

# *Arnold Studies: The Past Two Decades and Looking into the Future*

*Clinton Machann*

*I*n preparing to celebrate Matthew Arnold's 200<sup>th</sup> birthday, I have been reviving memories of coediting an essay collection with my friend and colleague Forrest D. Burt in the 1980s. *Matthew Arnold in His Time and Ours: Centenary Essays* (1988) memorializes Arnold on the centennial of his death, and it includes contributions by eminent Arnold scholars.<sup>1</sup> So now we move from death to birth, reminding ourselves that Arnold's reputation still lives today. My book *Matthew Arnold: A Literary Life* (1998) was an attempt to show how his poetry and prose grew out of his complex personal, social, and professional life (beginning with his relationship with his famous headmaster father Thomas Arnold), and how his critical reputation was built by early Arnold scholars, but through the years I have reported on and analyzed current Arnold scholarship as it has developed. It is important to look both at any famous author's life and reputation as it developed during his lifetime and in the years following his death, leading to the present; in the case of Arnold, with his multiple and fluctuating interests and his critics' responses, that is particularly true.

Arnold's career and his posthumous reputation are complicated in ways that make him the most elusive of the major Victorian writers. First, there is the divided nature of his literary career, the movement from poetry to cultural, social, and religious criticism. From the beginning, critics attempted to explain Arnold's "failure" to continue to devote himself to poetry (or introspective poetry) after 1853, and through the years they have

been drawn to compare and contrast the two aspects or phases of his literary career. Nearly everyone agrees that Arnold as a “man of letters” is a central figure in Victorian literature, yet his place in literary history is difficult to define. To some readers his persona as critical essayist appears to be distant from that as post-Romantic lyricist. Even in terms of his prose writings alone, however, it is difficult to generalize about his work, for in spite of his sometimes sweeping critical judgments and his focus on key concepts such as *criticism* and *culture*, he proudly called attention to his unsystematic approach as he extended literary criticism to cultural and political issues while avoiding obviously significant literary trends such as the rapid development of the novel. He helped to establish Wordsworth’s modern reputation but did not appreciate Shelley and had very little to say, for example, about Renaissance drama or eighteenth-century poetry.

Since the turn of the twenty-first century, Matthew Arnold scholars have been routinely referring to a decline in the number of critical studies devoted to him, but no one has seriously challenged his ranking as an eminent poet and the preeminent literary and cultural critic of the British Victorian period. In this essay I will briefly survey twenty-first-century Arnold scholarship and comment on recent critical trends, leading up to the present day. As part of a bicentennial commemoration, it is appropriate to look at his career and reputation as a whole, and some interesting studies of his poetry have been published in recent years, but my overall emphasis will be on his critical prose. Arnoldian concepts of criticism and culture remain central to current literary and cultural studies, even when there is no direct reference to Arnold or his works. Arnold’s identity as a Victorian white male may help to explain why he is ignored by current scholars who would be automatically inclined to label him as sexist and racist if they did mention him. But, more fundamentally, it is not only today’s “politically correct” attitude in academia but also Arnold’s broad and inclusive definition of criticism in “The Function of Criticism at the Present Time” that makes him “untouchable” to many: “a disinterested endeavor to learn and propagate the best that is known and thought in the world.” Arnold was an individualistic, some might say eccentric, scholar who was grounded in family and Oxford

University and fascinated by ancient and contemporary culture and religion, but who refused to identify himself with a particular party, movement, cult, or ideology. His search for "culture" is driven by independent thinking and intellectual curiosity. From our point of view, we can see that he helped prepare the way for pluralism and globalization, but he did not advocate what we would call "identity politics." Arnold is still relevant in an international context and deserves our further study.

My essay in this current collection is largely an expansion of my offering on Arnold in Laurence Mazzeno's 2014 collection, *Twenty-First Century Perspectives on Victorian Literature*, and that essay itself was largely built on my work in editing *NCP*'s special issue on Arnold in 2007, my compilation of *The Essential Matthew Arnold: An Annotated Bibliography of Major Modern Studies* (1993), and my annual review articles published in the journal *Victorian Poetry* (1994-2016). Those who have read my review articles in *VP* will understand that although I emphasized work on Arnold's poetry, I tried to cover all major Arnold scholarship, including work dealing exclusively with his prose. Given Arnold's lifelong interest in the genre of poetry, it cannot be ignored in any review of his work, but I will emphasize the prose in this essay, as I summarize his career from a modern perspective before moving into the critical response, beginning at the turn of the century.

### **Arnold's Career as a "Man of Letters"**

Although to some modern readers Arnold's persona as critical essayist appears to be distant from that as post-Romantic lyricist, even in terms of his prose writings alone, it is difficult to generalize about his work. However, several very important works of Arnold scholarship were published in the late 1990s and early 2000s, and a variety of critical studies continue to appear today. My purpose here is to briefly review the historical context of "The Function of Criticism," *Culture and Anarchy*, and other key Arnold texts for which scholars have demonstrated an interest through the years, before I review and comment on Arnold's critical reputation from the late twentieth century to the present.

In November 1860 as Oxford Professor of Poetry, Arnold gave a lecture entitled “On Translating Homer,” and what was intended to be one lecture grew into a series of three lectures, the last of which was presented in January 1861. These lectures are the bridge to the major essays in which he would fashion a new critical tradition in English. As a critic, Arnold does not use his public forum primarily to argue for and against particular doctrines or systems of thought. Instead, he attempts to express a certain way of looking at things that represents his true or “best” self and at least potentially appeals to the true or best selves of his audience. In the Homer lectures he began to develop the critical language that culminates a decade later in *Culture and Anarchy*, combining elements of social satire, journalism, religious sermon, philosophical dialogue, and literary lecture. In focusing on the role of the critic, Arnold said that “the critical perception of poetic truth,—is of all things the most volatile, elusive, and evanescent.” The critic of poetry “should have the finest tact, the nicest moderation, the most free, flexible, and elastic spirit imaginable” (*CPW* 1:174). This is recognizably the Arnold of *Essays in Criticism* and *Culture and Anarchy*, the prose classics of the 1860s that are still widely considered to be his most important literary productions.

Beginning with the series on Homer, nearly all of Arnold’s lectures were published initially as essays in journals. Avoiding the well-established and predictable journals such as the *Quarterly* and *Edinburgh*, he concentrated on new or renovated journals that were reaching out to new audiences more open to intellectual change. This expanding “higher journalism” was helping to bridge the distance between the discourse of cognoscenti and that of the popular press. Especially important for Arnold was the recently reorganized *Fraser’s Magazine*, under the editorship of Arnold’s old Oxford acquaintance J.A. Froude, as well as *Macmillan’s Magazine* and *Cornhill Magazine*, both of which had been launched in 1859. Arnold was not happy with the level of discourse in the English literary journals of his day, but he realized that they had become the chief source of intellectual influence in England. The development of his critical prose can be understood only in the context of the reviews and periodicals

that were a major force in shaping popular taste and ideas, even on the higher levels of literary culture.

Macmillan brought out *Essays in Criticism* in 1865, and what was to become the classic essay "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time" served as its introduction. Perhaps it is the single most important essay of its kind in Victorian literature. Drawing on his own powerful impressions of the *secular* side of John Henry Newman's legacy—the ideal of knowledge for its own sake—Arnold helped to lay the groundwork for disparate future developments such as late nineteenth-century Paterian aestheticism, early twentieth-century liberal humanism, and the late twentieth-century ascendancy of "criticism" over "literature" in academia. From the French critic Sainte-Beuve, Arnold adapted his central idea of disinterestedness. Characteristically, when Arnold finally gives his "definition" of criticism late in the essay, it is a very broad and inclusive one: "*a disinterested endeavor to learn and propagate the best that is known and thought in the world*" (CPW 3:283). *Essays in Criticism* was widely reviewed, and while many critics were positive about the *literary* criticism, they tended to be unhappy with the *social* criticism. They wondered why Arnold had to be so negative about English society and why he had not confined himself to literary matters, where his knowledge and authority were obvious. However, social criticism was not peripheral but central to his critical project. He did not limit himself to taste; his concern was with the totality of human experience as it was interpreted by a national culture. An aesthetic sense was important not primarily in itself but rather in its relation to knowledge and to religion.

After publishing *Essays in Criticism* in 1865, Arnold put aside literary criticism per se for a decade, but in June 1867 he delivered his final Oxford lecture, "Culture and Its Enemies," and this was the beginning of *Culture and Anarchy*. Although reluctant to define exactly what he means by "culture," it is clear that Arnold does not mean a precise body of knowledge about art but rather a psychological attitude of mental freedom, driven by the motive of intellectual curiosity. Arnold's fundamental egalitarianism is evident here. Culture "seeks to do away with

classes” and makes “the best that has been thought and known in the world current everywhere.” The “enemies” of culture are a “mechanical and material civilization” that stifles the inner life of the individual, an unsympathetic spirit of competition, and an “intense energetic absorption” in specialized pursuits (*CPW* 5:113). Later renamed “Sweetness and Light” as the first chapter of *Culture and Anarchy*, “Culture and Its Enemies” adapts Jonathan Swift’s metaphor of the bee from *The Battle of the Books*, making sweetness stand for beauty of character and light for intelligence, with the additional connotation of spiritual illumination. This was Arnold’s first unambiguous essay in social and political criticism, and his part in developing the modern usage of the term “culture,” which has become ubiquitous in literary and socio-political discourse, is one of his most important contributions as a man of letters, intimately tied to his own growth and development as a writer. At the heart of *Culture and Anarchy*, published as a book in 1869, is a tension between apolitical individualism and desire for community. In his poetry Arnold had explored the question of the individual’s authentic or true self and had implied that even though we assume it exists, it may be buried or cut off from ordinary consciousness. Now he equates the “best self” with “right reason.”

Arnold’s central ideas and reputation were somewhat controversial in his own day—especially in regard to the biblical or religious criticism to which he turned after *Culture and Anarchy*. His religious essays grow directly out of his writings about culture. His critique of the English Dissenters begins with “My Countrymen” in 1866, and he refers to St. Paul repeatedly in the essays of *Culture and Anarchy*. To Arnold, St. Paul represents the best of the Christian “Hebraic” tradition because, up to a point, he incorporated Hellenism, a free flow of consciousness, into his thinking about morality. The English Puritans, however, treated his teachings in a misleading, mechanical way, much like the mechanical way that Jews treated the Mosaic law in Paul’s day. In addition, Arnold wanted to challenge the Dissenters’ claim to the historical justification of their separation from the English Church. His line of thought led to *St. Paul and Protestantism* (1870), the first of his books to reach a second edition within

a single year, despite its controversial nature. Encouraged, Arnold began a new manuscript on "literature as it regards dogma," and Smith published it in 1873 as *Literature and Dogma*. Reaching a wider audience than any of his other books, Arnold's last substantial, original book of any kind was a "best seller" in an age of religious controversy. In it his term for God is "*the enduring power, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness*" (CPW 6:200). He followed it with *God and the Bible* (1875) and *Last Essays on Church and Religion* (1877). Arnold's concentrated study of the Bible as literature had a fundamental effect on his views about the status of poetry, and in the Preface to *Last Essays*, he announced another change of direction: "in returning to devote to literature, more strictly so-called, what remains to me of life and strength and leisure, I am returning, after all, to a field where work of the most important kind has now to be done, though indirectly, for religion." He believed that the essential transformation of religion could only be accomplished by applying the "literary" qualities of "flexibility, perceptiveness, and judgment" (CPW 8:148).

Arnold's introduction to Macmillan's 1879 edition of Wordsworth's poetry became one of his most important contributions to literary criticism, and other writing projects were important as well. His introduction to T. Humphry Ward's anthology *The English Poets*, later entitled "The Study of Poetry," contains some of his best known pronouncements about poetry and poets, and includes his extraordinary comment that "The strongest part of our religion to-day is its unconscious poetry" (CPW 9:161). At the same time, however, his essays on socio-political topics collected in his *Irish Essays* (1882) included his widely discussed views on Edmund Burke. Another important development in Arnold's career in the 1880s grew out of a kind of public debate he had with a formidable but amicable adversary, T.H. Huxley, the pre-eminent spokesman for science in Victorian England. The two men disagreed about the position of science in culture and education, and Arnold's "Literature and Science" lecture would prove to be popular with Arnold's audience in his American lecture tour of 1883-84. Other lectures would include commentary on American writers,

including Henry James, and Ralph Waldo Emerson. Arnold had an ambivalent attitude toward America, and his 1883-84 tour there was marked by hostile press coverage, though in the long run Arnold had a greater influence in America than any other British or European critic.

### **Critical Studies of Arnold**

In *Matthew Arnold: The Critical Legacy* (1999), Laurence W. Mazzeno offers a survey of the critical reception of Arnold's works up to the late twentieth century. Mazzeno's valuable account follows up on the work of Frederic Faverty, David DeLaura, Jacqueline E.M. Latham, Carl Dawson, John Pfordresher, and Sidney Coulling, among others, from the 1950s through the 1970s. He begins his survey with a chapter on "The Reputation of the Sage: 1849-1925," and follows up with "Arnold among the New Critics: 1925-1949," "Arnold's Reputation at Mid-Century: 1950-1959," "A New Wave of Arnoldians I: 1960-1969," "A New Wave of Arnoldians II: 1970-1979," and "Arnold and the Poststructuralists, 1980-1999." After the chronologically arranged chapters, Mazzeno adds a chapter on "The Critical Reception of Arnold's Religious Writings" and concluding comments on "The Critical Legacy." He generalizes that "even a cursory survey of Arnold criticism reveals the esteem in which he has been held by some of the greatest scholars of his own century and ours" although he acknowledges that in the late twentieth century a "growing sense that Arnold is no longer relevant pervades the commentary of poststructuralist critics" (136-37). Anyone interested in the history of Arnold criticism through the years should consult Mazzeno's work, and in a sense my own work is an attempt to extend his project.

I will begin with my own summary of trends in late twentieth-century criticism, which lay the groundwork for Arnold studies in the twenty-first century. In the 1980s, British critics influenced by Marxist ideology intensified what had already been a mid-century questioning of Arnold's position as a defender of liberal culture—and politics. Terry Eagleton in *Literary Theory* (1983) argued that Arnold had played a key role in the displacement of religion by "English literature" as a dominant instrument

of social control. Arnold's supposed patronizing or outright hostile attitude toward the working class was seen to be related to his paternalistic, authoritarian stance. Chris Baldick, in *The Social Mission of English Criticism, 1848-1932* (1983), also argued that Arnold's culture, so closely associated with the "humanities" discipline of literary studies, functioned as a means of ideological control. At the same time, other well-known developments in academia worked against the significance of Arnold as a "traditional" writer and thinker. The postmodernist critique of Arnold was devastating, and, for many feminist critics, Arnold was classified as one of the "dead white males."

In the 1990s some prominent American conservative intellectuals, including the historian Gertrude Himmelfarb, defended Arnold, praising him and other Victorians for their emphasis on individualism and moral issues. Samuel Lipman, who edited a new edition of *Culture and Anarchy* for Yale University Press, offered a strong argument for the continuing relevance of Arnold's version of culture (and some British Thatcherite conservative thinkers were attracted to this view as well). More subtle, however, was a cautious but consistent defense of Arnold by a few leftist academics and intellectuals, most prominently Stephan Collini, who emerged as one of the most influential British Arnold scholars in the 1980s and 1990s. In his 1988 book *Arnold*, he offered a strong argument for the continuing relevance of Arnold's version of culture, and in *Matthew Arnold: A Critical Portrait* (1994), he argued for a "cultural criticism" in the Arnold tradition. Collini expresses regret that his sympathetic portrait of Arnold had been misconstrued by those who did not understand that he did not necessarily agree with all of Arnold's "zealous champions" and had no "wish to defend all of Arnold's particular judgements or tastes" or sympathy with those who sought to appropriate Arnold in order to "add a historical veneer to an intransigent anti-modernism" (110). While taking care not to identify himself too closely with Arnold, Collini in a 2004 essay in *New Left Review* continued to argue for a "cultural criticism" in the Arnoldian tradition, one that "bring[s] into play the kinds of consideration that are uncongenial to, or habitually neglected by, those more

instrumental, pragmatic, aggressive processes which are nonetheless wholly necessary for running the world and getting its business done” (“On Variousness” 96). In emphasizing the significance of Arnold’s literary persona, tone, and *voice*, Collini is consistent with Arnold’s characteristically “disinterested,” “unsystematic” search for the “best ideas” without strict adherence to one’s political affiliations. Collini’s version of cultural criticism in the Arnoldian tradition was attacked by Francis Mulhern in his book *Culture/Metaculture* (2002) and in a subsequent series of exchanges with Collini in *New Left Review*.

Of course there were other late twentieth- and early twenty-first-century scholars with an interest in Arnold that went beyond what had become mainstream postmodernist academic generalizations about his associations with social élitism, sexism, and bourgeois hegemony, as we will see. At this point I want to point out scholarship fundamental to Arnold studies during this period. New editions of *Culture and Anarchy* along with other important Arnold essays appeared in 1993 (edited by Collini) and 1994 (edited by Samuel Lipman), indicating a significant contemporary interest in Arnold. There were two major book publications in 1996: the first volume of Cecil Y. Lang’s six-volume edition of *The Letters of Matthew Arnold* and Nicholas Murray’s new biography, *A Life of Matthew Arnold*. Lang’s second volume appeared in 1997. In the first two volumes of the correspondence, Arnold’s letters to family members, friends, and publishers furnished a great deal of background information about Arnold’s publications in his early career, as his books emerged from the give and take of critical dialogue in journals. Official correspondence related to his career as school inspector and his travels to France, Italy, Germany, and Switzerland to visit European schools also helps to illuminate his evolving ideas about education, and his close relationships with his sister Jane, brother Tom, and other family members are interesting in themselves. Murray’s biography is, along with Park Honan’s 1981 work, one of two full-scale biographies of Arnold. Murray is not sympathetic with what had become the commonplace treatment of Arnold’s “culture” and “humane letters” as politicized subordinating

forces used by ruling élites to portray their own ideas and values as positive and universal. In describing Arnold's debate with T.H. Huxley on the "literature and science" issue, he remarks that Arnold "could not have foreseen the intellectual uproar of the academy a century later as literary theory—rather than the natural sciences which, no doubt owing to Huxley's good influence, he always respected—began to attack the notion of humane letters, and even the person of Matthew Arnold himself as their representative figure, from within" (326).

In 1998 another biographical study appeared, Ian Hamilton's *A Gift Imprisoned: The Poetic Life of Matthew Arnold*. As the title suggests, this work focuses on Arnold's poetry, but of course, Hamilton must deal with Arnold's move to critical prose. A very significant 1997 publication is Donald D. Stone's critical study, *Communications with the Future: Matthew Arnold in Dialogue*. Stone boldly presents his study of "Arnold's dialogic temper—his openness to a variety of voices from past and present, from home and abroad" as well as "his recognition of the multiplicity of voices within each individual." This "dialogic temper" ties Arnold to classical tradition (through "his immersion in the Platonic dialogues") but it is also the key to Arnold's "continuing modernity" (1-2). Stone's method is to place Arnold "in the company of major figures, some of whom directly influenced or were influenced by him, others with whom he shared a common critical task" (9). In addition to Friedrich Nietzsche, these figures include Henry James, Charles-Augustin Sainte-Beuve, Ernest Renan, Michel Foucault, Hans-Georg Gadamer, William James, Richard Rorty, and John Dewey. Perhaps even more provocative than the inclusion of Nietzsche is that of Foucault, the darling of new historicists and other postmodernists but the *bête noire* of cultural conservatives who had claimed Arnold as one of their own. Mazzeno's "critical legacy" book was of course a major publication in 1999. Volumes of Lang's edition of letters continued to appear, with the final Volume 6 coming in 2001, a real milestone for Arnold studies at the beginning of the twenty-first century. In his preface Lang expresses his opinion that Arnold's correspondence as a whole "may well be the finest portrait of an age and of a person,

representing the main movements of mind and of events of nearly half a century and at the same time revealing the actual intimate life of the participant-observer, in any collection of English letters in the nineteenth century, possibly in existence" (xiv).

In her book *The Powers of Distance* (2001), Amanda Anderson's chapter on "Disinterestedness as a Vocation: Revisiting Matthew Arnold" analyzes Arnold's combination of aesthetic disinterestedness with critical reason, questioning what had become common assumptions that detachment is an illusory ideal or that it is always a concealed form of power and control. Another positive assessment of disinterestedness and cosmopolitanism challenging stereotypes about Arnold came from David Wayne Thomas, who in his 2004 book *Cultivating Victorians* makes the "surprising point" that the "individualist subjectivism" central to Arnold's thinking "stands at odds with his reputation today as an objective-minded precursor to an aestheticist impressionism ostensibly set up to oppose him" (38). Arnold's "cosmopolitanism" is also central to Christopher M. Keirstead's *Victorian Poetry, Europe, and the Challenge of Cosmopolitanism* (2011): "from the critical sidelines, Arnold would continue to press poets as he had pressed himself to fashion a more open intellectual engagement with the Continent and to sustain the genre's relevance to other kinds of border-crossing, whether social, economic, or political" (20). Kate Campbell's *Matthew Arnold*, published in 2008 by Northcote in its "Writers and Their Work" series, is focused on the critical work of Arnold up to the appearance of *Culture and Anarchy*. Her key concept is Arnold as "publicist." As a publicist, he promotes his central ideas about "criticism" and "culture," and, in spite of his ideal of "disinterestedness," he works for an activist agenda. "Culture and Its Enemies," his last lecture at Oxford, was in its published form his first unambiguous essay in social and political criticism. In writing this kind of criticism in the troubled times prior to the Second Reform Bill in 1867, Arnold was following the precedent of Thomas Carlyle. Campbell sees this as a positive development. Here is another way of putting Arnold's career in perspective: Christine Bolus-Reichert devotes a substantial

chapter to Arnold in her 2009 book *The Age of Eclecticism: Literature and Culture in Britain, 1815-1885*. She begins the chapter in this way: "It might seem perverse to make Matthew Arnold, that high priest of the highest of culture, into a representative for a literary middle way; but that is precisely how Arnold saw himself" (190).

In his 2010 article "'Poetry is the Reality': Matthew Arnold Tackles the Athletes of Logic (and Theory)," James Walter Caufield gives a compelling account of Arnold's shifting critical reputation through the years. Drawing on Arnold scholars such as Francis Mulhern, Isobel Armstrong, Tom Nairn, and Stefan Collini, he observes that "The general drift of Arnold criticism [...] from his own time until the inter-war period, largely figured him—[F.R.] Leavis notably excepted—as a spruce Athenaeum bon viveur who rather toyed with ideas than mastered them with rigorous systematicity" (238). Then he quotes Armstrong, who "said that 'one could argue that the Arnold we know did not exist before the 1930s, that he came into being as the construct of pre- and post-second world war liberals who were seeking an alternative to communism.'" This led to a caricature of Arnold by the New Left. Arnold's "views could be used in the service of an elite and oppressive high culture." It illustrates "the place that Hegel and Marx came to fill in some twentieth-century criticisms of Arnold, reprising in their way the roles that Mill, Comte, Bentham, or Darwin once played for Arnold's nineteenth-century critics" (239).

Arnold's complex influences on later literary figures with whom he differed in dramatic ways has been an interesting topic through the years. Two articles from 2015 illustrate this topic very well: "The Stephen Inheritance: Virginia Woolf and the Burden of the Arnoldian Critic," by Eleanor McNees, and "Devils, Souls and the Spectre of Matthew Arnold in Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray*," by Ilona Urquart. McNees points out that Woolf, like many of her contemporaries, sought to dissociate herself from Arnold's Victorian ideas, but in complex ways she in fact engaged in a kind of critical dialogue with him and was influenced by key ideas expressed by Arnold in works such as "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time" and "The Study of Poetry." However, for

Woolf the “literary legacies” of her father, Leslie Stephen, and her uncle, James Fitzjames Stephen, were associated with this process. McNees refers to the “sharp-edged literary and cultural debates between her barrister uncle, her father, and Matthew Arnold in the major periodicals of the Victorian period over the course of three decades” (120). There are various issues at play, but in general Arnold defended “the intellectual ‘sweetness and light’ of Oxford,” while Fitzjames and Leslie Stephen stood for “the more rational, if prosaic, Cambridge” (123). In her essay, Urquart refers to the widely accepted view that Wilde, in “The Critic as Artist,” rejects Arnold’s idea that literary criticism inspires works of art and supports the idea that criticism itself is a creative art form. She argues that Wilde’s only novel goes beyond the “function of criticism” issue and responds to “Arnold’s claim that ‘most of what now passes with us for religion and philosophy will be replaced by poetry’” (15). In fact “Wilde’s aesthetic ethics continually force him into the paradoxical position of moralizing against moralizing in literature” and “In disagreeing with Arnold’s view that poetry or other forms of art will replace religion in guiding moral conduct, Wilde paradoxically writes a narrative that is didactically anti-didactic” (23).

Philosophical pessimism in Arnold’s poetry, a prominent theme in modern criticism, is stressed in Alan Grob’s influential study *A Longing Like Despair* (2002), in which Arnold is compared to the philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer. Grob finds in Arnold “a disposition to look beyond nature to a determining metaphysical agency for the ultimate explanation of the common suffering that all phenomenal existence, nature as well as man, must endure” (30). He acknowledges that it is only Arnold the poet, not Arnold the cultural critic, who can be meaningfully labeled a philosophical pessimist. However, Grob implies that in spite of his metaphysical shift, Arnold in his later career came to accept his earlier poetry of pessimism on its own terms and understood that its fundamental pessimism was the key to its being placed in the main line of modern development. The implicit contrast between Arnold’s “pessimistic” poems and “optimistic” critical essays had been central to Arnold criticism

through the years but this assumption was challenged by Caufield in *Overcoming Matthew Arnold* (2012). Caufield, offering a new assessment of Arnold, argues that pessimism and "renouncement" are keys to understanding Arnold's prose as well as his poetry, leading to a new sense of unity in his divided career. He traces the dominant views of Arnold among his contemporary Victorians and the interwar critics such as T.S. Eliot before moving forward to the critics associated with the British New Left and, finally, more recent theorists associated with postcolonialism and cultural studies. Caufield helps us better understand important issues related to intuition, subjectivity, "human nature," and moral judgment, and he expresses an appreciation for Arnold's religious essays.

This picks up on a perhaps surprising trend in Arnold studies in the past two decades: an increased interest in religious issues. In *The Broad Church: A Biography of a Movement* (2003) Tod E. Jones includes a chapter on "Matthew Arnold and the Oxford Decade," in which he describes key relationships between Arnold and people he met during his years at Balliol College, Oxford, that profoundly influenced the development of his religious thought. In addition to his friend Arthur Hugh Clough and tutor Benjamin Jowett, there were William Charles Lake, Benjamin Collins Brodies, Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, Richard Duke Coleridge, Frederick Temple, Theodore Walrond, and Matthew's brother Thomas (Tom) Arnold. In his essay "Of Philistines and Puritans: Matthew Arnold's Construction of Puritanism" (2003) John Netland shows how Arnold appealed to traditionally negative stereotypes of "intellectual narrowness" in his treatment of the Puritans as he attempted to reconstruct a "post-theological" Church of England. Netland's discussion of Arnold's associations with both High Church Tractarians and the latitudinarian wing of the Broad Church can be usefully read in conjunction with that of Jones. Also dealing with the development of Arnold's religious ideas in the 1870s, Edward Alexander's 2002 article "Dr. Arnold, Matthew Arnold, and the Jews" traces Arnold's largely positive attitude toward the Jews and his increasing interest in Judaism. Of course the "Jewish" topic reminds us of Arnold's formulation of the dichotomy between "Hebraism"

and “Hellenism,” and Alan T. Levenson’s recent article in *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, “Invidious Distinctions: Hebraism and Hellenism in Heinrich Heine and Matthew Arnold” (2020), helps us to understand this central concept in Arnold studies. According to Levenson, his “threefold goal” in his essay consists of the following:

first, to engage in a close reading of two crucial, oft-cited paragraphs from Heinrich Heine’s *Ludwig Borne* and Matthew Arnold’s *Culture and Anarchy*—passages that did much to give prominence to the false notion of a transhistorical antinomy of Hebrew and Hellene; second, to demonstrate in both authors a decided slide away from a pro-Hellenic starting point, both within these works and in later works, toward an ambivalent philosemitism (which in each case problematizes their own Hebraic-Hellenic dichotomy); and third, to return to the problematic dimensions of this dichotomy, both by acknowledging its enduring appeal to authors since the nineteenth century and by suggesting some guidelines for a more legitimate and productive approach. (105)

Clearly, this is a must-read for anyone interested in the topic.

Returning to the broader topic of “Arnold and religion” and looking back a decade, a particularly substantial twenty-first-century article related to religion is Sebastian Lecourt’s “Matthew Arnold and Religion’s Cosmopolitan Histories” (2010) in which he analyzes the complex relationships between religion and culture, with an emphasis on disinterestedness, cosmopolitanism, and political ideology. He concludes that “Arnold’s essays on Culture remain such a potent site for discussing the role of religion in liberal thought because, in their unsystematic way, they register both the contradictory dangers that liberalism can see religion as embodying and the contradictory strategies by which it may construct religion as something the state can incorporate” (484). Arnold attempted to deal with inherent contradictions that he found in the cultural discourse of his day. Lecourt’s ideas can be compared to Daniel S. Malachuk’s

observations in his book *Perfection, the State, and Victorian Liberalism* (2005). In the Arnoldian tradition, Malachuk resists what he sees as the misguided modern tendency in liberal thought to divorce politics from morality. More specifically related to the academic study of religion is Joe Phelan's "The Language of Criticism in Arnold's Religious Writings" (2007), in which he shows that Arnold anticipated the work of I.A. Richards, William Empson, and other members of the "Cambridge School" in the first half of the twentieth century, arguing that Arnold's critical methods are still relevant in the field of philosophical aesthetics.

It is not surprising that some of the studies of Arnold and religion focus on his poetry, and often they deal with Arnold's association with Christian theology and cultural traditions. For example, a recent article, "Matthew Arnold, the Oxford Movement, and the 'Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse'" by J. Russell Perkin (published in *Christianity & Literature*, 2020), argues that Arnold's poem reflects conflicted ideas about Christianity in terms of the Oxford Movement and the Roman Catholic revival, while acknowledging Arnold's continuing general influence in literary and cultural studies today. A few earlier examples of the various articles related to Arnold and religious issues include Matthew Lagrone, "The Anglican Imagination of Matthew Arnold" (2010); J. Jeffrey Franklin, "The Influences of Buddhism and Comparative Religion on Matthew Arnold" (2012); Rhian Williams, "'Divine Liquidness of Diction ... Divine Fluidity of Movement': Reading Poetry After Matthew Arnold and the Higher Biblical Criticism" (2013); Geoffrey Nash, "Aryan and Semite in Ernest Renan's and Matthew Arnold's Quest for the Religion of Modernity" (2014); and Daniel A. Dombrowski, "The 'In Between' Status of Liberal Religion: Matthew Arnold's Influence on Charles Hartshorne" (2018).

Scanning other topics under the broad categories of literature and culture related to Arnold studies in the past decade, the variety is amazing: Helen Fulton, "Matthew Arnold and the Canon of Medieval Welsh Studies" (2012); David Russell, "Teaching Tact: Matthew Arnold on Education" (2013); Shannon Gilstrap, "Charting Culture: Cartography and

National Identity in Matthew Arnold's 'Ordnance Maps'" (2013); Douglas Thorpe, "'No Woman More': Matthew Arnold and the Loss of the Feminine" (2015); Kate Thomas, "Matthew Arnold's Diet" (2016); Ted Striphas, "Known-unknowns: Matthew Arnold, F.R. Leavis, and the Government of Culture" (2017); Simon Demetriou, "Space, Time, and Culture: Sorèze, Lacordaire, and Matthew Arnold's Conceptualisation of Culture in *A French Eton*" (2019); Alastair Morrison, "Beyond Bad Faith: Cultural Criticism and Instrumentality" (2019); and Eid Mohamed, "Culture and Society during Revolutionary Transformation: Rereading Matthew Arnold and Antonio Gramsci in the Context of the Arab Spring's Cultural Production" (2020). I do not have space enough to discuss these articles in any detail, but I will make a few comments about the ones by Striphas (2017) and Mohamed (2020), each of which is typical of the tendency to discuss Arnold in terms of his comparison to predecessors, contemporaries, or later critics or admirers. Striphas treats Arnold and Leavis (1895-1978) separately, but with some comments about their similarities. After referring to *Culture and Anarchy*, one of Striphas's main points is that "*culture* is best imagined not as an antithetical principle in Arnold's work, but as a word whose purpose is to mediate multiple tensions he perceived to exist in British society" (145). In his view, Arnold in fact argued for "the subsumption of at least some of the State functions under the auspices of culture." However, Striphas makes it clear that his essay "should not be construed as advocating for a wholesale return to the ways of Arnold and Leavis. Instead it is an argument for a more careful, contextual reading (and rereading) of the words they used, and an invitation to ask: what, if anything, is worth salvaging there?" (161). Mohamed argues that "Arnold and Gramsci, in search of the highest possible standards, are at the same time revolutionary and élitist in their views. Arnold, while traditional, authoritarian and politically conservative, made calls for the long-term levelling of British society. Likewise, Gramsci [1891-1937] managed to be both a communist revolutionary and an élitist, believing socialist revolution to be the highest (élite) standard to which humanity was called" (168).

Although I have referred to some titles in this essay that are related to the topic of poetry in general or Arnold's own poetry, because of my emphasis on Arnold's concepts of culture and criticism and the genre of critical prose I have passed over much in recent Arnold studies that is focused on Arnold's ideas about poetry and particular poems by Arnold. Here are just a few additional examples from the past decade: Tracy Miller, "What Remains: Matthew Arnold's Poetics of Place and the Victorian Elegy" (2012); Ivo Klaver, "Charles Lyell's Churches and the Erosion of Faith in Matthew Arnold's 'Dover Beach'" (2014); Barbara Barrow, "Deep Time and Epic Time in Alfred Tennyson's *In Memoriam* (1850), Matthew Arnold's *Empedocles on Etna* (1852), and Mathilde Blind's *The Ascent of Man* (1889)" (2018); Rose Sneyd, "Matthew Arnold and Giacomo Leopardi: Modernist Lyric Poetics and Stoic Pessimism in 'Dover Beach'" (2018); and Uğur Ergin Küçükboyacı, "Broken Ritualization and the Dynamics of In-betweenness in Matthew Arnold's 'Empedocles on Etna'" (2020). Arnold's narrative poems are still being discussed in a variety of contexts, and surely his classic lyric "Dover Beach"—one of the most famous poems in Victorian poetry—will continue to be discussed in the future. I will just add one reference to a short article (published while I was writing this essay) in which Arnold is compared to his contemporary friend, the poet Arthur Hugh Clough (1819-1861): "Devout Doubters" by Paul Dean (2021).

### Closing Remarks

Although the term "cultural studies" is still familiar, the term "cancel culture" may be more relevant to the current reception of Arnold's works. By many he is automatically assigned to the "old school" of English literature and, much larger than that, the tradition of "Western Civilization" that must be set aside in this new age of progressive thought. This is paradoxical because, as we have seen, Arnold himself was a very innovative thinker, dealing with new ideas in a changing world, shifting his opinions about current issues while recognizing that the human animal in basic ways has not changed a great deal in the past few thousand years. That is, ancient

classical literature—part of “the best that has been known and thought in the world”—is still interesting and relevant, and mankind still has a need to deal with deep emotional feelings and religious beliefs in spite of empiricism. Arnold pioneered the genre of critical prose, which is now ubiquitous on the Internet as well as in print, although very few writers indeed seem to have met his requirement of “disinterestedness.” Arnold may have been born two hundred years ago, but that is recent in the grand scheme of things. In spite of startling advances in technology, people have not changed all that much, and in addition to seeing him as an important literary writer and intellectual in the Victorian historical setting, we should see him still as an interesting model of a “critical thinker” today. Resistant to “identity politics,” some of his critical insights are likely to be verified and expanded in the future by more sophisticated studies of human nature.

*Texas A&M University*

#### **Note**

<sup>1</sup> Contributors include David J. DeLaura, Ruth apRoberts, James C. Livingston, Sidney Coulling, Mary G. McBride, Laurence W. Mazzeno and Allan Lefcowitz, Linda Ray Pratt, Patrick J. McCarthy, Allan C. Dooley, John P. Farrell, Leonard Orr, Sandra Segan Wheeler, Park Honan, Robert H. Super, and William B. Thesing. This collection grew out of a conference held on the campus of Texas A&M University in 1985.

#### **Works Cited**

- Adams, Amanda. “The Uses of Distinction: Matthew Arnold and American Literary Realism.” *American Literary Realism*, Vol. 37, No. 1 (2004), 37-49.
- Alexander, Edward. “Dr. Arnold, Matthew Arnold, and the Jews.” *Judaism*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (Spring 2002), 214-25.
- Anderson, Amanda. *The Powers of Distance: Cosmopolitanism and the Cultivation of Detachment*. Princeton UP, 2001.
- Arnold, Matthew. *The Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold*. Edited by R.H. Super. U of Michigan P, 1960-1977. 11 Vols.

- . *Culture and Anarchy*. Edited by Stefan Collini. Cambridge UP, 1993.
- . *Culture and Anarchy*. Edited by Samuel Lipman. Yale UP, 1994.
- . *The Letters of Matthew Arnold*. Edited by Cecil Y. Lang. UP of Virginia, 1996-2001. 6 Vols.
- Baldick, Chris. *The Social Mission of English Criticism, 1848-1932*. Clarendon P, 1983.
- Barrow, Barbara. "Deep Time and Epic Time in Alfred Tennyson's *In Memoriam* (1850), Matthew Arnold's *Empedocles on Etna* (1852), and Mathilde Blind's *The Ascent of Man* (1889)." *Nineteenth-Century Contexts*, Vol. 40, No. 2 (2018), 115-31.
- Behlman, Lee. "The Victorian Marcus Aurelius: Mill, Arnold and the Appeal of the Quasi-Christian." *Journal of Victorian Culture*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (2010), 1-24.
- Bolus-Reichert, Christine. *The Age of Eclecticism: Literature and Culture in Britain, 1815-1885*. Ohio State UP, 2009.
- Campbell, Kate. "Matthew Arnold and Publicity: A Modern Critic as Journalist." *Journalism, Literature and Modernity: From Hazlitt to Modernism*. Edited by Kate Campbell. Edinburgh UP, 2000. 91-120.
- . "W.E. Gladstone, W.T. Stead, Matthew Arnold and a New Journalism." *Victorian Periodicals Review*, Vol. 36, No. 1 (2003), 20-40.
- . *Matthew Arnold*. Northcote House, 2008.
- Caufield, James Walter. "'Poetry is the Reality': Matthew Arnold Tackles the Athletes of Logic (and Theory)." *Cambridge Quarterly*, Vol. 34, No. 7 (2010), 237-59.
- . *Overcoming Matthew Arnold: Ethics in Culture and Criticism*. Ashgate, 2012.
- Collini, Stefan. *Arnold*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988.
- . *Matthew Arnold: A Critical Portrait*. Clarendon P, 1994.
- . "Culture Talk." *New Left Review*, Vol. 7 (January-February 2001), 43-53.
- . "Defending Cultural Criticism." *New Left Review*, Vol. 18 (November-December 2002), 73-97.

- . “On Variousness: And on Persuasion.” *New Left Review*, Vol. 27 (May-June 2004), 65-97.
- Dean, Paul. “Devout Doubters.” *New Criterion*, Vol. 37, No. 9 (March 2021), <https://newcriterion.com/issues/2021/3/devout-doubters>.
- Demetriou, Simon. “Space, Time, and Culture: Sorèze, Lacordaire, and Matthew Arnold’s Conceptualisation of Culture in *A French Eton*.” *Victoriographies: A Journal of Nineteenth-Century Writing, 1790-1914*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (2019), 55-69.
- Dombrowski, Daniel A. “The ‘In Between’ Status of Liberal Religion: Matthew Arnold’s Influence on Charles Hartshorne.” *Christian Scholar’s Review*, Vol. 48, No.1 (2018), 17-29.
- Douglass, Paul. “T.S. Eliot’s European Tradition: The Roles of Dante Alighieri and Matthew Arnold.” *T.S. Eliot, Dante, and the Idea of Europe*. Edited by Paul Douglass. Cambridge Scholars P, 2011. 133-144.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. U of Minnesota P, 1983.
- Ferretter, Luke. “Matthew Arnold.” *Oxford Handbook of English Literature and Theology*. Edited by Andrew Haas, David Jasper, and Elisabeth Jay. Oxford UP, 2007. 639-654
- Franklin, J. Jeffrey. “The Influences of Buddhism and Comparative Religion on Matthew Arnold.” *Literature Compass*, Vol. 3, No. 11 (2012), 813-25.
- Fulton, Helen. “Matthew Arnold and the Canon of Medieval Welsh Literature.” *Review of English Studies*, Vol. 63, No. 259 (2011), 204-24.
- Gilstrap, Shannon. “Charting Culture: Cartography and National Identity in Matthew Arnold’s ‘Ordnance Maps.’” *Victorian Review*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (Spring 2013), 87-100.
- Grob, Alan. *A Longing Like Despair: Arnold’s Poetry of Pessimism*. U of Delaware P, 2002.
- Hamilton, Ian. *A Gift Imprisoned: The Poetic Life of Matthew Arnold*. Bloomsbury, 1998.
- Harrison, Antony H. *The Cultural Production of Matthew Arnold*. Ohio UP, 2009.

- Hentea, Marius. "The Silence of the Last Poet: Matthew Arnold, T.S. Eliot, and the Value of the Classic." *Modern Language Quarterly*, Vol. 71, No. 3 (2010), 297-328.
- Honan, Park. *Matthew Arnold: A Life*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1981.
- Jones, Tod E. *The Broad Church: A Biography of a Movement*. Lexington Books, 2003.
- Keirstead, Christopher M. *Victorian Poetry, Europe, and the Challenge of Cosmopolitanism*. Ohio State UP, 2011.
- Klaver, Ivo. "Charles Lyell's Churches and the Erosion of Faith in Matthew Arnold's 'Dover Beach.'" *Linguae & Revista di Lingue e Culture Moderne*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (2014), 21-34.
- Küçükboyacı, Uğur Ergin. "Broken Ritualization and the Dynamics of In-betweenness in Matthew Arnold's 'Empedocles on Etna.'" *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (2020), 861-81.
- Lagrone, Matthew. "The Anglican Imagination of Matthew Arnold." *Journal of Anglican Studies*, Vol. 8, No.2 (2010), 200-218.
- Lecourt, Sebastian. "Matthew Arnold and Religion's Cosmopolitan Histories." *Victorian Literature and Culture*, Vol. 38, No. 2 (2010), 467-87.
- Leerssen, Joep. "Englishness, Ethnicity, and Matthew Arnold." *Journal of English Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (2006), 63-79.
- Levenson, Alan T. "Invidious Distinctions: Hebraism and Hellenism in Heinrich Heine and Matthew Arnold." *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. 110, No. 1 (2020), 102-26.
- Lewis, Michael D. "Pictures of Revolutionary Reform in Carlyle, Arnold, and *Punch*." *Nineteenth-Century Contexts*, Vol. 34, No. 5 (November 2012), 533-52.
- Lustig, T.J. "James, Arnold, 'Culture,' and 'Modernity'; or, a Tale of Two Dachshunds." *Cambridge Quarterly*, Vol. 37, No. 1 (2008), 164-93.
- Machann, Clinton. *The Essential Matthew Arnold: An Annotated Bibliography of Major Modern Studies*. G.K. Hall, 1993.

- . *Matthew Arnold: A Literary Life*. Macmillan, 1998.
- . “Introduction: Arnold’s Prose Today.” *Nineteenth-Century Prose*, Vol. 34, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall 2007), 9-23.
- , and Forrest D. Burt. “Preface.” *Matthew Arnold in His Time and Ours: Centenary Essays*. Edited by Clinton Machann and Forrest D. Burt. UP of Virginia, 1988. xi-xvi.
- Malachuk, Daniel S. *Perfection, the State, and Victorian Liberalism*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Martin, Amy. *Alter-Nations*. Ohio State UP, 2012.
- Mazzeno, Laurence W. *Matthew Arnold: The Critical Legacy*. Camden House, 1999.
- , editor. *Twenty-First Century Perspectives on Victorian Literature*. Rowman and Littlefield, 2014.
- McCulloch, Gary. “Education and the Middle Classes: The Case of the English Grammar Schools, 1868-1944.” *History of Education*, Vol. 35, No. 6 (2006), 689-704.
- McNees, Eleanor. “The Stephen Inheritance: Virginia Woolf and the Burden of the Arnoldian Critic.” *Cambridge Quarterly*, Vol. 44, No. 2 (2015), 119-45.
- Miller, Tracy. “What Remains: Matthew Arnold’s Poetics of Place and the Victorian Elegy.” *Victorian Poetry*, Vol. 50, No. 2 (2012), 147-65.
- Mohamed, Eid. “Culture and Society during Revolutionary Transformation: Rereading Matthew Arnold and Antonio Gramsci in the Context of the Arab Spring’s Cultural Production.” *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (2020), 150-68.
- Morrison, Alastair. “Beyond Bad Faith: Cultural Criticism and Instrumentality.” *Criticism*, Vol. 61, No. 2 (2019), 167-89.
- Mulhern, Francis. *Culture/Metaculture*. Routledge, 2002.
- . “Beyond Metaculture.” *New Left Review*, Vol. 16 (July-August 2002), 86-104.
- . “What is Cultural Criticism?” *New Left Review*, Vol. 23 (September-October 2003), 35-49.
- Murray, Nicholas. *A Life of Matthew Arnold*. St. Martin’s, 1996.

- Nash, Geoffrey. "Aryan and Semite in Ernest Renan's and Matthew Arnold's Quest for the Religion of Modernity." *Religion and Literature*, Vol. 46, No. 1 (2014), 25-50.
- Netland, John. "Of Philistines and Puritans: Matthew Arnold's Construction of Puritanism." *Puritanism and Its Discontents*. Edited by Laura Lunger Knoppers. U of Delaware P, 2003. 67-82.
- Nicholls, Angus. "Scientific Literary Criticism in the Work of Matthew Arnold and William Dilthey." *Comparative Critical Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (2011), 7-31.
- Norberg, Peter. "Finding an Audience for *Clarel* in Matthew Arnold's *Essays in Criticism*." *Leviathan: A Journal of Melville Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (2004), 35-54.
- Novak, Bruce. "Humanizing Democracy: Matthew Arnold's Nineteenth-Century Call for a Common, Higher, Educative Pursuit of Happiness and Its Relevance to a Twenty-First Century Democratic Life." *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 39 (2002), 593-637.
- . "'National Standards' vs the Free Standards of Culture: Matthew Arnold's *Culture and Anarchy* and Contemporary Educational Philistinism." *Philosophy of Education Yearbook*, 2003. 376-383.
- Perkin, J. Russell. "Matthew Arnold, the Oxford Movement, and the 'Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse.'" *Christianity and Literature*, Vol. 65, No. 2 (2016), 131-50.
- Phelan, Joe. "The Language of Criticism in Arnold's Religious Writings." *Nineteenth-Century Prose*, Vol. 34, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall 2007), 191-209.
- Pratt, Linda Ray. "Passionate Reporting: Arnold on Elementary Schools, Teachers, and Children." *Nineteenth-Century Prose*, Vol. 34, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall 2007), 25-57.
- Raine, Craig. *T.S. Eliot*. Oxford UP, 2006.
- Russell, David. "Teaching Tact: Matthew Arnold on Education." *Raritan*, Vol. 32, No. 2 (2014), 122-39.
- Sansom, Steve. "'The Regrets Which Darken Last Days': Final Years of the Matthew Arnold-George Smalley Connection." *Nineteenth-Century Prose*, Vol. 35, No. 2 (2008), 133-62.

- Sneyd, Rose. "Matthew Arnold and Giacomo Leopardi: Modernist Lyric Poetics and Stoic Pessimism in 'Dover Beach.'" *Victorian Poetry*, Vol. 56, No. 4 (Winter 2018), 455-75.
- Stone, Donald D. *Communications with the Future: Matthew Arnold in Dialogue*. U of Michigan P, 1997.
- Striphas, Ted. "Known-unknowns: Matthew Arnold, F.R. Leavis, and the Government of Culture." *Cultural Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 1 (2017), 143-63.
- Thomas, David Wayne. *Cultivating Victorians: Liberal Culture and the Aesthetic*. U of Pennsylvania P, 2004.
- Thomas, Kate. "Matthew Arnold's Diet." *Victorian Literature and Culture*, Vol. 44 (2016), 1-18.
- Thorpe, Douglas. "'No Woman More': Matthew Arnold and the Loss of the Feminine." *Victorian Review*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (1990), 8-23.
- Urquart, Ilona. "Devils, Souls and the Spectre of Matthew Arnold in Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray*." *Australian Journal of Victorian Studies*, Vol. 20, No. 2 (2015), 19-27.
- Wallace, Nathan. "Matthew Arnold, Edmund Burke, and Irish Reconciliation." *Prose Studies*, Vol. 34, No. 3 (2012), 197-223.
- White, Paul. "Ministers of Culture: Arnold, Huxley and Liberal Anglican Reform of Learning." *History of Science*, Vol. 43 (2005), 115-38.
- Wilkes, Joanne. "Mary Ward as Critic of Matthew Arnold." *Women's Writing*, Vol. 18, No. 4 (2011), 453-67.
- Williams, Rhian. "'Divine Liquidness of Diction ... Divine Fluidity of Movement': Reading Poetry After Matthew Arnold and the Higher Biblical Criticism." *Literature and Theology*, Vol. 27, No. 3 (2013), 313-29.

