with them, and shown that they were involved in a variety of matters affecting the management of the school in which Arnold was anxious to have their support. There is no basis in the unpublished correspondence for the notion that they were mere ciphers. On the subject of his controversial writings, the evidence shows that private remonstrations, which he answered in a most conciliatory manner, were made to him years before the Howe correspondence, and that undue emphasis has been given to that incident in assessing his attitude to the Trustees. The affair appears to have been wholly exceptional. The impression received from the letters is that their relationship was based on mutual respect and that the Trustees were neither frightened of him, nor powerless, nor unwilling to intervene; rather that they were open-minded and ultimately convinced by the effect of his management of the school. Of the biographers, Wymer's view of the relationship has been found to come closest to the picture disclosed by the new evidence.

The third topic, the re-examination of the Wratislaw Case, has produced particularly significant results. The "astonishing revelations" of the received account, which created a picture of Arnold as a cruel, callous conspirator who was prepared to disobey the law of the land, have been considerably qualified. Most significantly, it has been revealed that Arnold had no opportunity to defend himself against the detailed allegations which were made against him, and that the received view of the case is one-sided in that it is based on the virtually uncontradicted assertions of the prosecution. Examination of each

point in this version has led either to the complete rejection of, or to considerable doubt being cast upon the validity of its disparaging revelations and pejorative inferences. And from the investigation, an explanation of the decline in the numbers of the boys in the Lower School at Rugby has emerged which refutes the theory that Arnold conspired to destroy that part of the establishment. The evidence shows that while Arnold did attempt to dissuade parents from sending boys below the age of twelve to the school - with the emphasis being on the children of non-residents - it was not for some of the reasons which have previously been suggested. They were not discouraged because he wished to eradicate the junior forms, nor because he disliked young boys, nor for the purpose of preventing the lower classes from entering, but rather because he feared the moral risk to which such children might be exposed. And it has been disclosed that the effect of his opinion regarding their admission has to be measured against the fact that an increasing number of boys aged thirteen and below were apparently coming to the school in less need of the kind of elementary instruction which the Lower School provided.

The application of unpublished material to the biographical record has, on account of the nature of this study, been more wide-ranging for Arnold's pre-Rugby years than for his Headmastership of Rugby School, where the emphasis has been placed largely on the re-examination of particular, often controversial events. Despite this, the results of testing the validity of specific facts and deductions in the received accounts are capable of generalisation. From them a conclusion emerges which challenges one aspect at least of what can be called the reductive view of Arnold and his work.

Although there was some nineteenth century criticism of the "legend"

which arose following the publication of The Life and Tom Brown's Schooldays of Arnold the educator, moralist, and great reformer of the Public Schools, the real reaction against his achievements and reputation has come in this century. Reference to the "Arnold myth" has been commonplace. The demolition work begun by Lytton Strachey in his Eminent Victorians and by Bertrand Russell in Education and the Good Life has been continued most notably by T.W. Bamford in the nineteen-sixties; and indeed the very latest study of the period, John Chandos' Boys Together, adopts a generally denigrating tone in its treatment of Arnold. In short, the "legend" has been repeatedly scrutinised and reappraised to discover what Arnold "really" accomplished. Because the present study has been selective in its treatment of Arnold's life, detailed consideration of the "Arnold myth", of the reality behind the tradition, is beyond its scope. Therefore it has not been necessary to continue the work of exposing, for example, the sweeping generalisations and distorted half-truths which pervade Strachey's assessment of Arnold's character. Likewise, such questions as whether Bertrand Russell's judgement, that the fruit of Arnold's system was the production of a class of empire-builders, is accurate; or whether Arnold did found the games' cult, or really "reform" the Public Schools fall beyond its limits. Aspects of Bamford's work, however, have fallen within its purview.

He has been perhaps the most outspoken critic of Arnold and his time at Rugby. His views have been particularly influential because they have frequently been founded on the disclosure of impressive, new evidence which appeared to give powerful support to his contentions. In his biography, the unflattering picture he draws of Arnold the schoolboy and youth, with its disparaging reference to his election to

an Oriel Fellowship, indeed the generally depreciatory assessment of his pre-Rugby years, lays the foundations for the dramatic and unsavoury revelations of the March and Wratislaw affairs. Here, apparently incontrovertible facts revealed a side of Arnold's character unknown to the traditional accounts. To say that the disclosures cast doubt on Arnold's fitness to be called a Christian gentleman (Bamford even suggested they questioned his claim to Headmasterly status) and demanded a reassessment of his character is an understatement. Yet, by an accident of history, unpublished letters have survived which provide important, new evidence relating directly to these controversial incidents; and re-examination of other topics has also yielded fresh information. It might have been that this new material confirmed the pejorative assertions which had been made - but this was not so. The general conclusion which emerges from an impartial examination of this evidence is that in some of the most important areas on which Bamford's reductive view is based, the conclusions which have been drawn are either untenable or unproven. In these respects, therefore, it is the traditional view of Arnold's character which has been reasserted.

The extent of the unpublished correspondence can be seen from the analysis of all the letters which is provided by Appendix One. While it is not claimed that those which have not been used in this study would, when applied to the biographical record, produce equally significant results, this body of material does represent a source of information which would repay study. There still remain specific incidents and details of Arnold's life in which the received accounts require correction and clarification. For example, Arnold was not offered a stall in Bristol Cathedral with a living attached in 1831;

he was offered a living in Somerset. Nor was he ever in a quandary about whether his conscience would allow him to hold such a Cure on a non-residentiary basis. He undertook the publication of the Englishman's Register fully aware of its likely fate and with the financial loss predetermined. There is dramatic, new evidence concerning the last-minute cancellation of his daughter Jane's marriage to one of the masters, G.L. Cotton, which reveals that it was Arnold not Cotton who terminated the event, and he did so because Cotton's mother was a domineering tyrant ("so bad and so coarse") and Cotton himself ("cold and weak, unable to resist [her] violence"). The traumatic nature of this event and its relationship to Arnold's death cannot be underestimated. In addition to these particular details, there are whole areas in which the unpublished correspondence provides a fuller picture of events. The letters contain much more information than can be found in The Life on such subjects as his campaign to include a compulsory theological examination as part of the London University's degrees in arts; the difficulties surrounding his acceptance of the Professorship of Modern History at Oxford; and his joint editorship of the Englishman's Register. Another element which Stanley largely excluded from The Life was the numerous letters he wrote in connection with his edition of Thucydides and his History of Rome. The painstaking thoroughness displayed by Arnold in acquiring information, as well as the practical difficulties involved, are themes which could be developed. This is particularly the case in relation to his edition of Thucydides, where his negotiations with the Admiralty, the Ordnance Surveyors, and officers of ships employed in hydrographical and topographical work, for the purpose of obtaining maps embodying the results of the latest surveys, provide a fascinating insight both into

his desire to elucidate the historical and geographical aspects of the text for the "modern" reader, and the difficulties of such classical research at that period. Similarly, the comprehensive series of letters to his publisher, J. Parker, give an insight into some of the methods and problems of preparing a classical text for the press in the early nineteenth century. Finally, an aspect of the Laleham period not dealt with in this study is that concerning his tutorial work with his pupils and its relation to his methods at Rugby. The authors he taught, the books he used, the identities of his pupils, his views on discipline and the moral development of his charges are all topics which could be developed from the letters.

In conclusion, therefore, this study of aspects of Arnold's life in the light of the unpublished correspondence has shown that the definitive account of his pre-Rugby years has yet to be written, and that some significant, controversial incidents in his later career require reassessment. Almost no area of Arnold's life is untouched by the unpublished letters, and their number and value is such that a comprehensive edition of his correspondence, as the necessary precursor of a new and more accurate Life, seems clearly to be a worthwhile undertaking.

APPENDIX ONE

A CHRONOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

OF THE

CORRESPONDENCE

INTRODUCTION

The 971 letters which have been traced are listed in chronological order with details given under six headings (see also the Addenda at the end of the listing):

1. LETTER NO.

This is the List Number (L.) which is used to refer to a letter throughout the thesis.

- a. An asterisk (*) attached to a List Number signifies that the letter is one which appears in Stanley's numbered series of letters in The Life.

2. CORRESPONDENT

This gives the name of the recipient of the letter.

- a. Unknown correspondents are indicated thus, "?".
- b. Where a recipient's name, or any portion of it, has been assigned, that portion is placed in brackets thus, "(...)".

3/4. YEAR AND DAY

These columns give the date on which the letter was written.

- a. Any portion which has been assigned is given in brackets thus, "(...)".
- b. A question mark, "?", means that particular element is unknown.

5. EXTANT SOURCE

The form in which a letter exists is indicated by one of the following letters:

- A = Original Autograph.
- B = Printed Copy.
- C = Ms or Typed Copy.
- D = The Records (Ms Copy).

- a. "The Records" as the sole or partial source.
 - 1) When "D" appears on its own, this means that The Records are the only source for a letter (or a substantial fragment of one).
 - 2) If The Records are the only source for a text published in The Life, and the text in The Records coincides with that printed in The Life, then the reference given in this column is, for the researcher's convenience, shown as "B" not "D".
 - 3) When one portion of a letter's text exists in The Records and a different portion in The Life; or when differences exist between the text in The Life and that transcribed in The Records, then both "B" and "D" will appear in this column since reference to two sources is necessary.

6. PRESENT LOCATION

The present location of the extant source is given by means of a number, save where that source is The Records, when the letter "D" is given.

- a. Since the extant source of some letters is in two forms, there will sometimes be two references in this column. Usually, such a reference will be "D & 1", meaning "The Records" (D) and "The Life" (1).

b. The Key to the numbers used is as follows (further reference details regarding manuscript sources will be found in section A of the Bibliography).

- 1) Where the location is a printed book, it is listed "Book:", followed by the author, title, and date of publication.
- 2) Where the location is a "Bookseller's/Autograph Dealer's Catalogue", a magazine, or newspaper, the details will be found in the Bibliography.

The Key

- | | | |
|----|---|-----------------------------------|
| 0 | = | <u>The Records</u> |
| 1 | = | <u>The Life</u> |
| 2 | = | Rugby School. |
| 3 | = | Brotherton Library, Leeds. |
| 4 | = | Bodleian Library. |
| 5 | = | Winchester College. |
| 6 | = | The British Library. |
| 7 | = | Harrow School. |
| 8 | = | Cornell University, U.S.A. |
| 9 | = | The Wordsworth Library, Grasmere. |
| 10 | = | Balliol College, Oxford. |
| 11 | = | Keble College, Oxford. |
| 12 | = | Harvard University, U.S.A. |
| 13 | = | National Library of Scotland. |
| 14 | = | Pusey House, Oxford. |
| 15 | = | Gloucestershire Record Office. |

- 16 = Book: W.Jardine, Memoir of H.E.Strickland. 1858
- 17 = Warwickshire County Record Office.
- 18 = Oriel College, Oxford.
- 19 = Trinity College, Dublin.
- 20 = Private Source.
- 21 = Bookseller's/Autograph Dealer's Catalogue.
- 22 = Book: A.Whitridge, Dr Arnold of Rugby. 1928.
- 23 = Yale University, U.S.A.
- 24 = Shrewsbury School.
- 25 = The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.
- 26 = University College London.
- 27 = Trinity College, Cambridge.
- 28 = Mrs.A.E.Gell,
- 29 = The University of Texas, U.S.A.
- 30 = The Northampton Mercury (newspaper).
- 31 = Kingston Upon Hull City Record Office.
- 32 = Lambeth Palace Library, London.
- 33 = The Leaflet (magazine).
- 34 = The National Library of Wales.
- 35 = Uniwersytet Jagiellonska, Poland.
- 36 = Book: K.Lake (ed.), Memorials of William Charles Lake. 1901.
- 37 = Book: W.E.Oswell, William Cotton Oswell. 1900.
- 38 = Dr.Williams's Library, London.
- 39 = New York University, U.S.A.
- 40 = Lexington Theological Seminary, U.S.A.
- 41 = Public Record Office,
- 42 = King Edward's School, Birmingham.
- 43 = Scottish Record Office.

- 44 = University of California, U.S.A.
45 = Lincolnshire County Record Office.
46 = University of Hull.
47 = Book: A.J.Arbutnot, Memories of Rugby and India. 1910.
48 = Cambridge University Library.
49 = Book: G.T.Fox, A Memoir of the Rev Henry Watson Fox. 1850.
50 = Book: J.B.Booth, Bits of Character ... 1936.
51 = Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.
52 = Christ Church College, Oxford.
53 = The Meteor (Rugby School magazine).

ADDENDA

After the chronological listing of the correspondence will be found two additions to the List Numbers.

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
1	(J.T. Lawes)	(1803)	30 Jan	A	5
2	S. Delafield	(1803)	? (Sept)	A	5
3	S. Delafield	1804	19 Feb	A	5
4	S. Delafield	(1804)	18 Apr	A	5
5	S. Delafield	1804	11 May	A	5
6	S. Delafield	1804	28 Aug	A	5
7	S. Delafield	1804	8 Sept	A	5
8	S. Delafield	1805	12 Mar	A	5
9	S. Delafield	1805	6 May	A	5
10	S. Delafield	1806	3 Mar	A	5
11	S. Delafield	1806	13 May	A	5
12	S. Delafield	(1806)	9 Sept	A	5
13	Martha Arnold	1806	18 Nov	A	5
14	Martha Arnold	1807	17 Feb	A	5
15	(Lydia Arnold)	1807	26 Feb	A	5
16	S. Delafield	1807	17 Mar	A	5
17	S. Delafield	1807	23 Apr	A	5
18	S. Delafield	1807	1 June	A	5
19	J.T. Lawes	1807	26 Dec	A	5
20	S. Delafield	1808	13 Feb	A	5
21	Lydia Arnold	1808	1 Apr	A	5
22	S. Delafield	1808	16 June	A	5
23	Martha Arnold	1808	3 July	A	5
24	Frances Arnold	1809	15 Feb	A	5
25	S. Delafield	1809	4 Mar	A	5
26	S. Delafield	1809	29 Mar	A	5
27	S. Delafield	1809	22 Apr	A	5
28	S. Delafield	1809	7 June	A	5
29	S. Delafield	1809	18 June	A	5
30	S. Delafield	1809	23 June	A	5
31	S. Delafield	1809	30 Sept	A	5
32	S. Delafield	1809	21 Nov	A	5
33	Susanna Arnold	1810	30 Sept	A	3
34	S. Delafield	1810	28 Nov	A	5
35	S. Delafield	1811	22 Mar	A	3
36	S. Delafield	1811	15 May	A	3
37	S. Delafield	1811	20 June	A	3
38	S. Delafield	1811	10 Oct	A	3
39	S. Delafield	1811	8 Dec	A	3

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
40	S. Delafield	1812	13 Feb	A	3
41	S. Delafield	1812	3 Apr	A	3
42	S. Delafield	1812	19 Apr	A	3
43	Frances Arnold	1812	13 May	A	3
44	S. Delafield	1812	15 May	A	3
45	S. Delafield	1812	9 June	A	3
46	S. Delafield	1812	6 July	A	3
47	S. Delafield	1812	24 July	A	3
48	S. Delafield	1812	3 Oct	A	3
49	S. Delafield	1812	19 Nov	A	3
50	S. Delafield	1812	22 Dec	A	3
51	S. Delafield	1813	19 Jan	A	3
52	S. Delafield	1813	25 Mar	A	3
53	S. Delafield	1813	10 July	A	3
54	S. Delafield	1813	23 Nov	A	3
55	S. Delafield	1813	10 Dec	A	3
56	S. Delafield	1814	11 Jan	A	3
57	Frances Arnold	1814	8 Feb	A	4
58	S. Delafield	1814	14 Feb	A	3
59	Frances Arnold	1814	4 Apr	A	4
60	S. Delafield	1814	30 Apr	A	3
61	S. Delafield	1814	24 May	A	3
62	Susanna Arnold	1814	19 June	A	3
63	S. Delafield	1814	22 June	A	3
64	S. Delafield	1814	11 Aug	A	3
65	Frances Arnold	1814	5 Sept	A	4
66	T.T. Penrose	1815	31 Mar	A	3
67	G. Cornish	1815	16 July	A	3
68	Martha Arnold	1815	1 Aug	B	22
69	Susanna Arnold	1815	14 Nov	A	3
70	Frances Arnold	1815	7 Dec	A	3
71	Susanna Arnold	1816	5 June	A	3
72	G. Cornish	1816	26 July	A	3
73	Susanna Arnold	1817	6 May	A	3
74*	J.T. Coleridge	1817	28 May	A	4
75	J.T. Coleridge	1817	14 Aug	A	4
76	J.T. Coleridge	1817	21 Oct	A	4
77	S. Delafield	1817	12 Nov	A	3
78	J.T. Coleridge	1818	17 Feb	A	4

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
79	S. Delafield	1818	19 Feb	A	3
80	Susanna Arnold	1818	5 Sep	A	9
81	J.T. Coleridge	1818	29 Dec	A	4
82	J.T. Coleridge	1819	31 Jan	A	4
83	J.T. Coleridge	1819	5 Feb	A	4
84	J.T. Coleridge	1819	16 Mar	A	4
85	J.T. Coleridge	1819	11 June	A	4
86	J.T. Coleridge	1819	7 July	A	4
87	G. Cornish	1819	14 July	A	3
88	H. Jenkyns	1819	19 July	A	10
89	G. Cornish	1819	27 Aug	A	3
90	E. Hawkins	1819	3 Sep	A	3
91*	G. Cornish	1819	20 Sep	A	3
92	J.T. Coleridge	1819	9 Oct	A	4
93*	F.C. Blackstone	1819	28 Oct	A	4
94*	J. Tucker	1819	20 Nov	B	1
95*	J.T. Coleridge	1819	29 Nov	A	4
96	J.T. Coleridge	1819	5 Dec	A	4
97	F.C. Blackstone	(1819)	9 Dec	A	4
98*	G. Cornish	1820	3 Jan	A	3
99	J.T. Coleridge	1820	8 Feb	A	4
100*	G. Cornish	1820	23 Feb	A	3
101	J.T. Coleridge	1820	28 Apr	A	4
102	J. Keble	1820	22 May	A	11
103	J.T. Coleridge	1820	23 May	A	4
104	J.T. Coleridge	1820	19 June	A	4
105	S. Delafield	1820	27 July	A	3
106	Susanna Arnold	1820	4 Aug	A	3
107	H. Jenkyns	1820	25 Sep	A	10
108	J.T. Coleridge	1820	9 Oct	A	4
109	F.C. Blackstone	1820	27 Oct	A	4
110	J.T. Coleridge	1820	5 Dec	A	4
111*	G. Cornish	1820	6 Dec	B	1
112	G. Cornish	1821	3 Feb	A	3
113	J.T. Coleridge	1821	1 Mar	A	4
114	H. Jenkyns	1821	4 Mar	A	10
115*	J.T. Coleridge	1821	25 Apr	A	4
116	J.T. Coleridge	1821	21 May	A	4
117	H. Jenkyns	1821	16 July	A	10

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
118	G. Cornish	1821	4 Sept	A	3
119	J.T. Coleridge	1821	17 Oct	A	4
120	J.T. Coleridge	(1821)	(29 Oct)	A	4
121	F.C. Blackstone	1821	31 Oct	A	4
122	J.T. Coleridge	1821	29 Nov	A	4
123	J.T. Coleridge	1821	18 Dec	A	4
124	J.T. Coleridge	1821	30 Dec	A	4
125	J.T. Coleridge	1822	2 Jan	A	4
126	G. Cornish	1822	3 Jan	A	3
127	F.C. Blackstone	1822	13 Apr	A	4
128	F.C. Blackstone	1822	1 May	A	4
129	J.T. Coleridge	1822	7 May	A	4
130	J.T. Coleridge	1822	24 Aug	A	4
131*	J. Tucker	1822	21 Oct	B	1
132	J.T. Coleridge	1822	23 Oct	A	4
133	F.C. Blackstone	1822	24 Oct	A	4
134	J.T. Coleridge	1822	12 Dec	A	4
135	J. Keble	1822	24 Dec	A	11
136	H. Jenkyns	1823	31 Jan	A	10
137*	J.T. Coleridge	1823	1 Mar	A	4
138	G. Cornish	1823	4 Apr	A	3
139	J.T. Coleridge	1823	5 June	A	4
140	F.C. Blackstone	1823	6 June	A	4
141	F.C. Blackstone	1823	30 June	A	4
142	Mary Arnold	1823	7 July	A	3
143	J.T. Coleridge	1823	12 Oct	A	4
144	J.T. Coleridge	1823	16 Nov	A	4
145	G. Cornish	1823	26 Dec	A	3
146	Mary Arnold	1823	29 Dec	A	3
147	Mary Arnold	1824	3 Jan	A	3
148	F.C. Blackstone	1824	7 Feb	A	4
149*	J. Tucker	1824	22 Feb	B	1
150	J.T. Coleridge	1824	6 Mar	A	4
151	G. Cornish	1824	15 Mar	A	3
152	G. Cornish	1824	26 Mar	A	3
153	J. Mawman	1824	22 Apr	A	4
154	J.T. Coleridge	1824	27 Apr	A	4
155	T.T. Penrose	1824	1 May	A	12
156	Frances Arnold	1824	21 July	A	9
157	Martha Arnold	1824	26 July	A	3

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
158	J.T. Coleridge	1824	16 Sep	A	4
159	F.C. Blackstone	1824	17 Sep	A	4
160	G. Cornish	1824	23 Sep	A	3
161 *	W.W. Hull	1824	30 Sep	B	1
162	F.C. Blackstone	1824	28 Nov	A	4
163	F.C. Blackstone	1824	17 Dec	A	4
164	G. Cornish	1824	23 Dec	A	3
165	Mary Arnold	1825	3 Jan	A	3
166	Mary Arnold	1825	7 Jan	A	3
167	Mary Arnold	1825	10 Jan	A	3
168	J.T. Coleridge	1825	5 Feb	A	4
169	J.T. Coleridge	1825	10 Feb	A	4
170 *	J. Tucker	1825	5 Apr	B	1
171	F.C. Blackstone	1825	9 June	A	4
172 *	G. Cornish	1825	15 July	B	1
173	J.T. Coleridge	1825	18 Aug	A	4
174 *	J. Tucker	1825	22 Aug	B	1
175	F.C. Blackstone	1825	25 Aug	A	4
176	H.I. Robertson	1825	16 Oct	A	2
177 *	G. Cornish	1825	18 Oct	B	1
178	F.C. Blackstone	1825	24 Nov	A	4
179	J.T. Coleridge	1825	2 Dec	A	4
180	J.G. Lockhart	1825	23 Dec	A	13
181	Mary Arnold	1825	30 Dec	A	3
182	(T.T. Penrose)	(1825)	? ?	A	21
183	H. Jenkyns	1826	27 Jan	A	10
184	H. Jenkyns	1826	5 Feb	A	10
185	F.C. Blackstone	1826	16 Feb	A	4
186	J.G. Lockhart	1826	22 Mar	A	13
187	G. Cornish	1826	14 June	A	3
188	E. Hawkins	1826	15 July	A	3
189	Mary Arnold	1826	26 July	A	3
190	Mary Arnold	1826	3 Aug	A	3
191	Matthew Arnold	1826	4 Aug	A	10
192	Mary Arnold	1826	6 Aug	A	3
193	Mary Arnold	1826	10 Aug	A	3
194	H. Jenkyns	1826	17 Sep	A	10
195	J.G. Lockhart	1826	1 Oct	A	13
196	(G. Cornish)	1826	2 Oct	D	D

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
197	F.C. Blackstone	1826	15 Oct	A	4
198 *	E. Hawkins	1826	22 Oct	A	3
199	W. Tooke	1826	27 Oct	A	4
200	T.T. Penrose	(1826)	? (Oct)	A	3
201	J. Parker	1826	9 Nov	A	4
202	J. Parker	1826	23 Nov	A	4
203	J.W. Croker	1826	5 Dec	A	4
204	W. Tooke	(1826)	23 Dec	A	4
205	W. Tooke	1826	26 Dec	A	4
206	W.K. Hamilton	1826	31 Dec	A	14
207 *	J. Tucker	1826	? ?	B	1
208	F.C. Blackstone	1827	11 Jan	A	4
209	E. Hawkins	1827	18 Jan	A	3
210	J.T. Coleridge	1827	12 Feb	A	4
211	R. Whateley	(1827)	? (Feb)	D & B	D & 1
212	F.C. Blackstone	1827	2 Mar	A	4
213 *	J. Tucker	1827	4 Mar	B	1
214	F.C. Blackstone	1827	6 Mar	A	4
215	F.C. Blackstone	1827	25 Mar	A	4
216	F.C. Blackstone	1827	1 June	A	4
217	H.E. Strickland	1827	4 June	A	15
218	J.T. Coleridge	1827	8 June	A	4
219	W. Tooke	1827	14 July	A	4
220	(A pupil's mother)	1827	1 Aug	D & B	D & 1
221	H.E. Strickland	1827	7 Aug	A	15
222	Susanna Arnold	1827	17 Aug	A	3
223	W. Tooke	(1827)	? (Aug)	A	4
224	J.T. Coleridge	1827	29 Sep	A	4
225	F.C. Blackstone	1827	3 Oct	A	13
226	H. Jenkyns	(1827)	? (Oct)	A	10
227	J. Parker	(1827)	12 Oct	A	4
228 *	E. Hawkins	1827	21 Oct	A	3
229	E. Hawkins	1827	2 Nov	A	2
230	W. Tooke	1827	20 Nov	A	4
231	H. Jenkyns	1827	24 Nov	A	10
232 *	G. Cornish	1827	30 Nov	B	1
233	H.E. Strickland	1827	14 Dec	B	16
234	W. Tooke	(1827)	18 Dec	A	4
235	Lord Denbigh	1827	20 Dec	A	17

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
236*	J. Tucker	1827	28 Dec	B	1
237*	E. Hawkins	1827	28 Dec	B	1
238	J. Parker	(1828)	27 Jan	A	4
239	E. Hawkins	1828	8 Feb	A	18
240*	J. Tucker	1828	2 Mar	B	1
241*	A. Hare	1828	7 Mar	B	1
242*	F.C. Blackstone	1828	14 Mar	B	1
243	J. Parker	(1828)	20 Mar	A	4
244	W. Tooke	(1828)	22 Mar	A	4
245	J. Parker	(1828)	6 Apr	A	4
246	J. Parker	(1828)	(13 Apr)	A	4
247*	J.T. Coleridge	1828	24 Apr	A	4
248	J. Parker	(1828)	28 Apr	A	4
249	W. Tooke	1828	4 May	A	4
250	Susanna Arnold	1828	8 May	A	3
251	J. Parker	(1828)	20 May	A	4
252*	J. Tucker	1828	25 May	B	1
253	W. Tooke	(1828)	27 May	A	4
254	Mary Arnold	1828	4 June	A	19
255	Thomas Arnold Jr.	1828	15 June	A	3
256	Mary Arnold	1828	7 July	A	3
257*	F.C. Blackstone	1828	11 July	B	1
258*	W.W. Hull	1828	29 July	B	1
259*	J. Tucker	1828	? Aug	B	1
260	W. Balston	1828	2 Aug	A	2
261	Frances Arnold	1828	7 Aug	A	3
262*	G. Cornish	1828	16 Aug	B	1
263*	J.T. Coleridge	1828	29 Aug	A	1
264*	F.C. Blackstone	1828	28 Sep	B	1
265	Susanna Arnold	1828	8 Oct	A	20
266	J. Parker	1828	20 Oct	A	4
267	H. Jenkyns	1828	20 Oct	A	10
268	J. Parker	1828	24 Oct	A	4
269	Mrs. Lawes	1828	6 Nov	A	20
270	E. Hawkins	1828	16 Nov	A	2
271	J. Leach	1828	26 Dec	A	21
272*	F.C. Blackstone	1828	29 Dec	A	4
273	C.J.G. & R. Rivington	(1829)	2 Feb	A	21
274*	Mrs. Evelyn	1829	22 Feb	A	20

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
275	J. Parker	(1829)	9 Mar	A	4
276	J. Parker	(1829)	14 Mar	A	4
277	Mrs. Evelyn	1829	15 Mar	A	20
278 *	J. Lowe	(1829)	16 Mar	B	1
279	R.I. Nevill	1829	23 Mar	A	21
280	J. Parker	(1829)	24 Mar	A	4
281 *	J. Hare	1829	30 Mar	B	1
282	C.T. Longley	1829	5 Apr	C	7
283	J. Miller	1829	8 Apr	A	2
284	J.T. Coleridge	1829	17 Apr	A	4
285	Mary Arnold	1829	17 Apr	A	3
286	Mrs. Ward	1829	26 Apr	D	D
287	E. Hawkins	1829	30 Apr	A	18
288	J. Miller	1829	4 May	A	2
289*	E. Hawkins	1829	29 May	A	2
290	W. Tooke	1829	31 May	A	4
291	T.F. Ellis	1829	31 May	C	23
292	H.T. Powell	1829	12 June	D	D
293*	A Unitarian Parent	1829	15 June	D & B	D & 1
294	H. Jenkyns	(1829)	21 June	A	10
295	Sir J. Vaughan	1829	29 June	A	14
296	T.F. Ellis	(1829)	19 Aug	A	23
297*	G. Cornish	1829	2 Sept	B	1
298	Lord Denbigh	1829	2 Sept	A	17
299	Lord Denbigh	1829	11 Sept	A	17
300	Susanna Arnold	1829	12 Sept	A	3
301	Mary Arnold	1829	13 Sept	A	3
302	Mary Arnold	1829	15 Sept	A	3
303	Lord Denbigh	1829	21 Sept	A	17
304	R.I. Nevill	1829	6 Oct	A	21
305 *	F.C. Blackstone	1829	14 Oct	B	1
306	J. Parker	(1829)	26 Oct	A	4
307 *	J. Tucker	1829	26 Oct	B	1
308 *	J.T. Coleridge	1829	4 Nov	A	4
309 *	H. Jenkyns	1829	11 Nov	A	10
310	J. Parker	(1829)	11 Dec	A	4
311	J. Parker	1830	1 Jan	A	4
312	W. Balston	1830	6 Jan	B	2
313	J. Parker	(1830)	4 Feb	A	4

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
314	Susanna Arnold	1830	2 Apr	A	3
315	E.E. Mynors	1830	17 Apr	A	3
316	H. Jenkyns	1830	26 Apr	A	10
317	J.T. Coleridge	1830	4 May	A	4
318	J.T. Coleridge	(1830)	(7 May)	A	4
319 *	J.T. Coleridge	1830	11 May	A	4
320	The Times Newspaper	1830	11 May	A	4
321 *	E. Hawkins	1830	12 May	B	1
322	T.T. Penrose	1830	17 May	A	3
323	Cpt. Smythe	1830	7 June	A	4
324	T.F. Ellis	1830	14 June	A	23
325 *	T.F. Ellis	(1830)	(26 June)	A	23
326 *	F. Hartwell	1830	28 June	D & B	D & 1
327	Lord Denbigh	1830	29 June	A	2
328 *	T.F. Ellis	1830	2 July	A	23
329 *	G. Cornish	1830	24 Aug	B	1
330 *	T.F. Ellis	1830	12 Sept	A	23
331	Susanna Arnold	1830	18 Sept	D	D
332	H. Jenkyns	1830	28 Sept	A	10
333 *	T.F. Ellis	1830	3 Oct	A	23
334	Lady (K.) Halkield	1830	? Oct	D	D
335 *	E. Hawkins	1830	16 Oct	A	3
336 *	J.T. Coleridge	1830	1 Nov	A	4
337 *	J. Hare	1830	12 Nov	B	1
338 *	Susanna Arnold	1830	17 Nov	D & B	D & 1
339 *	A. Hare	1830	24 Dec	B	1
340	W.H. Lonsdale	1831	5 Jan	A	2
341	W. Tooke	1831	16 Jan	A	4
342	H. White	1831	9 Feb	D & B	D & 1
343 *	H. Massingbird	1831	21 Feb	D & B	D & 1
344	R. Whateley	1831	28 Feb	D	D
345 *	R. Whateley	1831	7 Mar	D & B	D & 1
346	J Parker	1831	8 Mar	D	D
347	J. Miller	1831	14 Mar	A	2
348 *	C. Bunsen	1831	20 Mar	B	1
349 *	Susanna Arnold	1831	23 Mar	D & B	D & 1
350	J. Ward	(1831)	(Mar/Apr)	D	D
351	E. Hawkins	1831	4 Apr	D	D
352	Mr. Bury	1831	23 Apr	D	D

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
353	J. Parker	1831	24 Apr	A	4
354	Lord Denbigh	1831	26 Apr	A	2
355 *	J. Ward	1831	27 Apr	D & B	D & 1
356	Lady K. (Halkield)	1831	1 May	D	D
357 *	W.W. Hull	1831	2 May	B	1
358	T.F. Ellis	1831	4 June	D	D
359 *	R. Whateley	1831	11 June	B	1
360	F.C. Blackstone	1831	11 June	A	4
361 *	W. Tooke	1831	18 June	D & B	D & 1
362	Lord Brougham	1831	18 June	D	D
363	E. Burton	1831	20 June	A	24
364 *	E. Hawkins	1831	11 July	A	2
365 *	Mrs. Fletcher	1831	? Aug	B	1
366 *	R. Whateley	1831	12 Aug	B	1
367	J. Keble	1831	16 Aug	D	D
368	Matthew Arnold	1831	20 Sept	A	20
369	W. Balston	1831	5 Oct	A	2
370	J.T. Coleridge	1831	5 Oct	A	4
371	E. Hawkins	1831	12 Oct	A	2
372 *	F.C. Blackstone	1831	25 Oct	A	2
373 *	W.W. Hull	1831	26 Oct	B	1
374	Lord Denbigh	1831	27 Oct	A	17
375 *	R. Whateley	1831	8 Nov	B	1
376 *	J. Hare	1831	9 Nov	B	1
377 *	W.W. Hull	1831	16 Dec	B	1
378	Susanna Arnold	1831	20 Dec	A	3
379 *	G. Cornish	1831	23 Dec	B	1
380	S. Delafield	1831	29 Dec	A	3
381	Frances Arnold	1832	3 Jan	A	3
382	Susanna Arnold	1832	12 Jan	A	9
383	E. Stanley	1832	13 Jan	A	2
384	W.H. Lonsdale	1832	15 Jan	A	2
385	Susanna Arnold	(1832)	(21 Jan)	A	9
386	E.J. Shirley	1832	22 Jan	A	20
387	W. Wordsworth	(1832)	? (Jan)	A	9
388	J. Milford	1832	31 Jan	A	21
389	A. Hood	1832	15 Feb	A	2
390 *	G. Cornish	1832	15 Feb	B	1
391 *	Lady F. Egerton	1832	15 Feb	B	1

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
392	W. Balston	1832	28 Feb	A	2
393	Matthew Arnold	(1832)	(29 Feb)	A	10
394	J. Keble	(1832)	(1 Mar)	C	3
395*	Lady F. Egerton	1832	7 Mar	B	1
396	H. Jenkyns	1832	21 Mar	A	10
397	Susanna Arnold	1832	4 Apr	D	D
398*	J.T. Coleridge	1832	5 Apr	A	4
399	E. Maltby	1832	9 Apr	A	26
400	J. Parker	1832	16 Apr	A	4
401	W. Wordsworth	1832	11 May	A	9
402	W. Tooke	1832	25 May	B	1
403*	G. Cornish	1832	9 June	B	1
404*	J.E. Tyler	1832	10 June	B	1
405	E.J. Shirley	1832	24 June	A	20
406	H. Balston	1832	4 July	A	2
407*	J. Ward	1832	7 July	D & B	D & 1
408*	R. Whateley	1832	8 July	B	1
409*	J.E. Tyler	1832	28 July	B	1
410	Frances Arnold	1832	23 Aug	A	3
411*	R. Whateley	1832	6 Sept	D & B	D & 1
412*	J.T. Coleridge	1832	17 Sept	B	1
413	Dawson Turner	1832	26 Sept	A	27
414	W. Wordsworth	1832	3 Oct	A	9
415	W. Tooke	(1832)	4 Oct	A	4
416	W.W. Hull	1832	21 Nov	D	D & 1
417	P. Gell	1832	17 Dec	A	28
418	J. Moultrie	1832	31 Dec	A	29
419	W. Empson	1832	31 Dec	D	D
420*	J. Hearn	1833	1 Jan	D & B	D & 1
421*	W.K. Hamilton	1833	15 Jan	A	14
422*	R. Whateley	1833	17 Jan	D & B	D & 1
423	Lord Denbigh	1833	28 Jan	A	17
424	P. Gell	1833	31 Jan	A	28
425*	R. Whateley	1833	1 Feb	D & B	D & 1
426*	J. Tucker	1833	? Feb	D & B	D & 1
427	Lord Denbigh	1833	10 Feb	A	17
428	F. Lichfield	1833	16 Feb	B	30
429	C. Girdlestone	1833	18 Feb	A	23
430*	W.A. Greenhill	1833	25 Feb	D & B	D & 1

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
431 *	E. Hawkins	1833	5 Mar	A	2
432 *	(Sir W. Smith)	1833	9 Mar	A	4
433 *	E. Hawkins	1833	10 Mar	A	2
434	H. Jenkyns	1833	15 Apr	A	10
435	Lord Denbigh	1833	23 Apr	A	17
436	H. Jenkyns	1833	25 Apr	A	10
437	Lord Denbigh	1833	2 May	A	17
438	J.R. Pease	1833	4 May	A	31
439 *	C. Bunsen	1833	6 May	B	1
440	Lord Denbigh	1833	15 May	A	17
441 *	R. Whateley	1833	21 May	B	1
442 *	J. Hearn	1833	29 May	D & B	D & 1
443	Rugby School Trustees	1833	3 June	C	17
444	W. Balston	1833	5 June	A	2
445 *	Lydia Arnold	1833	11 June	D & B	D & 1
446 *	J.T. Coleridge	1833	12 June	A	4
447 *	W.W. Hull	1833	24 June	B	1
448	Rugby School Trustees	1833	8 July	A	17
449 *	'A Pupil'	1833	15 July	B	1
450	Lord (Denbigh)	1833	26 July	A	4
451 *	A. Hare	1833	3 Aug	D & B	D & 1
452	W. Balston	1833	7 Aug	A	2
453	Mr (J.C.) Platt	1833	8 Aug	D	D
454 *	G. Cornish	1833	18 Aug	B	1
455 *	J. Hare	1833	7 Oct	B	1
456	P. Gell	1833	12 Oct	A	28
457	E. Hawkins	1833	18 Oct	A	2
458 *	J.T. Coleridge	1833	23 Oct	A	4
459 *	J. Abbott	1833	6 Nov	D & B	D & 1
460 *	R. Whateley	1833	8 Nov	B	1
461	E. Hawkins	1833	22 Nov	A	2
462	E. Stanley	1833	5 Dec	A	2
463	W. Balston	1834	8 Jan	A	2
464	W. Balston	1834	28 Jan	A	2
465	E.B. Pusey	1834	18 Feb	A	14
466 *	W.W. Hull	1834	24 Feb	B	1
467 *	F.C. Blackstone	1834	26 Feb	A	4
468 *	J. Hare	1834	10 Mar	B	1
469	Frances Arnold	1834	4 Apr	A	2

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
470	E. Hawkins	1834	12 Apr	A	2
471 *	E. Hawkins	1834	14 Apr	B	1
472 *	W.W. Hull	1834	30 Apr	B	1
473	S. Butler	1834	7 May	A	6
474 *	J. Hare	1834	12 May	B	1
475 *	H. Balston	1834	19 May	B	1
476	C.P. Cooper	1834	29 May	A	4
477 *	W. Empson	1834	11 June	B	1
478 *	C.T. Longley	1834	25 June	B	1
479 *	R. Whateley	1834	2 July	B	1
480	Dawson Turner	1834	7 July	A	27
481	P. Gell	1834	18 July	A	28
482	(W. Empson)	1834	18 July	D	D
483 *	A Former Landlord	1834	6 Aug	D & B	D. & 1
484	Dawson Turner	1834	1 Sept	A	27
485 *	S. Delafield	1834	10 Sept	B	1
486	J. Hearn	1834	10 Sept	D	D
487 *	C. Bunsen	1834	29 Sept	B	1
488	S. Hawtrey	1834	6 Oct	B	33
489	R. Palmer	(1834)	15 Oct	A	32
490	C. Girdlestone	1834	22 Oct	A	4
491 *	W.A. Greenhill	1834	29 Oct	A	3
492 *	T.F. Ellis	1834	21 Nov	B	1
493	W. Lloyd	1834	26 Nov	A	34
494 *	H. Highton	1834	26 Nov	B	1
495	J.T. Coleridge	(1834)	(10 Dec)	A	4
496 *	J. Hearn	1834	31 Dec	B	1
497	Dawson Turner	1835	7 Jan	A	27
498 *	J.T. Coleridge	1835	24 Jan	A	4
499 *	J. Hare	1835	26 Jan	B	1
500 *	C.T. Longley	1835	28 Jan	B	1
501 *	F.C. Blackstone	1835	29 Jan	A	4
502 *	C. Bunsen	1835	10 Feb	B	1
503 *	C.J. Vaughan	1835	25 Feb	B	1
504 *	A.P. Stanley	1835	4 Mar	A	3
505 *	R. Whateley	1835	22 Mar	B	1
506 *	W.A. Greenhill	1835	30 Mar	A	3
507 *	Sir T.S. Pasley	1835	15 Apr	A	20
508	A.P. Stanley	1835	? Apr	A	21

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
509	J. Keble	1835	11 May	A	11
510	F. Wrangham	1835	11 May	A	6
511	(An Old Wykehamist)	1835	13 May	A	5
512	R.D. Hampden	1835	17 May	A	18
513 *	H.E.Strickland	1835	18 May	B	1
514 *	J.T. Coleridge	1835	20 May	A	4
515 *	E. Hawkins	1835	27 May	A	2
516	H.H. Vaughan	1835	18 June	A	4
517 *	(Lady) ?	1835	21 June	B	1
518	Frances Arnold	(1835)	? (July)	A	3
519 *	J.T. Coleridge	1835	1 July	A	4
520	P. Gell	1835	11 July	A	28
521 *	F.C. Blackstone	1835	28 July	A	4
522 *	H. Hatch	1835	31 July	A	2
523	Mrs. Marshall	1835	19 Aug	A	27
524 *	C.J. Vaughan	1835	9 Sept	A	2
525	F.R.G. von Raumer	1835	16 Sept	A	35
526 *	C. Bunsen	1835	21 Sept	B	1
527	C. Spring Rice	1835	25 Sept	D	D
528 *	J.P. Gell	1835	30 Sept	A	28
529	C. Spring Rice	1835	1 Oct	D	D
530 *	A.P. Stanley	1835	7 Oct	B	1
531 *	J.T. Coleridge	1835	12 Oct	A	4
532 *	W.C. Lake	1835	30 Oct	B	1 & 36
533	R.D. Hampden	1835	31 Oct	A	18
534 *	E. Hawkins	1835	4 Nov	A	2
535	R. Palmer	1835	9 Nov	A	32
536 *	F.C. Blackstone	1835	11 Nov	A	4
537 *	J.T. Coleridge	1835	18 Nov	A	4
538 *	J.T. Coleridge	1835	16 Dec	A	4
539	W.C. Oswell	1835	21 Dec	B	37
540 *	W. Empson	1836	8 Jan	D & B	D & 1
541	A. Grenfell	1836	16 Jan	D	D
542	A.P. Stanley	1836	17 Jan	A	2
543 *	C. Bunsen	1836	1 Feb	B	1
544 *	J.C. Platt	1836	5 Feb	B	1
545	C.T. Longley	1836	12 Feb	B	33
546	T. Knightely	1836	13 Feb	A	21
547	R.D. Hampden	1836	17 Feb	A	18

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
548	H.C. Robinson	1836	22 Feb	A	38
549 *	J.T. Coleridge	1836	2 Mar	A	4
550 *	C.J. Vaughan	1836	7 Mar	B	1
551	C.T. Longley	1836	7 Mar	A	32
552 *	W.C. Lake	1836	9 Mar	B	1 & 36
553 *	W.W. Hull	1836	17 Mar	B	1
554	J.T. Coleridge	1836	28 Mar	A	4
555	R.D. Hampden	1836	28 Mar	A	18
556 *	J. Hearn	1836	12 Apr	D & B	D & 1
557	F.C. Blackstone	1836	20 Apr	A	4
558 *	W.W. Hull	1836	27 Apr	B	1
559	F.R.G. von Raumer	1836	1 May	A	35
560	Sir J. Franklin	1836	1 May	C	2
561 *	R. Whateley	1836	4 May	B	1
562 *	W.A. Greenhill	1836	9 May	A	2
563 *	Sir T.S. Pasley	1836	11 May	A	20
564	Martha Buckland	1836	14 May	A	23
565 *	R. Whateley	1836	16 May	A	32
566 *	A.P. Stanley	1836	24 May	B	1
567	E. Hawkins	1836	3 June	A	2
568	M. Napier	1836	10 June	A	6
569 *	W.W. Hull	1836	11 June	B	1
570	H.C. Robinson	1836	14 June	A	38
571	E. Hawkins	1836	19 June	A	21
572 *	Earl Howe	1836	22 June	B	1
573	Sir T.S. Pasley	1836	27 June	A	20
574 *	Earl Howe	1836	27 June	B	1
575	J.T. Coleridge	1836	27 June	A	4
576 *	Earl Howe	1836	30 June	B	1
577 *	Sir J. Franklin	1836	20 July	C	2
578	P. Gell	1836	22 July	A	28
579	J.T. Coleridge	1836	22 July	A	4
580 *	Frances Arnold	1836	27 July	A	3
581 *	E. Hawkins	1836	31 July	A	2
582	F.C. Blackstone	1836	(31) July	A	4
583	Frances Arnold	1836	9 Aug	A	3
584	R.A. Arnold	1836	13 Aug	A	6
585	J.T. Coleridge	1836	14 Aug	A	4
586	M. Napier	1836	23 Aug	A	6

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
587.	W.K. Hamilton	(1836)	(28/29 Aug)	A	21
588	C. Wordsworth	1836	30 Aug	A	32
589 *	J. Hearn	1836	14 Sept	B	1
590 *	J.T. Coleridge	1836	23 Sept	A	4
591	C. Bunsen	1836	(19) Oct	B	1
592 *	A.P. Stanley	1836	21 Oct	B	1
593 *	Sir T.S. Pasley	1836	29 Oct	A	20
594 *	W.A. Greenhill	1836	31 Oct	A	3
595	Matthew Arnold	1836	4 Nov	D	D
596 *	W.W. Hull	1836	16 Nov	B	1
597 *	W.C. Lake	1836	18 Nov	D & B	D & 1
598 *	E. Hawkins	1836	23 Nov	A	2
599 *	R. Whateley	1836	25 Nov	D & B	D & 1
600 *	J.C. Platt	1836	28 Nov	B	1
601 *	J.T. Coleridge	1836	30 Nov	A	4
602 *	Sir T.S. Pasley	1836	14 Dec	A	20
603	H.C. Robinson	1837	3 Feb	A	38
604 *	J.C. Platt	1837	4 Feb	B	1
605	H. Hill	1837	5 Feb	A	2
606	C. Wordsworth	1837	5 Feb	A	32
607 *	J.T. Coleridge	1837	5 Feb	A	4
608 *	G. Cornish	1837	5 Feb	B	1
609 *	J. Hearn	1837	6 Feb	B	1
610	J. Keble	(1837)	? (Feb)	C	3
611 *	W.W. Hull	1837	3 Mar	B	1
612 *	G. Pryme	1837	8 Mar	B	1
613 *	H.C. Robinson	1837	15 Mar	A	38
614	E. Hawkins	1837	27 Mar	A	2
615 *	H. Highton	1837	5 Apr	A	2
616	E. Stanley	1837	19 Apr	A	2
617 *	Sir T.S. Pasley	1837	21 Apr	A	20
618	W. Empson	1837	27 Apr	A	3
619	E. Stanley	1837	28 Apr	D	D
620 *	Bishop Otter	1837	30 Apr	B	1
621	J. Yates	1837	3 May	A	2
622 *	H. Hill	1837	25 May	A	2
623	A.P. Stanley	1837	26 May	A	2
624	J.T. Coleridge	1837	28 May	A	4
625	C. Wordsworth	1837	31 May	A	7

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
626	Sir T.S. Pasley	1837	29 June	A	20
627	R. Congreve	(1837)	19 July	A	6
628	A.P. Stanley	1837	28 July	A	2
629	R. Baldwin	1837	25 Aug	A	21
630	P. Gell	1837	25 Aug	A	28
631 *	C.J. Vaughan	1837	13 Sept	D & B	D & 1
632	R. Baldwin	1837	17 Sept	D	D
633 *	W.A. Greenhill	1837	18 Sept	A	3
634	A.P. Stanley	1837	20 Sept	A	2
635 *	J. Hearn	1837	25 Sept	B	1
636	A.B. Clough	1837	19 Oct	A	4
637	E. Hawkins	1837	19 Oct	A	2
638	J.T. Coleridge	1837	3 Nov	A	4
639	Frances Arnold	1837	10 Nov	A	3
640 *	W. Empson	1837	18 Nov	D & B	D & 1
641 *	T.T. Penrose	1837	20 Nov	B	1
642 *	W. Empson	1837	28 Nov	B	1
643	A.P. Stanley	1837	30 Nov	A	2
644 *	J.C. Platt	1837	6 Dec	B	1
645 *	J.T. Coleridge	1837	8 Dec	A	4
646 *	T.J. Ormerod	1837	18 Dec	B	1
647 *	J.T. Coleridge	1837	20 Dec	A	4
648	J.T. Coleridge	1837	30 Dec	A	4
649	D.A. Talboys	1838	2 Jan	A	4
650	C. Spring Rice	1838	19 Jan	D	D
651	Lydia Arnold	1838	21 Jan	A	3
652 *	E. Hawkins	1838	23 Jan	B	1
653 *	C. Bunsen	1838	27 Jan	B	1
654	Bishop Otter	1838	28 Jan	A	39
655 *	A.H. Clough	1838	29 Jan	B	1
656	R. Baldwin	1838	3 Feb	D	D
657	E. Hawkins	1838	9 Feb	A	2
658 *	Sir T.S. Pasley	1838	16 Feb	A	20
659 *	E. Stanley	1838	17 Feb	B	1
660 *	J.E. Tyler	1838	17 Feb	B	1
661 *	A.P. Stanley	1838	28 Feb	B	1
662 *	C.J. Vaughan	1838	4 Mar	B	1
663 *	Earl of Burlington	1838	17 Mar	B	1
664 .	C. Richardson	1838	19 Mar	A	40

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
665	H. Balston	1838	28 Mar	A	2
666	H. Jenkyns	1838	30 Mar	A	10
667	G.R. Moorsom	1838	30 Mar	A	41
668	E. Stanley	1838	3 Apr	D	D
669	G.R. Moorsom	1838	6 Apr	A	41
670	The Governors of King Edward's School	1838	18 Apr	B	42
671	W.K. Hamilton	1838	5 May	A	20
672 *	W.A. Greenhill	1838	15 May	B	1
673 *	J.T. Coleridge	1838	18 May	A	4
674	Mrs. Proby	1838	25 May	A	43
675	Mrs. Proby	1838	28 May	A	43
676	Dr. Mayo	1838	1 June	A	43
677	W.A. Greenhill	(1838)	5 June	A	14
678	Dr. Mayo	1838	6 June	A	43
679 *	E. Stanley	1838	7 June	B	1
680 *	E. Hawkins	(1838)	(13/19 June)	A	4
681 *	A.P. Stanley	1838	22 June	D & B	D & 1
682	P. Gell	1838	2 July	A	28
683	R. Conington	1838	13 July	A	44
684	J.T. Coleridge	1838	31 July	A	4
685	W.W. Hull	1838	4 Aug	D	D
686 *	E. Hawkins	1838	5 Aug	A	2
687	J.T. Coleridge	1838	6 Aug	A	4
688 *	T.F. Ellis	1838	29 Aug	B	1
689	R. Congreve	1838	21 Sept	A	6
690	Frances Arnold	1838	21 Sept	A	2
691	A.P. Stanley	1838	3 Oct	A	2
692 *	W.K. Hamilton	1838	5 Oct	A	14
693	Sir T.S. Pasley	1838	8 Oct	A	20
694	W. Empson	1838	29 Oct	D	D
695 *	Earl of Burlington	1838	7 Nov	B	1
696 *	C. Bunsen	1838	9 Nov	D & B	D & 1
697	H. Rodd	1838	14 Nov	A	21
698	J.T. Coleridge	1838	16 Nov	A	4
699 *	J. Hearn	1838	23 Nov	D & B	D & 1
700	J.T. Coleridge	1838	29 Nov	A	4
701	R. Congreve	1838	1 Dec	A	6
702	W.C. Lake	1838	6 Dec	B	36
703	E. Hawkins	1838	12 Dec	A	2

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
704	P. Gell	1838	27 Dec	A	28
705	C. Bradley	(1839)	(4) Jan	A	21
706	Sir T.S. Pasley	(1839)	(10 Jan)	A	20
707	R. Stanley	1839	10 Jan	A	21
708 *	E. Hawkins	1839	12 Jan	B	1
709	C. Bunsen	1839	15 Jan	D	D
710 *	J.C. Platt	1839	20 Jan	B	1
711	T.T. Penrose	1839	4 Feb	A	3
712 *	F.C. Blackstone	1839	25 Feb	A	4
713 *	A.P. Stanley	1839	27 Feb	A	3
714	W.A. Greenhill	1839	8 Mar	A	2
715 *	J.P. Gell	1839	15 Mar	A	28
716	H. Hill	1839	16 Mar	A	2
717 *	Mr. Labouchere	1839	19 Mar	B	1
718	J.P. Gell	1839	20 Mar	A	28
719 *	E. Wise	1839	20 Mar	B	1
720	H. Hill	1839	25 Mar	A	2
721	E. Coleridge	1839	27 Mar	A	4
722	J.P. Gell	1839	28 Mar	A	28
723 *	J.P. Gell	1839	5 Apr	A	28
724	Dawson Turner	(1839)	15 Apr	A	27
725	M. Napier	1839	19 Apr	A	6
726	J.T. Coleridge	1839	29 Apr	A	4
727	F.C. Massingbird	1839	1 May	A	45
728 *	J.T. Coleridge	1839	8 May	A	4
729 *	Sir T.S. Pasley	1839	10 May	A	20
730	J.T. Coleridge	1839	15 May	A	4
731	J.T. Coleridge	1839	17 May	A	4
732	A.P. Stanley	1839	19 May	A	2
733	Lord Brougham	1839	27 May	A	26
734	F.C. Blackstone	1839	29 May	A	4
735	H.H. Vaughan	1839	30 May	A	20
736	H.H. Vaughan	1839	31 May	A	4
737	H.H. Vaughan	1839	2 June	A	4
738	F.C. Blackstone	1839	5 June	A	4
739	J.P. Gell	1839	7 June	A	28
740 *	J. Hare	1839	21 June	B	1
741 *	E. Wise	1839	22 June	B	1
742	P. Gell	1839	28 June	A	28

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
743	P. Gell	1839	1 July	A	28
744*	Mr. Labouchere	1839	1 July	B	1
745	J.P. Gell	1839	2 July	A	28
746	Lord Denbigh	1839	4 July	A	17
747	Lord Wenlock	1839	5 July	A	46
748*	G. Cornish	1839	6 July	B	1
749	Duchess of Argyll	1839	9 July	A	5
750	Duchess of Argyll	(1839)	(9 July)	A	5
751	Lord Brougham	(1839)	(2 Aug)	A	26
752	F.C. Blackstone	1839	21 Aug	A	4
753	Lord Brougham	1839	22 Aug	A	26
754*	C. Bunsen	1839	23 Aug	B	1
755	J.P. Gell	1839	8 Sept	A	28
756*	Sir T.S. Pasley	1839	9 Sept	A	20
757	Lord Brougham	1839	14 Sept	A	26
758	C. Wordsworth	1839	18 Sept	A	7
759*	J.L. Hoskyns	1839	22 Sept	B	1
760*	J.T. Coleridge	1839	25 Sept	A	4
761*	T. Burbidge	1839	2 Oct	B	1
762*	C. Bunsen	1839	4 Oct	B	1
763	Sir T.S. Pasley	1839	14 Oct	A	20
764	Lord Denbigh	1839	15 Oct	A	17
765	Lord Denbigh	(1839)	(15/18 Oct)	A	17
766*	J. Marshall	1839	30 Oct	B	1
767	P. Gell	1839	31 Oct	A	28
768	R.I. Nevill	1839	2 Nov	A	21
769	Sir J. Franklin	1839	3 Nov	C	28
770	H. Jenkyns	1839	11 Nov	A	10
771	H. Jenkyns	1839	16 Nov	A	10
772*	H. Balston	1839	21 Nov	D & B	D & 1
773	H.C. Robinson	1839	27 Nov	A	38
774	(R. Whateley)	(1839)	15 Dec	A	3
775	F.C. Blackstone	1839	15 Dec	A	4
776*	A.P. Stanley	1839	20 Dec	B	1
777*	?	1839	22 Dec	B	1
778*	E. Hawkins	1839	29 Dec	B	1
779*	J. Marshall	1840	1 Jan	B	1
780*	T. Carlyle	1840	3 Jan	A	13
781*	J. Hearn	1840	5 Jan	B	1

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
782 *	J.C. Platt	1840	12 Jan	B	1
783	R.P. Graves	1840	15 Jan	A	4
784	Mrs. Arbuthnot	1840	19 Jan	B	47
785 *	J. Marshall	1840	23 Jan	B	1
786 *	W.W. Hull	1840	24 Jan	B	1
787 *	Sir T.S. Pasley	1840	25 Jan	A	20
788 *	J. Hare	1840	26 Jan	B	1
789 *	J.T. Coleridge	1840	26 Jan	A	4
790	Lord Brougham	1840	26 Jan	A	26
791	Lord Brougham	1840	28 Jan	A	26
792	H. Rodd	1840	9 Feb	A	12
793 *	Sir C.E. Smith	1840	14 Feb	B	1
794 *	W.L. Newton	1840	19 Feb	B	1
795 *	H. Fox	1840	21 Feb	B	1
796 *	W.L. Newton	1840	22 Feb	B	1
797 *	C. Bunsen	1840	25 Feb	B	1
798 *	H. Lloyd	1840	25 Feb	B	1
799	J. Ward	1840	26 Feb	A	48
800	Cpt. Beaufort	1840	9 Mar	A	21
801	H. Fox	1840	10 Mar	C	4
802 *	W.W. Hull	1840	13 Mar	B	1
803	?	1840	27 Mar	A	44
804 *	H. Fox	1840	30 Mar	B	1
805	H. Fox	1840	? Apr	B	49
806 *	W.W. Hull	1840	? Apr	B	1
807 *	W.W. Hull	1840	? Apr	B	1
808 *	W.L. Newton	1840	1 Apr	B	1
809	A.P. Stanley	1840	1 Apr	A	2
810	Dawson Turner	1840	10 Apr	A	27
811 *	J.P. Gell	1840	12 Apr	A	28
812	D. Coleridge	1840	13 Apr	A	29
813	Mr. Walker	1840	23 Apr	A	2
814 *	W.K. Hamilton	1840	4 May	A	14
815 *	H. Hill	1840	8 May	B	1
816 *	E. Hawkins	1840	8 May	B	1
817 *	W.W. Hull	1840	16 May	B	1
818	J.T. Coleridge	1840	24 May	A	4
819 *	C. Bunsen	1840	26 May	B	1
820	H. Balston	1840	3 June	A	2

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
821	E. Stanley	1840	8 June	A	3
822	Sir T.S. Pasley	(1840)	(10/13 June)	A	20
823	W.K. Hamilton	(1840)	(20 June)	A	14
824*	W.C. Lake	1840	17 Aug	B	36
825*	H. Balston	1840	17 Aug	A	2
826	E. Stanley	1840	21 Aug	A	3
827	E. Stanley	1840	26 Aug	A	2
828*	C. Bunsen	1840	4 Sept	B	1
829*	H. Balston	1840	9 Sept	A	2
830	A.H. Clough	(1840)	14 Sept	A	4
831*	E. Hawkins	1840	14 Sept	A	2
832*	J.T. Coleridge	1840	21 Sept	A	4
833	F.C. Blackstone	1840	25 Sept	A	4
834	E. Stanley	(1840)	(28 Sept)	A	3
835	Frances Arnold	1840	2 Oct	A	2
836*	W.S. Karr	1840	5 Oct	B	1
837	?	1840	16 Oct	A	21
838*	Sir T.S. Pasley	1840	19 Oct	A	20
839	W.A. Greenhill	1840	24 Oct	C	14
840*	J. Hare	1840	28 Oct	B	1
841*	H. Balston	1840	29 Oct	B	1
842	T.T. Penrose	1840	30 Oct	A	3
843*	C.J. Vaughan	1840	4 Nov	B	1
844	W.E. Hartopp	1840	6 Nov	A	21
845*	C.J. Vaughan	1840	16 Nov	B	1
846*	J. Acton	1840	18 Nov	B	1
847*	W.K. Hamilton	1840	18 Nov	A	14
848	J. Mawman	1840	27 Nov	A	4
849	H. Balston	1840	30 Nov	A	2
850	T. Burbidge	1840	2 Dec	A	21
851	R. Congreve	1840	2 Dec	A	6
852*	E. Hawkins	1840	4 Dec	B	1
853*	C.J. Vaughan	1840	4 Dec	B	1
854	T. Hughes	1840	18 Dec	B	53
855*	C.J. Vaughan	1840	28 Dec	B	1
856	D. Coleridge	1840	31 Dec	A	8
857	P. Dixon	1841	1 Jan	B	50
858*	W. Balston	1841	(2/5) Jan	A	2
859*	J.T. Coleridge	1841	2 Jan	A	4

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
860 *	T.J. Ormerod	1841	3 Jan	B	1
861 *	T.T. Penrose	1841	6 Jan	B	1
862	T. Balston	1841	7 Jan	A	2
863	Sir T.S. Pasley	1841	8 Jan	A	20
864 *	W.W. Hull	1841	15 Jan	B	1
865 *	J. Hearn	1841	25 Jan	B	1
866 *	C. Bunsen	1841	28 Jan	B	1
867	F.C. Blackstone	1841	11 Feb	A	4
868	Lord Denbigh	1841	12 Feb	A	17
869	(J.P.Lee)	1841	22 Feb	B	2
870	J.P. Gell	1841	1 Mar	A	28
871 *	J.P. Gell	1841	3 Mar	A	28
872 *	A.P. Stanley	1841	8 Mar	A	2
873	A.C. Tait	(1841)	11 Mar	A	32
874 *	Sir J. Franklin	1841	16 Mar	C	2
875	(R. Whateley)	1841	25 Mar	D	D
876	Mrs. J. Newby	1841	29 Mar	A	21
877 *	Sir J. Franklin	1841	4 Apr	B	1
878	P. Gell	1841	8 Apr	A	28
879	?	1841	9 Apr	A	51
880 *	T.T. Penrose	1841	10 Apr	B	1
881	?	1841	22 Apr	A	52
882	J. Wood	1841	28 Apr	A	2
883	Frances Arnold	1841	11 May	A	2
884	W.K. Hamilton	1841	11 May	A	14
885	E. Hawkins	1841	21 May	A	14
886 *	T.J. Ormerod	1841	19 June	B	1
887	J. (Ward)	1841	25 June	A	3
888	Sir T.S. Pasley	(1841)	? (May/June)	A	20
889	Sir T.S. Pasley	1841	25 June	A	20
890 *	J. Hearn	1841	25 June	B	1
891 *	J.T. Coleridge	1841	26 June	A	4
892	Frances Arnold	1841	12 July	A	3
893	J.T. Coleridge	1841	26 July	A	4
894 *	J.T. Coleridge	1841	1 Aug	A	4
895 *	J. Tucker	1841	2 Aug	B	1
896	?	1841	9 Aug	C	13
897	Lord Denbigh	1841	9 Aug	A	17
898	J. Wood	1841	10 Aug	C	2

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
899*	J. Tucker	1841	12 Aug	B	1
900	Mr. Le Marchant	1841	16 Aug	D	D
901	?	1841	16 Aug	A	21
902	A.H. Clough	(1841)	20 Aug	A	4
903*	E. Hawkins	1841	21 Aug	A	29
904	A.C. Tait	1841	27 Aug	A	32
905	W.A. Greenhill	1841	29 Aug	A	3
906	T.J. Ormerod	(1841)	? (Aug)	D	D
907*	J.T. Coleridge	1841	1 Sept	A	4
908	F. Myers	1841	5 Sept	A	27
909	T. Burbidge	1841	7 Sept	A	2
910*	J. Randall	1841	20 Sept	B	1
911*	J. Tucker	1841	22 Sept	B	1
912*	Sir T.S. Pasley	(1841)	23 Sept	A	20
913*	A.P. Stanley	1841	29 Sept	A	2
914*	W. Empson	1841	15 Oct	B	1
915	E. Hawkins	1841	18 Oct	A	2
916	E. Stanley	(1841)	22 Oct	A	3
917	R. Whateley	(1841)	24 Oct	A	32
918*	T. Hill	1841	29 Oct	B	1
919*	A.P. Stanley	1841	30 Oct	A	2
920	F. Myers	1841	8 Nov	A	19
921	E. Hawkins	1841	10 Nov	A	3
922*	J.T. Coleridge	1841	19 Nov	A	4
923*	C. Bunsen	1841	22 Nov	B	1
924	J.T. Coleridge	1841	23 Nov	A	4
925	J.T. Coleridge	1841	26 Nov	A	4
926*	E. Hawkins	1841	4 Dec	B	1
927	Frances Arnold	1841	7 Dec	A	3
928	Lord ?	1841	14 Dec	A	25
929	(G.) Butler	1841	15 Dec	A	4
930*	F.C. Blackstone	1841	17 Dec	A	4
931	Lord Wenlock	1841	24 Dec	A	46
932*	R. Thorpe	1841	25 Dec	C	23
933*	E. Hawkins	1841	26 Dec	B	1
934*	J.T. Coleridge	1841	26 Dec	A	4
935	J.T. Coleridge	1841	30 Dec	A	4
936*	J.T. Coleridge	1841	31 Dec	A	4
937	J. Wood	1842	2 Jan	A	2

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Correspondent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Extant Source</u>	<u>Present Location</u>
938	J. Wood	1842	8 Jan	A	2
939 *	J.T. Coleridge	1842	9 Jan	A	4
940	T. Carlyle	1842	12 Jan	A	13
941 *	J. Hearn	1842	17 Jan	B	1
942	Sir T.S. Pasley	1842	23 Jan	A	20
943	Sir G. Clerk	1842	8 Feb	A	43
944 *	H. Hill	1842	9 Feb	B	1
945 *	'An Old Pupil'	1842	9 Feb	B	1
946	Frances Arnold	1842	21 Feb	A	19
947	P. Gell	1842	24 Feb	A	28
948	H. Hallam	1842	1 Mar	A	53
949 *	J.T. Coleridge	1842	3 Mar	A	4
950 *	J. Hare	1842	18 Mar	B	1
951	F. Myers	1842	25 Mar	A	27
952	J.P. Gell	1842	1 Apr	A	28
953	A.H. Clough	(1842)	2 Apr	A	4
954	Sir J. Franklin	1842	4 Apr	C	2
955 *	H. Fox	1842	10 Apr	B	1
956	J. Wood	1842	17 Apr	A	2
957	J. Wood	1842	27 Apr	A	2
958	F.C. Blackstone	1842	29 Apr	A	4
959	J. Leach	1842	2 May	A	21
960 *	C. Bunsen	1842	3 May	B	1
961	E. Hawkins	1842	5 May	A	2
962	Sir T.S. Pasley	1842	6 May	A	20
963	(Col. Napier)	1842	9 May	A	4
964	Dawson Turner	1842	13 May	A	27
965 *	E. Hawkins	1842	19 May	A	2
966	J.T. Coleridge	1842	21 May	A	4
967 *	J.T. Coleridge	1842	22 May	A	4
968	E. Hawkins	1842	27 May	A	2
969	T. Carlyle	1842	3 June	A	13
<u>Addenda(1)</u>					
601A	F.C. Blackstone	1836	12 Dec	A	4
822A*	C. Bunsen	1840	13 June	B	1

Note: In The Life, L.680 bears the date 5 August 1838 "(B.)".

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. MANUSCRIPT SOURCESNOTE:

The sources are listed in alphabetical order. It should be noted that in virtually every case, an institution can trace a Thomas Arnold letter simply by knowing the name of the recipient and the date of the letter.

Although some of these sources hold other Arnold material, reference is only made here to documents used in the thesis.

BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD.

Letters of Thomas Arnold to Henry Jenkyns are held in the College Library in Box V A, 3; also a letter from A.P.Stanley to Jenkyns.

BODLEIAN LIBRARY, OXFORD.

1. The principal collections of Arnold letters held by the Library (Department of Western Manuscripts) are those written to J.T.Coleridge: Ms.Eng.Lett. D130; F.C.Blackstone: Ms.Eng.Lett. D348; Joseph Parker: Ms.Eng.Lett. D399; and William Tooke: Ms.Eng.Lett. D350.

Note: Two letters to J.Mawman - 22 April 1824 and 27 November 1840 - are bound with the J.T.Coleridge correspondence.

2. Other letters by Arnold will be found under the following references:

Ms.Eng.Lett. D310	:	Frances Buckland (nee Arnold)
Ms.Autogr. D43	:	(G.) Butler
Ms.DON. C72	:	E.Coleridge
Ms.Eng.Lett. C189	:	A.H.Clough
Ms.Eng.Lett. D175	;	A.B.Clough
Ms.Eng.Misc. C143	:	H.W.Fox

- Ms.Eng.Lett. C144 : C.Girdlestone
- Ms.Eng.Lett. D350 : R.P.Graves
- Ms.Eng.Lett. E141 : Fols.192-3 = Unaddressed letter of 9 May 1842 (i.e. Col.Napier, L.963); fol.177 = E.Hawkins (L.680).
- Ms.Eng.Lett. C462 : Cpt.Smythe
- Ms.Eng.Lett. D338 : Fols.168-174 are letters to J.W.Croker, C.P.Cooper, D.A.Talboys, and two unaddressed letters: 9 March 1833 (i.e. Sir W.Smith, L.432); 26 July 1833 (i.e. Lord Denbigh, L.450).

THE BRITISH LIBRARY, LONDON.

The Department of Manuscripts holds Arnold's letters to S.Butler: Mss.34589, fol.64; M.Napier: Mss.34617, fols.447, 525 and Ms.34620, fol. 206; F.Wrangham: Mss.45918, fol.3; R.Congreve: Mss.45241, fols.1-6, 10; and R.A.Arnold: Mss.46359A, fol.7.

THE BROTHERTON LIBRARY, LEEDS.

The Brotherton Collection contains a large number of Arnold letters and other family papers. Reference to the Thomas Arnold correspondence is by the recipient's name and the letter date. Letters will be found to the following people: Frances Arnold, Lydia Arnold, Martha Arnold, Mary Arnold, Susanna Arnold, Thomas Arnold Jr., G.Cornish, W.Empson, W.A.Greenhill, E.Hawkins, J.Keble, E.E.Mynors, T.T.Penrose, A.P. Stanley, E.Stanley, R.Whateley.

The Collection also holds two of Arnold's Diaries/Notebooks: one headed, "Rugby and Fox How 1837 to 1839"; the other covers the period 14 April 1839 to 7 February 1840; and a number of volumes of Mrs Arnold's Journals.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, CAMBRIDGE.

One Arnold letter is in the J.Ward Papers, Ms.Add.6157(D).

CHRIST CHURCH COLLEGE, OXFORD.

The Hallam Papers, vol.16, fols.17-18 include an Arnold letter.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

The Cornell University Libraries' Rare Books Collection hold a letter from Arnold to Derwent Coleridge (31 December 1840).

DEUTSCHE STAATSBIBLIOTHEK PREUBISCHER KULTURBESITZ, BERLIN.

In the Handschriftenabteilung/Literaturarchiv among the Dokumentensammlung Darmstaedter, 2f 1811 (3) is a letter written by Arnold to an unknown recipient (9 April 1841, L.879).

THE FITZWILLIAM MUSEUM, CAMBRIDGE.

The Ashcombe MSS Collection holds a letter from Arnold to an unknown member of the aristocracy (14 December 1841, L.928) Ashcombe V No.7.

MRS A.E.GELL, HOPTON HALL, WIRKSWORTH, DERBYSHIRE.

The collection of letters written by Arnold to John Philip Gell and his father are preserved among the family papers in the Muniments Room.

GLOUCESTERSHIRE RECORD OFFICE, GLOUCESTER.

Arnold's letters to H.E.Strickland can be found under reference D 1245 F 18.

HARROW SCHOOL, HARROW ON THE HILL, MIDDLESEX.

In the Archives Room are letters from Arnold to Charles Wordsworth, reference: 7A/HMC/W S.CH. and 7A/HMC/W.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS, U.S.A.

The Houghton Library holds Arnold's letters to J.Penrose: b MS AM 1631 (8); and to H.Rodd: Autograph File (Feb. 1840).

KEBLE COLLEGE, OXFORD.

The Library holds three letters from Arnold to John Keble under the reference Keble College Archives K75.

KING EDWARD'S SCHOOL, BIRMINGHAM.

A letter from Arnold to the Governors of the school is in the Governors' Muniment Room, Box 4/4.

KINGSTON UPON HULL CITY RECORD OFFICE, HULL.

The Pease Family Papers, reference DFP 911, contain one Arnold letter.

LAMBETH PALACE LIBRARY, LONDON.

Arnold letters will be found under the following references:
Papers of Roundell Palmer - Ms.1861, fols.9,11; Papers of Charles Thomas Longley - Longley Papers, vol.1, fol.105; Papers of Richard Whateley - Whateley Papers Ms.2164, fol.30; and Letters and Papers of Archibald Campbell Tait - Tait V.77, fols.,11,89.

LEICESTERSHIRE RECORD OFFICE, LEICESTER.

The Halford Collection includes an undated letter from Arnold to Sir Henry Halford, reference 802/40, and the letter from J.H.Macauley to General Macauley, reference DG24/977/1.

LEXINGTON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY, U.S.A.

The Bosworth Memorial Library have Arnold's letter to C.Richardson under reference MS.B/17/419/8.

LINCOLNSHIRE COUNTY RECORD OFFICE, LINCOLN.

The Massingbird Papers include Arnold's letter to F.C. Massingbird, reference Mass.31/33.

MARLBOROUGH GRAMMAR SCHOOL (NOW ST.JOHN'S SCHOOL), MARLBOROUGH.

In the school archives is the letter from G.Evelyn to J.T.Lawes of 27 December (1817).

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF SCOTLAND, EDINBURGH.

The Department of Manuscripts holds a number of letters written by Arnold under the following references: to J.G.Lockhart: Ms.924, no's., 67-69; F.C.Blackstone: Ms.7178, no.9; T.Carlyle: Ms.665, no's. 43,52,54B; Recipient Unknown: Ms.962, fol.8 (letter dated 9 August 1841, L.896).

THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF WALES, ABERYSTWYTH.

Arnold's letter to William Lloyd can be found in the Aston Hall Correspondence, no.147.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

The Elmer Holmes Bobst Library/Fales Library holds one letter from Arnold, to the Bishop of Chichester (Bishop Otter), reference, Ms.EHB1072/98/FW.

ORIEL COLLEGE, OXFORD.

Letters from Arnold to E.Hawkins and R.D.Hampden are in the College Library. The Hampden correspondence is in Locked Case C.B. I-3; the Hawkins' letters are in Oriel College Bound Letters, vol.6, no.567, and vol.8, no.759.

THE PIERPONT MORGAN LIBRARY, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

The Library holds a letter from Arnold to an unknown recipient under reference, Ms.RP/2761/D4 (letter dated 22 April 1841, L.881).

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE, KEW, SURREY.

Two letters from Arnold to G.R.Moorsom are in the British Transport Commission Archives, reference HL2/8/R209 and HL2/8/R209/1.

PUSEY HOUSE, OXFORD.

The Pusey Memorial Library contains several letters written by Arnold to W.K.Hamilton among the Hamilton Papers, and to E.B.Pusey among the Pusey Papers. In addition to these, there are letters

to E.Hawkins, W.A.Greenhill, and Sir John Vaughan. Reference in each case is by the names of sender and recipient and the date of the letter.

RUGBY SCHOOL, RUGBY.

The Temple Reading Room houses an extensive collection of Arnold and related papers. Reference to letters is by name(s) and date.

1. Correspondence from Arnold to the following individuals will be found: Frances Arnold, H.Balston, T.Balston, W.Balston, F.C. Blackstone, T.Burbidge, Lord Denbigh, Sir J.Franklin, W.A.Greenhill, H.Hatch, E.Hawkins, H.Highton, H.Hill, A.Hood, W.H.Lonsdale, J.Miller, A.P.Stanley, E.Stanley, Mr.Walker, J.Wood, J.Yates.
2. The original MS of Arnold's review article, "Thoughts on the Advancement of Academical Education in England."
3. Two Notebooks used by Stanley in writing The Life.
4. The Trustees Order Books.
5. Annotated copies of the school Form Lists produced each term.

SCOTTISH RECORD OFFICE, EDINBURGH.

One letter from Arnold to Sir G.Clerk is in the Clerk of Penicuik Muniments, reference GD18/5585. Letters to Dr.Mayo and Mrs.Proby are among the Mackenzie Papers, reference GD46/15/59/15-24.

SHREWSBURY SCHOOL, SHREWSBURY.

The School Library holds a letter from Arnold to E.Burton in the Burton MSS, vol.2, no.146.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

Arnold letters will be found in the Dawson Turner Collection, and the F.W.H.Myers Collection (reference is by letter date). One other letter is held, from Arnold to a Mrs.Marshall, under reference Add.

Ms.c.65⁴.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

The Library holds letters to Mary and Frances Arnold under reference T.C.D. Ms.5102.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON.

Several letters from Arnold to Lord Brougham, and one to Edward Maltby will be found among the Brougham Papers in the Manuscripts and Rare Books Room of the D.M.S.Watson Library.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, U.S.A.

The Department of Special Collections in the University Research Library has two of Arnold's letters: 13 July 1838 to R.Conington, and 27 March 1840 to an unknown recipient (L.803).

UNIVERSITY OF HULL, HULL.

The Brynmor Jones Library holds one letter from Arnold, to Lord Wenlock among the Forbes-Adam of Escrick Papers, reference DDFA(3)/7/5.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN, TEXAS, U.S.A.

The Humanities Research Center houses three letters written by Arnold: 13 April 1840 to Derwent Coleridge; 31 December 1832 to John Moultrie; and 21 August 1841 to Edward Hawkins.

UNIWERSYTET JAGIELLONSKA, KRAKOW, POLAND.

Letters from Arnold to F.R.G. von Raumer are held in the University Library under reference, MS: V. 11.

WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY RECORD OFFICE, WARWICK.

Letters written by Arnold and other documents relating to Rugby School are among the papers of the 7th Earl of Denbigh, which are contained in the Feilding of Newnham Paddox Correspondence.

1. Letters from Arnold to Denbigh and to the Trustees of Rugby School will be found under references: CR2017/C342,C343,C344, C345, C413.

2. Papers relating to the "March affair", including letters from J.P.Lee, A.Grenfell, and R.Bird are under reference CR2017/C413/1-21 in an envelope endorsed "Rugby Papers July 9th 1833".
3. The letter from G.Harris to Denbigh, dated 10th September, 1829, is under reference CR2017/C344/5.
4. The letter from Sir H. Halford to Denbigh referred to in note 248 in Part Two of the thesis is under reference CR2017/C344/5.

DR WILLIAMS'S LIBRARY, LONDON.

The Library holds several letters from Arnold to H.C. Robinson in the Henry Crabb Robinson correspondence.

WINCHESTER COLLEGE, WINCHESTER.

Arnold's schoolboy correspondence is held in the College Archives under reference WCL 23508-23529. WCM 21793 is the Election Roll for 1810.

THE WORDSWORTH LIBRARY, GRASMERE, CUMBRIA.

Letters from Arnold to Susanna Arnold and to William Wordsworth are held under reference WLL/Arnold, Thomas 1-7.

Other letters written jointly by Arnold and his wife to the Wordsworths are also held by the Library, though these are not included in this study.

YALE UNIVERSITY, NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT, U.S.A.

The Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library has letters from Arnold to T.F. Ellis, R. Thorpe, and Martha Buckland.

The Library also holds on loan eight notebooks written by Mrs Arnold which contain extracts from her husband's correspondence and related matters. These volumes are called "Mrs Arnold's Records of Dr Arnold's Correspondence 1825 to 1841", (The Records).

B. BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, AND JOURNALSNOTE:

The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.

- Adams. H.G. Wykehamica. 1878.
- (Aldrich. H.) Artis Logicae Compendium. Oxford, 1804.
- Anonymous. Lexicon Thucydidaem. 1824.
- .. Liber Scholasticus. 1829.
- Arbuthnot. A.G. Memories of Rugby and India. 1910.
- Archer. R.L. Secondary Education in the Nineteenth Century.
Cambridge, 1921 (reprint, 1937).
- Arnold. Thomas.
- Sermons:
- Sermons. 1829.
- Sermons, with an essay on the Right Interpretation and
Understanding of the Scriptures. vol. II, 2nd. ed., 1832.
- Two Sermons on the Interpretation of Prophecy, preached
in the Chapel of Rugby School. Oxford, 1839.
- Sermons. vol.III, 2nd. ed., 1844.
- Christian Life, its course, its hindrances, and its
helps. Sermons preached mostly in the Chapel of Rugby School. 3rd.
ed., 1844.
- Christian Life, its hopes, its fears, and its close.
Sermons preached mostly in the Chapel of Rugby School. 2nd. ed., 1845.

Sermons chiefly on the Interpretation of Scripture.

2nd. ed., 1845.

Sermons preached in the Chapel of Rugby School, with an address before Confirmation. New ed., 1861.

Other Theological Works:

The Christian Duty of granting the claims of The Roman Catholics, with a postscript in answer to The Letters Of The Rev. E.S.Faber. Oxford, 1829.

Principles of Church Reform. 1833.

Fragment on The Church; in which are contained appendices on the Same Subject. 2nd. ed., 1845.

Historical Works:

History of Rome. 3 vols., 1838-43.

History of the later Roman Commonwealth. 2 vols., 1845.

Introductory Lectures on Modern History. 5th. ed., 1860.

Classical Editions:

M. Tullius Ciceronis Verrinarum Libri Septem. Oxford, 1831. (The marginal summary is by Arnold).

The History of the Peloponnesian War, by Thucydides. 3 vols., Oxford, 1840-42.

Miscellaneous Works:

The Effects of distant Colonization on the Parent State;
A Prize Essay recited in the theatre at Oxford, June 7, 1815.
 (Oxford, 1815).

Quam Vim Habeat Ad Informandos Juvenum Animos Poetarum

Lectio? Oxford, (1817).

"A Non-Resident Member of Convocation", Address to the Members of Convocation, on the expediency of the proposed Statute. Oxford, 1824.

The Englishman's Register. May7, 1831 to July 2, 1831.

The Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Arnold, D.D. 1845.

Doctor Arnold as a Winchester Boy, Letters from College, 1807-1810. Winchester, 1932.

Articles and Reviews:

'De Rance, A Poem', British Critic. March, 1816.

'Wat Tyler. A Dramatic Poem', British Critic. May, 1817.

'Niebuhr. B.G., History of Rome: Wachsmuth. W., An inquiry into the early history of the Roman State: Creuxer. F., Sketch of Roman Antiquities.', Quarterly Review. vol. XXXII, 1825.

'Letters Of An Episcopalian', Edinburgh Review. vol. XLIV, 1826.

'Rugby School', The Quarterly Journal of Education. vol. VII, 1834.

'On The Discipline Of Public Schools', The Quarterly Journal of Education. vol. IX, 1835.

'The Oxford Malignants And Dr Hampden', Edinburgh Review. vol. LXIII, 1836.

Arnold. Thomas, Jr. Passages in a Wandering Life. 1900.

- Arnold-Forster. D. At War with the Smugglers. 1936.
- Bamford. T.W. 'Public School Town In The Nineteenth Century',
British Journal of Educational Studies. vol.6, 1957.
'Discipline at Rugby Under Arnold',
Educational Review. vol.10, 1957-8.
Thomas Arnold. 1960.
'The Prosperity of Public Schools, 1801-1850',
The Durham Research Review. vol.3, Durham, 1961.
'Public Schools And Social Class, 1801-1850',
The British Journal of Sociology. vol.12, 1961.
Rise of the Public Schools. 1967.
Thomas Arnold on Education. Cambridge, 1970.
- Barnard. H.C. A Short History of English Education from 1760-1944. 1949.
- Beavan. C. Report of Cases in Chancery argued in the Rolls
Court ... vol.1, 1840.
- Bertram. J. (ed.) New Zealand Letters of Thomas Arnold the Younger
with Further Letters from Van Diemen's Land and Letters of Arthur
Hugh Clough 1847-1851. Oxford, 1966.
- Bettinson. G.H. Rugby School. Birmingham, 1929.
- Bill. E.G.W. University Reform in Nineteenth-Century Oxford. Oxford, 1979.
- Bloxam. M.H. Rugby, The School and the Neighbourhood. 1889.
- Booth. J.B. Bits of Character - A Life of Henry Hall Dixon. 1936.
- Bradley. G.G. Recollections of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley. 1883.
- Buxton.J. & Williams.P. New College Oxford 1379-1979. Oxford, 1979.
- Campbell. R.J. Thomas Arnold. 1927.
- Carlisle.N. A Concise Description of the Endowed Grammar Schools
in England and Wales. 2 vols., 1818.

- Carpenter. L. Brief Notes on the Rev. Dr. Arnold's Principles of Church Reform. 1833.
- Chandos. J. Boys Together. 1984.
- Clarke. M.L. Greek Studies in England 1700-1830. Cambridge, 1945.
- .. Classical Education in Britain 1500-1900. Cambridge, 1959.
- (Clough. Mrs) The Poems and Prose Remains of Arthur Hugh Clough.
2 vols., 1869.
- Cockshutt. A.O.J. Truth to Life. 1974.
- Coleridge. G. Eton in The 'Seventies. 1912.
- Coleridge. J.T. A Memoir of the Rev. John Keble, M.A. 3rd. ed., 1870.
- Coleridge. Lord. This For Remembrance. 1925.
- Coplestone. E. A Reply to the Calumnies of the Edinburgh Review against Oxford, Containing an Account of the studies pursued in that University. Oxford, 1810.
- Cotton. S.A. (ed.) Memoirs of George Lynch Cotton, D.D. 1872.
- Cust. L. A History of Eton College. 1899.
- Custance. R. (ed.) Winchester College Sixth-Centenary Essays.
Oxford, 1982.
- Engel. A.J. From Clergyman to Don. Oxford. 1983.
- Findlay. J.J. Arnold of Rugby. Cambridge, 1897.
- Firth. J.D'E. Winchester College. Winchester, 1949.
- Fitch. Sir J. Thomas and Matthew Arnold and their influence on English Education. 1897.
- Forbes. G. The Liberal Anglican Ideal of History. Cambridge, 1952.
- Fowler. T. The History of Corpus Christi College. Oxford, 1893.
- Fox. G.T. A Memoir of the Rev. Henry Watson Fox. 1850.
- Fremantle. W.R. A Memoir of the Rev. Spencer Thornton. 1850.

- Goldsmith. O. The Grecian History, From the Earliest State to the Death of Alexander the Great. 1785.
- .. History From the Foundation of the City of Rome to the Destruction of the Western Empire. 1769.
- Gooch. G.P. History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century. 1928.
- (Gover. W.) 'Memories of Arnold and Rugby Sixty Years Ago',
The Parents' Review. 1895-6.
- Hare. A.J.C. Memorials of a Quiet Life. 2 vols., 1873.
- Hole. C. The Life of the Rev. & Ven. William Whitmarsh Phelps, M.A. 2 vols., 1871.
- Holgate. C.W. Winchester Long Rolls 1732-1812. Winchester, 1904.
- Honan. P. Matthew Arnold. A Life. 1981.
- Honey. J.R. de S. Tom Brown's Universe. 1977.
- Hope-Simpson. J.B. Rugby Since Arnold. 1967.
- Hughes. T. Memoir of a Brother. 1873.
- .. Tom Brown's Schooldays. New ed., 1874.
- Jardine. W. Memoir of H.E.Strickland. 1858.
- Ker. I. and Gornall. T. (eds.) The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman. vol., 1, Oxford, 1978.
- Lake. K. (ed.) Memorials of William Charles Lake 1819-1894. 1901.
- Leach. A.F. History of Warwick School. 1906.
- Leaflet. The. 1885, 1887.
- Liddon. H.P. The Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey. 4 vols., 1894.
- Lubbock. A. Memories of Eton and Etonians. 1899.
- McIntosh. P.C. Physical Education in-England since 1800. 1968.
- Mack. E.C. Public Schools and British Opinion, 1780-1860. 1938.
- Mack. E.C. and Armytage. W.H.G. Thomas Hughes: The Life of the Author of 'Tom Brown's Schooldays'. 1952.

- Mackay. D. Leinster. 'Old School Ties ... ', British Journal of Educational Studies. vol., 32, 1984.
- Mackay. T. The Reminiscences of Albert Pell. 1908.
- Martineau. J. Essays, Review and Addresses. vol., 1, 1890.
- Milner. J. The History of the Church of Christ. 5 vols., 1810.
- Mitchell. A.T. The Rugby School Register From April, 1675 to April, 1842. vol., 1, Rugby, 1901.
- Mitford. W. The History of Greece. 10 vols., 1835.
- Morrah. A.H. The Oxford Union 1823-1923. 1923.
- Mosheim. J.L. von. An Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern. 6 vols., 1806.
- Mozley. T. Reminiscences chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement. 2 vols., 1882.
- Mulhauser. F.L. (ed.) The Correspondence of Arthur Hugh Clough. 2 vols., Oxford, 1957.
- Munby. A.N.L. The Cult of the Autograph Letter in England. 1962.
- Nevill. R. Floreat Etona. 1911.
- Newsome. D. Godliness and Good Learning. 1961.
- Ogilvie. V. The English Public School. 1957.
- Ollard. R. An English Education. 1982.
- Oswell. W.E. William Cotton Oswell. 2 vols., 1900.
- Pantin. W.A. Oxford Life in Oxford Archives. Oxford, 1972.
- Paterson. Lt. Col. A New and Accurate Description of all the Principal Cross Roads in England and Wales. 1808.
- Pearson. C.H. Memorials. New York, 1900.
- Percival. A.C. Very Superior Men. 1973.
- Perrin. N. Dr Bowdler's Legacy. 1970.

- Poppo. E.F. Observationes Criticae in Thucydidem. 1819.
- Prothero. R.E. and Bradley. G.G. The Life and Correspondence of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley. 2 vols., 1893.
- Rannie. D.W. Oriel College. 1900.
- Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Revenues and Management of Certain Colleges and Schools and the Studies pursued and Instruction Given therein. 4 vols., 1864.
- Report Of The Proceedings Respecting Rugby School, Before The Right Hon. Lord Langdale, Master Of The Rolls, With His Lordship's Judgement Thereon. Rugby, 1839.
- Richards. G.C. and Shadwell. C.L. The Provosts and Fellows of Oriel College Oxford. Oxford, 1892.
- Rouse. W.H.D. A History of Rugby School. 1898.
- Rugbeian. An Old. Recollections of Rugby. 1848.
- Russell. B. Education and the Good Life. New York, 1926.
- Scott. P. 'The School and the Novel: Tom Brown's Schooldays', in The Victorian Public School, ed. B.Simon and I.Bradley, 1975.
- Selfe. R. Dr Arnold of Rugby 1889.
- Selfe. S. Chapters from the history of Rugby School together with notes on the characters and incidents depicted in Tom Brown's Schooldays. Rev. ed., Rugby, 1910.
- Selwyn. E.G. ed. 'Dr Arnold As A Winchester Boy', Theology. vols. XXIV, XXV, 1932.
- Simon. B. Studies in the History of Education, 1780-1870. 1964.
- Simon. B. and Bradley. I. (eds.) The Victorian Public School. 1975.
- Stanley. A.P. The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D. 6th. ed., 1846.

- Stedman. A.R. A History of Marlborough Grammar School. Devizes, 1945.
- Stephens. W.R.W. Memoir of Lord Hatherley. 2 vols., 1883.
- Sterry. W. Annals of The King's College Of Our Lady Of Eton
Beside Windsor. 1898.
- Strachey. L. Eminent Victorians. 1918.
- Tindal. N. A Guide to Classical Learning; or Polymetis Abridged.
1777.
- Trapp. J. Lectures on Poetry. 1742.
- Trevelyan, G.M. British History in the Nineteenth Century and
After; 1782-1919. 1965.
- Trevor. M. The Arnolds. 1973.
- Tristram. W. Outram. Coaching Days and Coaching Ways. 1893.
- Tuckwell. W. The Ancient Ways. 1893.
- .. Reminiscences of Oxford. 1900.
- .. Pre-Tractarian Oxford. 1909.
- Valpy. R. Delectus Sententiarum et Historiarum ad usum tironum
accommodatus. 1800.
- Vance. N. 'The Ideal of Manliness', in The Victorian Public
School, ed. B.Simon and I.Bradley, 1975.
- Ward. W.R. Victorian Oxford. 1965.
- Whitridge. A. Dr Arnold of Rugby. 1928.
- Wickham. H.L. and Cræmer. J.A. A Dissertation on the Passage of
Hannibal over the Alps. 1820.
- Willey. B. Nineteenth Century Studies: Coleridge to Matthew
Arnold. 1949.
- Williamson. E.L. Jr. The Liberalism of Thomas Arnold. Alabama,
1964.

- Williamson. E.L. Jr. 'Dr Arnold as a Literary Critic: two uncollected essays', Notes and Queries. December, 1961.
- Wilson. J. Poems. 2 vols., 1825.
- Woodward. F.J. The Doctor's Disciples. 1954.
- Worboise. E.J. The Life of Thomas Arnold, D.D. 1859.
- Wymer. N. Dr Arnold of Rugby. 1953.
- Yates. J. Thoughts on the Advancement of Academical Education in England. 1826.

C. GENERAL WORKS OF REFERENCE

- Murray. J.A.H. (ed.) A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. 10 vols., Oxford, 1908.
- Page. W. (ed.) The Victoria History of the County of Warwick. vol., 2, Oxford, 1965.
- Stephen. L. and Lee. S. Dictionary of National Biography. 1908.
- The Historical Register of the University of Oxford 1220-1900. Oxford, 1900.
- Ward. G.R.M. and Heywood. J. (eds.) Oxford University Statutes. 2 vols., 1844-1851.
- Oxford University Calendar. 1814.

D. NEWSPAPERS AND SCHOOL MAGAZINES

1. Northampton Herald, 19 January 1833, 2 February 1833, 23 February 1833, 9 March 1833, 16 March 1833, 30 March 1833, 28 November 1835, 26 December 1835, 23 January 1836, 23 April 1836,

Northampton Herald (cont.), 25 November 1837.

Northampton Mercury, 16 February 1833.

Salisbury Journal, December 1789; January 1790.

2. The Meteor, 25 June 1892.

The New Rugbeian, vol.2, no.6, 1860.

The Wykehamist, June 1895; July 1895.

E. BOOKSELLERS/AUTOGRAPH DEALERS CATALOGUES

Hoffman & Freeman Ltd., Sevenoaks, Kent:

Catalogue Number - 26.

Maggs Bros. Ltd., London:

Catalogue numbers - 894. 920. 941. 949. 954. 971.

Winifred A. Myers (Autographs) Ltd., London:

Catalogue Numbers - 1. 2. 3. 6. 8. 11.

John Wilson, Dealer in Autographs, Eynsham, Oxford:

Catalogue Number - 52.