

or two he won prizes for Latin and English Essays. He became a fellow of Oriel, then the home of a brilliant set of young scholars, Wheatley, Keble, Hawkins, Hampden and others. Of the friendships he then formed he afterwards wrote: "The benefits which I have received from my Oxford friendships have been so invaluable, as relating to points of the highest importance, that it is impossible for me ever to forget them, or to cease to look upon them as the greatest blessings I have ever enjoyed in life."

In the olden times, the fellows of colleges were all bachelors, therefore, when in 1829 Arnold married, he resigned his fellowship, and accepting a small curacy in a small village on the banks of the Thames, he devoted himself partly to the work of a parish priest of the Anglican Church, and partly to private tuition of a small number of young men preparing for the Universities. He at once displayed those characteristic qualities as a schoolmaster to which I have already alluded. One of his pupils at Laleham, who afterwards became Professor of Political Economy at Oxford, Mr. Bonamy Price, writes that: "The most remarkable thing that struck me at once on joining the Laleham circle was the wonderful healthiness of love and feeling which prevailed in it. . . . Arnold's great power as a private tutor resided in this, that he gave such intense earnestness to life. Every pupil was made to feel that there was a work for him to do, that his *happiness* as well as his duty lay in doing that work well."

For seven years Arnold continued his quiet but busy life at Laleham. His parochial duties were not heavy, but they were conscientiously performed. He always sympathized with the poor and the humbler class

of society. He was also engaged in literary tasks. But what was of deepest import to him, at this time, was the influence exerted over his mind by the study of Niebuhr's history of Rome, which introduced him to the critical method of studying history, and to the writings of German scholars. Perhaps this will be the best point at which to say a word or two of Arnold as an historian. You are aware of the fact that he wrote a history of Rome, and that in the year 1842 he was Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford, in which capacity he unfortunately only delivered one course of lectures. It is from these lectures that we discover Arnold's conception of history. "The general idea of history," he says, "seems to be that it is the biography of society. It does not appear to me to be history at all, but simply biography, unless it finds in the persons who are its subject something of a common purpose, the accomplishment of which is the object of their common life. History is to this common life of many, what biography is to the life of an individual." History he held had in the past been beguiled from her proper business, of describing the life of a commonwealth, and had worked itself to the record of the lives of kings or of governments.

This idea of history is no doubt familiar to us all since Green wrote his *Short History of the English People*, but in the year 1842 it was new, and it has proved fruitful. He believed that every nation had some end to which it was consciously or unconsciously moving, and that one object of the study of history was the discovery of that end. He divided a nation's history into two parts, its external and its internal. In its internal history it manifested its normal principles,