Beyond Impediments to Empedocles: Notes Toward a Post-Postmodern Liberal Education

W. L. PREHN
Independent Scholar

Abstract: This essay is about a problem for which one solution is a certain unique kind of scholastic community. The author argues that the rationalism that is at once effect and cause of the imbalance in Western culture and in our education can be successfully overcome with a school model created two hundred years ago. Part I presents the problem and discusses a few of those who saw the problem clearly. Part II is a brief description of a historically-rooted alternative to the status quo in the North Atlantic world.

Keywords: Virtue, Liberal education, Transcendentals, Rationalism, Commercial culture, Faith, Christianity, Incarnation, Grace, Modernity, Postmodernity, Secularism, Brain Hemispheres, Culture.

> "Two extravagances: to exclude Reason, to admit only Reason."—Blaise Pascal, *Pensées*
>
> "All things are double."—*Ecclesiasticus*, 42.25, an epigraph for Bishop Butler's *Analogy of Religion* (1736)

PART I: THE PROBLEM–AN IMBALANCE IN WESTERN CULTURE

In 1921, the Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford published an article on education. Gilbert Murray (1866-1957) was invited by R. W. Livingstone (1880-1960), the first-ever "professor of education" in the university, to contribute to a collection of essays entitled *The Legacy of Greece*. It is obvious in his *Legacy* chapter that Murray was concerned that education in the early twentieth century was less and less providing the means for students to apprehend what he believed was indispensable to an education worthy of the name: "eternal values."

Murray did not wish to be misunderstood. His essay was not an argument for mandatory classical study. In fact, Murray voted against such a requirement when it came before the university faculty a few years before. For a century and more, there had been "utilitarian" attacks on the traditional—i.e. classical—curriculum, but Murray's essay was not a response to the boosters of "useful knowledge". He had another motive.

Murray's objective in "The Value of Greece to the Future of the World" was to simply use examples from the

resources he knew best to make the point that "eternal values" are definitely imparted to a person when the greatest products of human artifice and ingenuity are diligently studied. If the mystic is correct that "heart speaketh unto heart", it is reasonable for the classical scholar to believe that the "permanent" parts of a truly fine work of human making can mysteriously enter into the human nature of other persons.[1] Murray believed that the acquisition of these eternal verities is an end in itself. If the values or principles are irreducible and foundational, we need not, in his view, consider that there is something beyond them or that we should look for anything else to better situate us in our search for meaning and fulfilment.

It is startling that Murray uses Euclid's geometry to make his point. Murray of course knew that many aspects of Euclid's geometry are "progressive" knowledge, and that progressive knowledge becomes obsolete. Such scientific knowledge is indispensable for a season, then becomes dated when new knowledge replaces it. Clearly a portion of Euclid's geometry was superseded by 1921, because knowledge had progressed beyond it. Yet Murray shows how even Euclid's ancient geometry contains comely features and beautiful dynamics. These "eternal values" can be gained through committed study.

Murray also used the Venus de Milo and Homer's *Iliad* to make his point. The student can sit or stand before the classic sculpture created in the second century BC. The student can take up his or her notebook reserved for rational descriptions of world-class art, use instrumental reason to observe it, think on it, then write about its appearance, dimensions, effects, and so on. But Murray insists that something else is happening to the student all along: He or she is *moved* by it. What moves us as we experience a classic work of art? In any case, the observer *experiences* some quality in the sculpture which goes well beyond rational description, and this experience mysteriously includes the eternal value of beauty.

It is obvious that Murray was anxious about curricula and pedagogy in his time. It was increasingly geared to always-changing progressive knowledge. Hence, he thought it very important to ask the question of how well the emergent orthodoxy in schools would give students the educational experience wherein progressive *and* fixed knowledge are acquired. The good, the beautiful, the true, the one: such durable objects do not progress and evolve, even if our comprehension of them does develop cumulatively. They are never unimportant. The religiously agnostic Murray considered them to be eternal.

That liberal knowledge, and the eternal verities especially, are ends in themselves is one of the very principles of the liberal education as most advocates conceive it. The doctrine is seldom departed from, even today when liberal education is in hasty retreat. John Henry Newman (1801-1890) wrote in the *Idea of a University*:

> That alone is liberal knowledge which stands on its own pretensions, which is independent of sequel, expects no complement, refuses to be *informed* (as it is called) by an end, or absorbed into any art, in order duly to present itself to our contemplation (Newman 1976, I.v.4).

The late Jaroslav Pelikan glosses on the Newman quotation by urging that too much utilitarianism in education is actually "a threat to utility", and he uses several paragraphs to illustrate the difference between real knowledge and mere information (Pelikan 1992, pp. 34-35). Pelikan, Newman, and Murray certainly knew the work of Joseph Butler (1692-1752), one of the greatest thinkers of the eighteenth century, who advised, "Of education, information is the least part" (Butler 1745). The idea is also evoked by Henry John Newbolt in *The Twymans*, his *roman à clef* about Clifton under headmaster John Percival in the 1860s. In the novel, a boy's guardian arrives to withdraw him from the school. When asked why this must happen, the guardian explains to the house-master that he wants the boy to get a "practical" and "modern" education. "Useful information" is what the boy should have. The house-master is very courteous to and patient with the guardian as he enthusiastically rehearses the benefits of modern, manly training. At last, the house-master replies, "For information, you purchase a text-book; for education, you live in a society" (Newbolt 1911, p. 90).

Murray and all the contributors to *The Legacy of Greece* were concerned that educational policy-makers and institutional administrators might inadvertently expunge learning's very heart. They knew what

every sensible educator in the history of the world knows: that some non-rational (or let us say *supra*-rational) aspect of the mind can indeed give us a knowledge that no other part of the mind can deliver. It is "the light by which we see light" (*Psalm* 36.9).[2] Such an education is the most practical of all, for it frees the mind and makes a person "intensely interested in life and full of hope, trying in every direction for that excellence which the Greeks called *areté* [virtue], and guided by some peculiar instinct toward Temperance and Beauty (Murray 1921, p. 19).

Such an education is never done all at once. It is a most involved occupation. Leisure is required, and many years of time allotted just for this purpose. Considerable patience is required of both student and teacher. The liberal education is about neither calculable production nor academic episodes but veritable peregrinations through other times and places. Getting to know other *personalities*, living and dead, is crucial. Thus Murray:

> The things that we have called eternal, the things of the spirit and the imagination, always seem to lie more in a process than in a result, and can only be reached and enjoyed by somehow going through the process again. If the value of a particular walk lies in the scenery, you do not get that value by taking a short cut or using a fast motor-car (Murray 1921, p. 7).

Goodness and greatness; eternal verities; values durable across generations and centuries; liberty *for* and not only liberty *from*—these were the priorities of Murray, Livingstone, and the other distinguished scholars who contributed to *The Legacy of Greece* published a century ago. Murray clearly wanted the democratization of education to result in a *complete* education for everyone. He did not want children and youth to be robbed of the opportunity to experience the qualities, insights, and tools that make life worth living. Training and specialization can come later in a person's life. This world-renown Regius Professor was no "elitist". He only wanted *the best* education for every child and youth in the land. He had a real "faith" (of sorts) in the education that had delivered countless benefits to the individual and to society for centuries. He was confident that children and youth can gain such an education *if* the right scholastic circumstances are established for them and if the necessary school *environment* is bravely created and sedulously maintained.

What Causes the Imbalance in North Atlantic Culture?

Murray, Livingstone, and so many others recognized long ago what one present-day sage names "the barbaric functionalizing of education" (Williams 2023). Some of the most learned and wise educators in the world feared the worst and hoped for the best, but their side of the moon was growing quickly dark.[3] As they published luminous books on the soundest ways to educate the young, schools and universities on both sides of the Atlantic were very far gone along the path of educating the instrumental reason and leaving the tuition of all the other aspects of human nature in a truly haphazard state. It is increasingly obvious that the modus vivendi in modern, progressive education is at root ideological; it is based on a very late-coming assumption that *reality* is by definition what can be seen, thought, touched, felt, smelt, tasted, and measured. In this ideology, *Homo sapiens* is reducible to his rational faculty and his appetites.

What happened? It is extremely tempting (but we must resist the temptation) to make the "rationalism", mentioned already here and there, the cause of our Western imbalance. It is true that the emphasis on instrumental reason and its needs and tools is the great preoccupation of North Atlantic society, if not of the entire Western world, and that this form of rationalism or over-emphasis on reason is the most obvious problem with our schools. But such a plan would require that we demonstrate how an *effect* is a *cause*, which is nonsense.

To make rationalism or science or technology the cause of the Western imbalance would require a rehearsal of the history, science, and philosophy that tendentiously impugns the character of some of the greatest women and men of Western civilization, and this would lead to a condemnation of the West itself.

Imperfect as we are, we Westerners are not all bad. Honest science and good philosophy can never be a bad thing. It never hurts to "get at" reality. Francis Bacon, Descartes, Leibniz, Locke, Hume, Kant, Fichte, and Hegel, no less than Comte, Bentham, Mill, Marx, Russell, Wittgenstein, the British analytical philosophers, and the quantum heads and nuclear gurus, cannot be held to account for our cultural out-of-whack-ness. The cause is something else, something as pervasive and yet "invisible" as the air we breathe.

If poets are the "antennae of the race" (Ezra Pound), then we can trust that Blake, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Goethe, and other strongly right-brained prophets likely gave us *accurate* pictures of a seismic change occurring in front of their eyes. At the end of the first quarter of the twenty-first century, we take the changed culture for granted. We cannot easily conceive of a culture without burning-hot business, steady production of consumables, and *technic* applied to every aspect of life. But contemporaries watched it appear more suddenly than we who are used to it have supposed.

In two works of profound explanatory power summarizing two centuries of social science and discourse, the moral philosopher Charles Taylor uses the phrase "commercial culture" to establish an idea of the powerful cultural formation of which we are a part.[4] Historian Neil McKendrick writes that just the twenty-five years between 1750 and 1775 brought "as great a change in the lifestyle of the population as was brought about by the Neolithic revolution in agriculture of 8,000 BC" (McKendrick 2018, p. xii). This was a pan-Atlantic disruption of culture. The peoples, cultures, and economies of the entire Atlantic basin were soon sliding into the vortex of a spider's web. The extensiveness of the web can be illustrated almost randomly. For instance, the data assembled by historian Stuart Bruchy shows how closely woven was the warp and woof of the pan-Atlantic fiber industry. In the late 1790s, fifty-six million pounds of cotton were imported by British mill-owners from various warm-weather countries; by 1850, this datum was 660 million pounds. In 1843, eighty-five percent of British textile cotton was grown in and exported from the American South. In the same year, fifty percent of England's export economy was the popular cotton fabric produced in textile mills. This fabric was softer than wool, easily dyed, and inexpensive (Bruchy 1967, pp. 7-17). A similarly deep and complex Atlantic network obtained in the sugar industry. Everyone, everywhere, was associated with this North Atlantic system. It shaped them all and still does.

William Blake's "dark Satanic mills" may have been a nightmare, but they were not a fantasy. The change was colossal. The new situation suddenly appeared as a storm in the daylight. If Wordsworth thought that "the world is too much us", he was not meaning to be quaint. We are used to the heat in this kitchen, but Wordsworth was alarmed in 1807.

The work of another able poet, Matthew Arnold (1822-1888), is especially important to us because he was an astute critic of commercial culture in the mid-nineteenth century anglophone world. This gifted essayist, poet, and school inspector not only spoke to many in the pan-Atlantic Victorian world; he believed it was his calling to speak *for* them. Arnold longed deeply for *wholeness* and *completeness* for himself and for his society. His native sensitivity equipped him to sniff out rationalism, which also worried him.[5]

Arnold's *Empedocles on Etna* (1835) was a poetic drama the author knew fell far short of artistic perfection, but for Arnold, Empedocles was and remained a vital symbol of intelligence, learning, culture, balance, harmony, and human "totality". The poet suggests that Empedocles had an attitude we might adopt. We too ought to look more often for the *Both-And* instead of the rationalist's *Either-Or*. Merely aiming for "totality", as Arnold called it, improves any person's life.

In the poem, Empedocles teaches his pupil Pausanias that, if he would be a true disciple, he must "be neither Saint nor Sophist led, but be a man." The problem is that the Sophists—i.e. facile thinkers and materialists—have "got empire in our schools" but the Saints appear to be afraid of life. The Victorian reader was supposed to know that Empedocles spent his life showing how a single thing is related to all other things, each thing arising from one of the primal elements—earth, air, water, fire—or various combinations of the same. But the old Greco-Sicilian philosopher laments the one problem he never solved: What is the primal element from which mind and thought arise and are related to the world? Empedocles admits that he cannot figure it out. The question points to transcendental Mind and eternal Thought (topics Aristotle and

Plotinus pondered). These are realities beyond the ken of a man dedicated to the doctrine of *sola ratio*; so, despairing, Empedocles puts an end to himself.

Arnold saw a parallel between Victorian England and the world Empedocles faced in the fifth century BC. Change was fast and constant. Business was good. The young were being well prepared by Sophists for success in commercial life, which does not always require virtue as traditionally understood. In terms of religious change, it is ironic that Arnold saw faith receding at a time when its outward manifestation—stupendous new church buildings, for example, and convents of nuns in the Church of England!—could not have been more impressive. But it is the calling of prophets to see below the surface of things. If Arnold wished to see how high culture might become the means by which his contemporaries and he could move across the abyss of disintegrating (in his mind) Western civilization, I submit that this program was an attempt at remediation rather than replacement by a perceptive person more pragmatic than sometimes supposed.

Arnold's *Culture and Anarchy* (1869) impressed a few of his peers and infuriated many. It has often been said that the cultural unity of the West engendered by Christianity was destroyed by modern knowledge; hence Arnold's great desideratum was to work with others to create a new unifying force he called "culture."

This interpretation of Arnold's agenda is partly true and (likely) partly propaganda. DeLaura astutely saw that the central point of Arnold's contrast of "Hebrew" and "Hellene" in *Culture and Anarchy* was "the Victorian phase of one of the great recurrent 'myths' of European history: the conflict of Apollo and Christ, Rome and Jerusalem, intelligence and belief, the secular and the sacred impulses of society" (DeLaura 1969, p. xvii). In his "heterodox" studies of Christianity and the Bible, Arnold not only failed to purge Christianity of its putatively impossible doctrines, but he failed to purge Christianity from himself. DeLaura therefore proposes that Arnold's real objective was to figure out a way to retain "those qualities of mind, emotion, and imagination which have defined what it has meant to be fully 'human' in the European past" (DeLaura 1969, p. xviii). Hence his program to have the public consider "the best that has been thought and said" (Arnold 1869, *passim*). Gilbert Murray wanted the same outcome but was post-religious.

The condition of North Atlantic culture experienced negatively by the sensitive thinkers and writers mentioned above can be historized. There was a time when it was not. What we are calling commercial culture *emerged* at a particular time under certain conditions, and these conditions too can be historicized and have been. The entire thing was historically contingent. It was not surprising, neither was it inevitable. It may well be that entrepreneurialism based on available discoverable resources, free-trade, and capital-sparked economics are as old as the human race (I believe they are), but capital*ism* as the engine of unlimited consumption (and vice versa)—this is something different. Like scientism and moralism, it is a wholly modern phenomenon. It was firmly in place by the year 1800, if not earlier. It grew into a more elaborate system in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. At the end of the first quarter of the twenty-first century, we are only waiting for Han Solo to put his hand on the throttle of this merry-go-round and push it forward.

To assume that the status quo we know is what "Western civilization" is by definition is to ignore meaningful data derived at once from scholarship (historical and socio-scientific), the poets and artists, and religious tradition. The phenomenon was caused by neither modern science, nor superstars of the "Age of Reason", nor PoMo *philosophes*, nor sado-nuclear engineers, nor Wall Street and City "capitalists", nor Mrs. O'Leary's cow. Rather, the problem was caused by *ourselves*—our appetites, our fears, and our deathless mimetic impulses.

Rationalism

Rationalism is "produce" from the garden of modern commercial culture. Once produced, it can be consumed or worked to good effect back into the soil. We like the way it tastes. We see how it can work for us. We want more of it. In turn, rationalism bellows air into the machine. The massive economic change in the West (especially after 1750) naturally altered old ways of life. We might then see rationalism as one of the "new matrix of modern attitudes" which accompany commercial culture (Appleby 2011, p. 139). Such "modern attitudes" and virtues are adaptations allowing human beings to "fit" the modern commercial culture.

Since one point of this article is to assert that rationalism has ruined our schools in the North Atlantic world, we must now hasten to more concrete definitions of rationalism. There are too many. 'Rationalism' can denote the good use of reason *contra* allowing our emotions to rule us. Rationalism can mean the assumption that *a priori* ideas in the mind are the best foundation of real and lasting knowledge (thus Descartes, Leibniz, Wolff, *et al*.). In his classic essay "Rationalism in Politics" (1947), Oakeshott's 'rationalism' is reductionism and the bureaucratic oversimplifications that suck life out of a social groups or society. My reading of Montaigne is that his rationalism is a healthy skepticism serving as an amulet against believing *too much*. More germane to the present essay is rationalism as preoccupation with the human rational faculty and its needs and tools. This appears to be the first purpose or mission of most schools and universities in the Western world. I believe Gilbert Murray would have liked this definition, just as he would deplore the terrible situation to which it refers.

I have another definition of *rationalism* which I have derived from the extant writings of two who are crucial to this essay, John Henry Newman (1801-1890) and William Augustus Muhlenberg (1796-1877). I propose that rationalism is *the inordinate self-reliance of a being possessed of reason*.

Self-reliance is a virtue, not a vice. However, just as counter-Enlightenment thinkers saw that all the wonderful goods of the Enlightenment can morph into their opposites (e.g. experimental science can become *scientism* and liberty can half-life into mere license and selfish individualism), so the good and crucial modern virtues of self-reliance, self-sufficiency, hard work, rational application, *etc*., can devolve into *vices*. The smart-thinking person's vice is *rationalism*.

Modern virtues such as self-reliance were the appropriate adaptative responses of colonists, pioneers, settlers, farmers, town and village citizens, and agriculturalists rising into the middle class, and of middle-class folk who wished to rise higher in the sacred chain of being. Anticipating welcome returns on their labor, their anxiety, and their prayers, such people developed new ways to face the fairly harsh and fast-moving world they met every day, whether in the industrializing "free market" mother country or in New World wildernesses, Asian forests, or African vastnesses. It is only natural that the requisite moral virtues took up residence in the command center of the mind. Rationalism as a rational soul's *inordinate self-reliance* was thus a predictable development in the West. It is a problem.[6]

In the increasingly competitive North Atlantic system, being tough-minded and correct, projecting confidence and absolute accuracy, giving others the impression that one cannot be mistaken, the need to be mathematically perfect in one's counting, calculations, and relationships, and the intense pressure to never wander off from the herd: these opened the door to what I am calling rationalism. In the altogether new environment that obtained in the North Atlantic world after about 1800, it would have been most unusual and perhaps impossible for educators to fail to see their duty and to ensure that their schools were tooled up to produce just the kind of children and youth for such a "real world".

The thesis gains corroboration from a perhaps unlikely source: brain science. It is easy to see rationalism as we have defined it as a clear indication of "left brain dominance" in the Western world. Iain McGilchrist is a literary scholar turned neuroscientist. (He thus embodies the *beau ideal* of the proffered educational program sketched in Part II, below.) For about twenty-five years, Dr. McGilchrist has reported "the war of the hemispheres" from the front (so to speak). He shows in his work how the left hemisphere has "usurped" the right hemisphere's preordained right to rule the human person. Think *left* for calculation

and *right* for making sense of it all. Both are necessary. Each has its role in all thinking. McGilchrist has lately averred that an imbalance in the Western brain goes far to explain our "predicament" (McGilchrist 2024). A physician would never believe that modern attitudes, modern science, and modern institutions have not brought a great deal of good to persons and peoples, but McGilchrist wants us to know about, and acknowledge, and do something about the less than spectacular effects of the dominant culture.

Using a story from Nietzsche, McGilchrist compares the left hemisphere of the brain to the "emissary" of the king who cleverly convinces loyal subjects out in the provinces that he is in fact the king and they should obey his commands. The emissary is the left brain. While teaching English literature at Oxford and working as a literary critic McGilchrist noticed that too much rational application destroys a work of art. Deep analysis often *prevents* students from experiencing the very qualities the poet or the painter hoped to give others when he made the work of art. In *The Master and His Emissary*, McGilchrist writes that:

> Many important aspects of experience, those that the right hemisphere is particularly well equipped to deal with—our passions, our sense of humor, all metaphoric and symbolic understanding (and with it the metaphoric and symbolic nature of art), all religious sense, all imaginative and intuitive processes—are *denatured* by becoming the objects of focused attention [left brain], which renders them explicit, therefore mechanical, lifeless. The value of the left hemisphere is precisely in making *explicit*, but this is a staging post, an intermediate level of the "processing" of experience, never the starting point or end point, never the deepest, or the final level. The relationship between the hemispheres is therefore highly significant for the type of world we find ourselves living in (McGilchrist 2009, slide 294).

McGilchrist writes in his recent two-volume opus that "the brain's left hemisphere is designed to help us apprehend—and thus manipulate—the world; the right hemisphere, to comprehend it—to see it all for what it is" (McGilchrist 2021, slide 339). The left hemisphere, intended always for a servant, "makes a very poor master" (McGilchrist 2021, slide 1271).

While the science backing McGilchrist's musings on large questions is state-of-the-art and granite solid, the use to which he puts the science is in places speculative and is already controversial. It is a full-bore contestation of modern rationalist culture. He admits this and welcomes the dialogue. By all accounts he is an unpretentious, humble, and authentically scientific person. Good questions do not alarm him in the least.

Rationalism as the rational creature's *inordinate self-reliance*, which is a moral imbalance, fits hand in glove with McGilchrist's proposal that left-hemisphere dominance is a major problem in the Western world. McGilchrist observes that a world dominated by the left hemisphere "would become a heap of data bits", its only meaning coming "through its capacity to be used" (McGilchrist 2024). McGilchrist deepens our understanding of how commercial culture gave rise to rationalism and how both have a lot to do with the out-of-whack-ness of the West.

It is impossible that such a strong cultural imbalance would not be characteristic of schools and educational programs throughout the North Atlantic world. An increasing number of parents on both sides of the Atlantic are dissatisfied with the schooling their children and youth are getting. Many thoughtful persons have had a hunch that something is amiss in our schools and colleges. Some tacitly embrace the dominant rationalism of the age and only want schools—private as well as public—wherein the STEM or other sorts of technical curricula are a larger portion of the program, are better funded and more ably administered, and are more justly and consistently offered. But likewise, a growing number of parents are demanding much more out of schools than the cultivation of the instrumental reason and the development of the tools and accoutrements of the "left-hemisphere" of the brain. What follows is a brief description of a kind of school that once thrived in the United States and can with adequate backing do so again.

PART II: ONE SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM

William Augustus Muhlenberg (1796-1877) never did brain research and would have only wondered at many of the propositions offered in the paragraphs above. There is evidence that, were his sensibility and intellect not ballasted by Christian convictions, ideas, and practices, he might have given himself to his "left-hemisphere". He hailed from an admired and patriotic family of Philadelphians who were adept parliamentarians, naturalists, clergy, and major generals. Muhlenberg believed his school-making venture was exceedingly practical.

But he did see the imbalance, smelled the rat in rationalism, and decried both under the rubric of "Mammon". He was exceptionally learned, but he lived prior to the time when Tönnies, Weber, Geertz, Charles Taylor, *et al*., provided concepts and vocabulary to explicate the world. His mission in education was indeed a direct assault on rationalism and the cultural imbalance whence rationalism comes. His close acquaintance with the sermons, articles, and tracts of John Henry Newman and like-minded writers only confirmed his suspicion—way back in the 1820s—that concentration on the light provided by the instrumental reason would eventually eclipse the tuition of other important aspects of human nature in American schools. Muhlenberg feared the power of "Mammon". He hated the way it pulled on children and adolescents. He decried the emerging market culture as culturally decadent and morally repugnant. He didn't use the word but would have heartily agreed that the market culture was already hegemonic in the United States. This is clear in the prospectus he published in 1928 to attract patrons to his new school at Flushing, New York. On the first page of *The Application of Christianity to Education*, he wrote:

> The progress of Education which distinguishes the present age is confined chiefly to its intellectual and physical departments. Improvement in moral respects is not unknown, but it is slow and to the mind of Christianity far from being radical. The system of our schools needs to be materially reformed (Muhlenberg, henceforth WAM 1828, p. 1).

Eight years later, when he laid the cornerstone for St. Paul's College and Grammar School at College Point, one mile north of Flushing, Muhlenberg reiterated that his school would not raise a sail to catch the *Zeitgeist* but would be, like the Flushing Institute, counter cultural. "If knowledge is power, then with every increase of knowledge there should be additional security for the right direction of that increase of power" (WAM 1836). This motive and message stuck to the ribs of the Muhlenbergian school men. Over five decades later, Henry Augustus Coit (1830-1895), one of Muhlenberg's most successful school-making disciples, remarked in a national news magazine, "When one faculty of the mind is inordinately used and developed, the result is very like the excessive development of some member or organ of the body" (Coit 1891, p. 10). Overplay leads directly to imbalance.

Before sketching *The Thing*, it is important to state right up front that the language I am constrained to use to describe Muhlenberg's school-making mission is not in every case the language he would have used: Yet I hasten to say that almost all of his scholastic heirs, upon whose extant literary remains we very much depend, did and do use this vocabulary and discourse to articulate the phenomenon Muhlenberg set in motion.[7] Muhlenberg and his companions created eleven schools in six states.

Explaining the phenomenon of Muhlenberg's scholastic projects and those of his protégés is not a simple matter. It is very true that the 1828 prospectus listed eight "principles", but extant sources show that he had moved well beyond these principles by 1831. The solid principles remained but became stepping-stones into a deeper understanding of the unfolding vision and practical life of the schools. They learned, grew, compared notes, and swapped personnel. Their philosophy and practice gained depth and momentum by trial and error. The Doctor was the pioneer, and his disciples the perfecters, of a new kind of American school. Great and life-giving institutions do not mature overnight.[8]

Muhlenberg was an exact contemporary of Horace Mann (1796-1859), leader of the common school movement in the United States. Typical of most Protestant clergy in America, Muhlenberg was an enthusi-

astic booster of the new common schools. As a very young man, he was elected a director of the first public school district in his hometown of Philadelphia. He founded the second public district in Lancaster and served as its superintendent while also serving as a pastor of the local Episcopal parish.

In 1826, Muhlenberg walked away from public education. Seeing that religion in the schools would eventually become lowest-common-denominator, which made sense if a religiously diverse population would be educated together in the same schools, he worried that the souls of children and youth would be neglected during all those hours spent in school. A reform-minded person anyway, Muhlenberg decided that this developing situation would not do at all. He did not believe that the typical American academy was any better. Less than humane pedagogical practices and a woefully dated understanding of the nature and needs of children obtained in these proud old schools up and down the Atlantic seaboard. Hence, Muhlenberg decided to start his own school by which he would educate youth his way.

In the spring of 1826, Muhlenberg sailed for Europe. He wanted to investigate up close several innovative schools attracting international attention, notably the remarkable schools established by Pestalozzi and von Fellenberg. He was welcomed by school leaders. He took notes. He critiqued the schools, noting pros and cons. As he imagined the tight-knit community he would establish, he was mindful that an American school must have a republican ethos while maintaining the crucial principle that there is but *one authority* in the school, the principal or headmaster.

Departing the Alps, Muhlenberg was not encouraged by what he found across the channel. He thought the great old English schools impressive but too much wed to old ways. Thomas Arnold (1795-1842) had not yet been elected headmaster of Rugby; so Muhlenberg did not meet any school leader given to reform. Muhlenberg wished to see exactly how the Christian faith could be combined with the traditionally best education in the world. He was loath to say he had found what he was looking for. Something rather new was required. Well-studied and well-versed, W.A. Muhlenberg returned to America and began planning.

The Muhlenberg-Type Church School: A Sketch

The balance of this essay is dedicated to sketching the superstructure and some of the sinews of Muhlenburg's scholastic vision and practice. Muhlenberg's two school projects were deeply considered, comprehensive attempts to overcome every sort of lopsided, unbalanced, and excuse-making secular approach to teaching and learning. While Muhlenberg received in Philadelphia a superlative and full-blooded liberal education, he knew that every school in America could be improved. Muhlenberg's Church school concept was fleshed out in the work of four principal disciples between 1828 and 1865. With Muhlenberg in command until 1845, these educators together made an ambitious and successful national school-making movement yielding eleven schools in six states.[9] To educate *the whole person* to excellence: this was their definition of the liberal education.

Any scholarly description of the Muhlenberg-type school necessarily involves extant sources produced by or associated with Muhlenberg's four principal disciples. It was they who took "the Doctor's" *beau ideal* and developed it in time, space, and at least five different American regions. Please note that mine is *an interpretation* of the phenomenon from the perspective of one living 197 years after Muhlenberg founded the Flushing Institute. As an educator who hoped to carry on the vision of Muhlenberg and company, *mutatis mutandis*, I feel the liberty to use my own philosophical language and theological vocabulary to "unpack" and expose the ideas, ways, and means of the remarkable schools established by Muhlenberg and his heirs. This approach makes it much easier to persuade the reader that this sort of school is a compelling model for our own time.

The High Aim

"Academic excellence", intellectual prowess, and teenagers creating new knowledge by spending all day indoors: These were never the objective of Muhlenberg and his protégés. They aimed *above* "academic excel-

lence" and got it in the bargain. Their high-aim philosophy made *Virtue* in the Christian sense of the word the Target of education. *Character* is a useful word in this context but does not quite suffice as a synonym of Virtue as these Christian educators defined it (see two sections below). This might be regarded as common sense. If the long-bow archer is ambitious to hit the bull's eye far away and down the course, she or he must *aim high*. This was the number-one point of the schools: to hit the target that is Virtue—with the capital 'V'. Since such a mission requires that *every part* of human nature be considered, addressed, exercised, challenged, refined, honed, rehearsed, and, in a word, *educated*, Muhlenberg and his heirs had to conceive, create, and maintain unique school communities that could do the job. Perhaps it is rationalism that causes us to be quite surprised to learn that the schools committed to this high-aim philosophy got remarkable *academic* results. Muhlenberg's high-aim philosophy was not derived from the attractive idealism of the ancients. Its source was the New Testament. "Seek first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness", said Jesus, "and all these other things will be added to it" (*Matthew* 6.13). One of the best ways to understand the entire project of Muhlenberg and company is to use a quotation from C. S. Lewis: "Aim at Heaven and you will get earth 'thrown in'; aim at earth, and you will get neither" (Lewis 1952, p. 73).

Christianity and the Perennial Philosophy of Education

The Muhlenbergians were Christian school folk who refused to replace Virtue as the first purpose of education, so they had to marry Christianity to the perennial philosophy of education in the West. Their commitment to the classical curriculum—at least until midway through the twentieth century—is an outward and visible sign of this marriage. What I call the perennial philosophy is 2,500 years old at least. Put simply, this very traditional education makes *Virtue* the first purpose or goal of education, as stated above. From even before the days of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, *et al*., the ancient sages defined Virtue as "general human excellence", skill or proficiency at being human as such. The Sophists made a lot of money teaching their students a particular skill or art; this they named "Virtue". As Plato has it in the *Meno* and the *Protagoras,* Socrates was very unsatisfied with the Sophist definition of Virtue.

In the Muhlenberg-type Church school, even the much-valued academic work was ancillary to the first purpose of developing Virtue. The assumption here is that, if the priorities are straight, all the other "natural goods" of education (Aristotle) which parents want for their children will fall into place as a matter of course, and such acquisitions will in fact be improved and made more valuable because the community is pursuing Virtue as the top priority. Those who put this philosophy into practice are never disappointed of gaining the other goods of education; for example, sound learning, useful skills, and practical knowledge with real cash value.

Pursuing Virtue Creates a Problem

The marriage of the perennial philosophy to Christianity created a problem from the get-go: In contrast to Plato, Aristotle, and other good pagan sages, Christians do not believe that it is possible for human beings to attain the envisioned Virtue, even as reason indicates that it is the proper aim and human destiny. Following Bible and Creed, orthodox Christians hold the doctrines that: (1) human nature is permanently disabled by "the Fall", and (2) the resulting "sin" prevents humankind from attaining Virtue. Muhlenberg and company were rather Augustinian in this regard, but it does not necessarily follow that they affirmed the Calvinist doctrine of *total* depravity. Muhlenberg possessed something of Enlightenment optimism about human nature, providing the right steps are taken to make amends with God. In any case, they took it for granted that Christ alone possesses Virtue and that, as the New Testament puts it, Christ *is* our Virtue. Muhlenberg thus recognized that, in some manner or other, and by God's initiative alone, *Christ's* Virtue must become our Virtue. We must become part of Christ if we are to gain Virtue. Is this even possible? These educators actually believed that "nothing is impossible for God" (*Matthew* 19.26).

Incorporation into Christ

The problem of Virtue is solved by recourse to the most important resource in such a school: God's Grace. In the Christian scheme in which Muhlenberg rooted his schools, both humankind's existential disability and our inability to overcome it to attain Virtue are overcome by God's help. This benefit occurs in a certain *kind* of community or social body wherein Grace abounds and is given the maximum number of opportunities to freely operate. Incorporation into Christ and the life and work of the school are thus bound up together.

The Meaning of 'Church' in the Church School

If incorporation into Christ is essential to the stated purpose of a Church school, which is Virtue in the Christian sense of the word, then it follows that, for the Muhlenbergian school men, the school *is* the Church in the Church's scholastic or teaching-and-learning mode. They took it for granted that the school is the "academic aspect" of the Body mystical of Christ. In this particular Body scholastic, Grace is mediated in Christ to *and by* each member of the fellowship. They espoused the "one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church" of the Creed, which is a living thing and a great mystery; the Church is its own entity with its own history and ways. The Church is infinitely more than a mere bureaucratic institution. If invited, Grace is everywhere; and *Grace completes nature*, one of the oldest and mostly lovely maxims of Christianity.

'Church' does not then denote a mere denominational institution in this philosophy of education. 'Church' denotes the Body mystical as it is constituted in the scholastic brotherhood.

Religion

While the schools created by William Muhlenberg and his heirs were superlative academic institutions, religious life was not a side-show. Unlike many latter-day schools, there was at Flushing, College Point, and the other schools no profession of Christianity followed by a wink and grin. Muhlenberg wrote at the end of his third year of operations:

> The zeal to make scholars, should, in the minds of Christians at least, be tempered by the knowledge that it may repress a zeal for better things. The head should not be furnished at the expense of the heart. Surely, at most, it is exchanging fine gold for silver when the culture of gracious affections and holy principle is neglected for any attainments of intellect, however brilliant or varied (WAM 1831, p. 5).

Yet Muhlenberg writes in the same place that:

> if the inquiry be made, how far any evidences of decided Christian character have been the result of our care, I would premise an answer by remarking, that, as the promise of spring is rather its blossoms than its fruits, so in a youthful community, it is unreasonable to expect much of mature and ripened piety. Precocity is as rare in religion as in learning (WAM 1831: p. 5).

Without exception, the religion of these schools was intelligently and thoughtfully planned and pursued. These educators were men of their time, which is to say that there was much more religion in the school than would fly today (and they worshipped twice on Sunday), but Muhlenberg was extremely careful to not overburden adolescent souls. In this he was ahead of his time.

Daily chapels were "short and sweet". Liturgy and formal worship were brilliantly planned to impart basic dogmas in a beautiful way. Since these educators understood that incorporation into Christ means the grafting of a branch onto the root, the root was something in *particular*. "There is no such thing as

Christianity in the abstract", Muhlenberg astutely wrote in his first prospectus (WAM 1928, p. 4). Religion is not real if it is watered down. Teenagers can know what is authentic—what is taken seriously by the older members of the school—in approximately five minutes. A particular form of Christianity must be allowed its integrity, and the community grows and differentiates religiously on that basis. For his time and day, none was more "ecumenical" than Muhlenberg. He is considered one of the early leaders of the ecumenical movement in the United States which eventually gave rise to the World Council of Churches. But he understood that a genuinely welcoming community must first be something definite in terms of beliefs, ethos, and piety: From this "position of strength" it becomes possible to foster diversity and welcome many sorts of persons into the fellowship.

Curriculum and Instruction

From the beginning, Muhlenberg's curriculum was designed to serve the mission of the school which was to educate *the whole person* to excellence. The formation of Virtue was not the means to "academic excellence", but the "academic excellence" a means to realizing Virtue. This is a subtle but monumentally important principle, and there is a huge difference between a school which pursues the second goal and a school focused on the first. These American educators would have heartily agreed with a famous Harrow master who insisted on "the moral value of exact scholarship" (B. F. Westcott quoted in Honey 1977, p. 127). The academic hours of a student's day were spent learning the Greek and Latin classics, the fundamentals of mathematics and geometry, and the practical skills for mastering each of these subjects. In this way, the student gradually gained confidence, sound knowledge, personal effectiveness, and the traits of a person we in our day would call "a life-long learner". Drawing and draftsmanship were required, as were elocution and a host of duties on behalf of the community (e.g., various chores including maintaining a garden plot).

All of this appears to us as very traditional and lacking in innovation. But in fact, Muhlenberg brought teachers to his schools who could teach the classics with enthusiasm and in such a way that the students saw the acquired knowledge as immediately applicable to their lives. Though firmly established and maintained, the rich, challenging, and rewarding course of study did grow and develop over the decades. By 1895, when the great Henry Coit of St. Paul's, Concord, died, the old Church-school curriculum included considerably more natural science, higher math, modern languages, and a few electives, but the basic curriculum was still in place as the best means to *making students strong* in every aspect of their human nature.

Instruction no less than every other activity of the schools was prosecuted under the aspect of the mission or first purpose. The school-making disciples never wavered from the fundamental principle of their rabbi that the secret to high-quality tuition is high-quality teachers. It is always the case that an excellent teacher will have his or her own methods. The Muhlenbergian school men believed that the teacher must embody the ideals of the scholastic fellowship. Since the standards were very high indeed, the search for such human beings was never easy.

Educators who favor classical studies insist that the translation of a single line of Greek or Latin into English, or an English sentence into Latin or Greek, involves a student in *many* operations simultaneously. Carefulness, mindfulness, and attention to small things—punctuation, the vowels at the end of words, diction)—and basic willpower are mandatory. A good work ethic goes a long way toward the acquisition of serious learning and to the experience of those "eternal values" to which Professor Murray referred.

Similarly, the daily recitations required of every student twice or three times every day (and, until the 1970s, on Saturday mornings) killed many birds with one stone. When a student is asked to stand among his peers and recite twenty lines of Vergil in well-spoken Latin, then to offer his own English translation, then to answer the questions of other students and the teacher *about* the choice lines (e.g., whether the sentiment expressed is morally beautiful, morally repugnant, or something indifferent), he or she is gaining an education *par excellence*. And let us imagine how important it is for every student in a class to watch the student, who requires three times the work others in the class must do to memorize those lines from

Homer's *Iliad*, yet astonish them all with her poise, eloquence, and comprehension of the poet's purpose. In a good school, this kind of experience happens every day.

What's the Hurry?

Because incorporation into Christ and "secular" education went on side by side in these schools, there was no thought that they would not be boarding schools. Such an education requires long days, multiple years, and plenty of scheduled leisure. The highest standards could be and were set, because Grace *via* the brotherhood enabled each member of the school to acquire the virtues to successfully attain the standards. In this sense, the school was "a little image of the Church", since the standards were lowered for none but Grace to attain them was always available. The mysterious benefits of committed life in the fellowship would ensure that everyone made the grade; some would do so more quickly than others, which is only fitting. Ample time and lots of space are necessary for such a school philosophy to be enacted in real life. This is because the standards are high, the community is ambitious, and a bona fide *Church* school is unthinkable without students of all description, including those deemed—at first—"less promising".

The plan succeeded. By the time St. Paul's was opened (1836), Muhlenberg was nationally admired for his work in education. Boys were sent to him from all over the land, even from the slave-holding South, in spite of the Rector's strong opposition to slavery. Witnesses who attended the public expositions at the schools in July were amazed at the learning of the students. Young men with Flushing or St. Paul's diplomas frequently matriculated into higher education as third-year collegians.

This was not a "system", a word Muhlenberg hated as much as he hated supporters and parents who wished for his schools to be seen as "fine literary institutions". What he created was neither a machine (God forbid!) nor a prisoners' camp where Latin was beaten into the pupils. These schools were *families*. They were the most humanely prosecuted, and likely the most outstanding academic, schools in America at the time.

A poster-boy for the entire mission was James Lloyd Breck (1818-1876). Breck hailed from Philadelphia and was with Muhlenberg and company on Long Island for five full years (excluding the Long Vacations taken in August and September). By all accounts a boy of average to just above average intellectual power, he yet developed the virtues and skills of a scholar and of a leader. He matriculated into the University of Pennsylvania as a junior and graduated *magna cum laude* in classical literature two years later (1838). He again distinguished himself academically at the General Theological Seminary in New York (an Episcopal institution) but also impressed persons with his humility and winsome piety. Breck was captivated by the story of St. Columba of Iona (*ca*. 521-597), a missionary educator. While under Muhlenberg's tutelage at Flushing, Breck committed himself to serving as a missionary and educator on the American frontier. When he died—some say of exhaustion—in 1876, he was mourned from coast to coast, remembered as a "Galahad", and compared to his "school father" who commissioned each one of his mission enterprises.

It is manifest that what Muhlenberg and his most important disciples established was more than a network of very good schools. They established scholastic brotherhoods, and those who lived in them never forgot the experience. Each school was "a life" entered into by those who believed they were suited to such a program and up to its demands, regardless of what later came to be called their "IQ" or their social standing. What mattered was the desire. Slackers did not last, but students whose education had been heretofore haphazardly done were not turned away for that reason. If he had the faith and the *willpower* to make use of the program, he was invited to join the brotherhood.

These educators produced no treatises (to speak of) on liberal education, nor did they publish tractates on pedagogy. When people wanted to know what they were up to, or how they were able to achieve so much with adolescents, the standard reply of Muhlenberg and company was: "Come visit us and see for yourself". This is characteristic of any of those rare and deeply life-giving fellowships that appear for a season and then, all too often, disappear—usually for lack of adequate financial support.

III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

William Augustus Muhlenberg and his protégés recognized that, if human beings are more than their rational faculty, a school must educate the other parts of human nature. Such a vision is in fact the perennial philosophy of education in the West: to educate the whole person to excellence. Muhlenberg was a well-educated person and considered reason a great gift, but if education makes the reason "captious", if a school educates the head at the expense of the heart, then the school has failed to do its proper work.

Muhlenberg was neither a philosopher nor a political activist. His solution to the imbalance already developing in American education was to establish two model schools on Long Island. These were an experiment in education by which the founder hoped to address the imbalance in western life and the concomitant rationalism, as well as problems and issues facing educators in the new republic.

Muhlenberg's model schools were replicated by his closely mentored protégés in six American states. Extant explanations of Muhlenberg's educational work are rare. His way was ever that of personal influence and teaching others. He did want to *show* the world his *beau ideal* of a school, and he did so whenever possible; because his greatest statement on education was, truly, the exceptional schools he presided over for seventeen years. In our own time, the best way to understand the Doctor's powerful and most effective vision for American education is to go see what he envisioned in the legacies of his closest fellows who founded schools still in operation, several of them among the very best in the United States. It is likely that Muhlenberg did not want to publish a prolix tractate on education because he felt himself unqualified to describe a kind of school—the *Church school*—that to his knowledge had never existed before. But his scholastic heirs did describe their work and their schools.

This facile sketch of the Muhlenberg-type school is submitted to readers as something new, innovative, and worth considering in our time.

Perhaps the motto Dr. Henry Coit and Dr. George Shattuck adopted for St. Paul's School in New Hampshire (1856) is a good way to end this essay. The motto was taken directly from the Latin grammar Dr. Muhlenberg personally prepared and gave to each student upon matriculation into the school. Henry Coit was given this little book when he came to be educated by Muhlenberg and the brethren in 1843. I have seen a copy of this Latin grammar in the Smithtown, New York, archives. The epigraph, taken from one of St. Jerome's letters, was intended to define the very essence of the first and the second St. Paul's School.

> Ea discamus in terris quorum scientia perseveret in coelis.
> "Let us learn those things on earth the knowledge of which will last in Heaven."

NOTES

1 "Heart speaketh unto heart" is the motto John Henry Newman (1801-1890) chose when he was made a cardinal in the Roman Catholic Church. According to Claire Ward, a Missionary of La Salette writing in the order's blog, Newman thought the source was Thomas à Kempis's *Imitation of Christ* but it was a phrase of the mystic bishop St. Francis de Sales (1567-1622).

2 *Psalm* 36.9: "For with you is the fountain of life; in your light we see light" (New Revised Standard Version).

3 Allow me to reiterate that this essay is not necessarily advocating the study of the Greek and Latin classics. What Murray, *et al*., stood for, and the sort of education they advocated—the complete or liberal education—may well involve learning Greek and Latin and studying classical literature, but their, Newman's, and Muhlenberg's vision does not require an exclusive commitment to classical studies *necessarily*.

4 In Taylor (1989, 2007) and many other utterances over the years, the phenomenon of "commercial culture"—one outcome of modern scientific rationality and the revolutions in finance, industry, and markets in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries—is an ever-present horizon. "Commercial Culture" is not a chapter heading in either of the books just named, because (I aver) the phenomenon is like the gnat on an elephant's back: the reality assumed is too big, obvious, and complex to describe. Four superb works of historical scholarship will suffice to orien-

tate the reader to American history in this period of economic "firing up". They are: Howe (2007); Larson (2010); McDougall (2004); and Sellers (1994). For a penetrating assessment of how the commercial culture gained a new momentum during the Civil War, when the states of the Confederacy were not sitting in Congress, and the years after the Civil War—i.e. the years between the death of Muhlenberg and Gilbert Murray's gentle alarm, see Lears (2009).

5 In this he reminds us of Michael Oakeshott (1901-1990), another great believer in the liberal education, whose "integrity" is rather more similar to Arnold's "perfection" and "totality" than (I believe) some readers of Oakeshott usually allow.

6 There are plenty of other definitions of rationalism. I was once taught that rationalism is by definition the tendency to assume that the human reason gives us the power to know things clearly, and thus what the reason cannot know clearly is of no vital importance and may not exist at all. Reason itself is not impugned in this definition; what is implicated is a certain overconfident attitude. Similarly, a rational person will never impugn experimental science, even as we hope to avoid scientism, which is the assumption that science—even the best experimental science—will answer all of our questions and solve all of our problems. This is Baconian confidence taken too far. If, as implied, scientism and rationalism tend to exclude metaphysics and God, making theology and perhaps revealed religion a waste of time, then modern moralism fits rationalism and scientism like white on rice: because moralism is the tendency to forget theology and doctrine in order to reduce all religion to a matter of morals and personal ethics.

Newman and Muhlenberg saw the same thing on different sides of the Atlantic, but Newman likely assumed that rationalism arose centuries earlier, whereas it would have been impossible for Muhlenberg—the great-grandson of the founder of Lutheranism in America—to take Luther for a rationalist.

7 It is a commonplace that the creator of something new, impactful, and important often requires another or others to articulate the very phenomenon for which the creator is responsible. Creators of truly great works of art (for example) are often startled by what a critic finds in that production – and the poet or painter will often agree that what the critic saw was "there all along". We must always bear it in mind that a historical actor is a diachronic figure. In the case of Muhlenberg, we must remember that his religious views were central his school-making projects but he (like anyone would) went through religious *phases*. It is a fact that, during the years that he was schoolmastering, Muhlenberg was deeply smitten by the personalities and religious ideas of the Tractarian or Oxford Movement, also known as "the Catholic Revival" in Anglican Christianity (see below). Though he was likely not in lock-step with every Tractarian dogma (e.g. Baptismal Regeneration), Muhlenberg admitted in a document he wrote in 1872 that he was definitely under the influence of the Oxford Movement from the late 1820s into the 1840s; and it is crystal clear that not a few students and teachers who worked with "the Doctor" during these years became what is called "Anglo-Catholics". Of Muhlenberg's four principal school-making disciples, three were "High Church" at the least and embryonic Anglo-Catholics. Muhlenberg was especially influenced by John Henry Newman (1801-1890), with whom he had much in common – e.g. a commitment to celibacy and a deep, affecting devotion to the Person of Jesus. It is significant that Muhlenberg would read Newman's sermons in chapel to his boys. Muhlenberg met Newman in person on three occasions in the late summer of 1843. He wrote home to a colleague at College Point that Newman reminded him of Christ. Many hundreds of people were similarly affected by Newman, now Saint John Henry Newman, including Matthew Arnold. Arnold and Muhlenberg more or less renounced Newman when the latter converted to the Roman Catholic Church in 1845, but such an affection and influence can never be effaced entirely. *Suffice it to say that the Muhlenberg-type Church school was indeed created and developed under the aspect of the Catholici Revival in Anglicanism*. This is why it is entirely appropriate to employ "catholic" usages to explain the phenomenon and its often-subtle reality.

8 This is a good place to impress upon the reader that Muhlenberg believed he was creating something somewhat *de novo*. The historian James McLachlan (*op. cit.*) demonstrated that the schools Muhlenberg and his fellows created were *not* based on, or replicas of, the great old English schools such as "The Nine" (Winchester, Eton, St. Paul's, Shrewsbury, Westminster, Merchant Taylors, Rugby, Harrow, and the Charterhouse). Muhlenberg was such a pragmatist that he took up anything good and wholesome he found in the English schools; his first lieutenant J.B. Kerfoot began calling the grade-level classes "forms" when he founded Saint James in Maryland; and his disciples

were generally wont to borrow good ideas from the English when they were instrumental to the original concept. But the influence of schools such as Rugby or Harrow on the original Muhlenberg-type school was minimal until much later in the nineteenth century. From about 1870, we begin to see a proliferation of boarding schools in the USA, many of them unabashedly Anglophilic.

9 The most important heirs (who understudied Muhlenberg both as students and staff) were: Libertus van Bokkelen (1815-1889); John Barrett Kerfoot (1816-1881); James Lloyd Breck (1818-1876); and Henry Augustus Coit (1830-1895). Including Muhlenberg's two, the schools founded were: the Church Institute at Flushing, Long Island (1828); St. Paul's College and Grammar School at College Point, Long Island (1836); the College and Grammar School of St. James at Hagerstown, Maryland (1842, by Kerfoot); the Grammar School at Nashotah, Wisconsin (1844, by Breck); St. Timothy's School at Catonsville, Maryland (1845, by van Bokkelen); St. Paul's School, Concord, New Hampshire (1856, by Coit); the Shattuck School at Faribault, Minnesota (1858, by Breck); St. Mary's School at Faribault, Minnesota (1859, by Breck); St. Mary's School at New York City and later Peekskill (1865, by Muhlenberg and Harriett Starr Cannon); Saint Mark's School at Southborough, Massachusetts (1865, by Kerfoot and his nephew John Kerfoot Lewis); St. Augustine's College and Grammar School at Benecia, California (1868, by Breck); and St. Mary's of the Pacific at Benecia, California (1870, by Breck). Many other American school founders looked to Muhlenberg and company as the creator of the American *Church school* which they wished to replicate and sometimes succeeded beautifully. The trustees of the Episcopal High School in Alexandria, Virginia, asked Muhlenberg to come start their school. The founders of Groton, St. George's, St. Andrew's in Tennessee, the Blue Ridge School in Virginia, and the Kent School took the schools of the Muhlenbergians as their model.

REFERENCES

All quotations from the Bible are taken from the *New Revised Standard Version Bible*, copyright © 1989, the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America.

Appleby, Joyce. 2011. Moderation in the First Era of Popular Consumption. Joshua J. Yates and James Davison Hunter, eds. In: *Thrift and Thriving in America: Capitalism and Moral Order from the Puritans to the Present*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Arnold, Matthew. 1853. *Poems*. 2nd ed. London: Longmans, Brown, Green, and Longmans

_____. 1869. *Culture and Anarchy: An Essay in Political and Social Criticism*. London: Smith, Elder and Co.

Ayres, Anne. 1875. In *Evangelical and Catholic Papers: Addresses of the Reverend William Augustus Muhlenberg, DD.* First Series. Queens Co. New York: St. Johnland Press.

Berlin, Isaiah. 1979. The Counter-Enlightenment. In: *Against the Current: Essays in the History of Ideas by Isaiah Berlin*, pp. 1-24. Henry Hardy ed. London: Hogarth.

Brazeale, Daniel. 1990. Introduction. In: *Philosophy and Truth: Selections from Nietzsche's Notebooks of the Early 1870s*. Tr. Daniel Brazeale. Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press.

Breck, Charles. 1883. *The Life of the Reverend James Lloyd Breck, D.D., Chiefly from Letters Written by Himself*. New York: E. & J. B. Young.

Bruchy, Stuart. 1967. *Cotton and the Growth of the American Economy, 1790*-1860. New York: Harcourt.

Butler, Joseph. 1745. Sermon Preached … [for] the Yearly Meeting of the Children Educated in the Charity Schools in and about the Cities of London and Westminster, Thursday, May 9, 1745. In: *The Whole Works of Joseph Butler: Public Sermons, No. 4*. Wikisource.org/wiki/Whole_Works_of_Joseph _Butler/Sermon_19.

Coit, Henry Augustus. 1891. An American Boys' School—What It Should Be. In: *The Forum*. September number.

Cunningham, Valentine. 2000. *The Victorians: An Anthology of Poetry and Poetics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Honey, John Raymond de Symons. 1977. *Tom Brown's Universe: The Development of the Victorian Public School*. London: Paragon.

DeLaura, David J. 1969. *Hebrew and Hellene in Victorian England: Newman, Arnold, Pater.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Harrison, Hall. 1883. *Life of the Right Reverend John Barrett Kerfoot, D.D., LL.D, First Bishop of Pittsburgh*. Two vols. New York: James Pott & Co.

Holcombe, Theodore I. 1903. An *Apostle in the Wilderness: James Lloyd Breck, D.D., His Missions and Schools*. New York: Thomas Whittaker.
Honan, Park Matthew. 1981. *Matthew Arnold: A Life*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
Howe, Daniel Walker. 2007. *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815–1848*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kingsley, K. Scarlett, and Parry, Richard. 2020. Empedocles. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* online.
Kripal, Jeffrey J. 2022. *The Superhumanities: Historical Precedents, Moral Objections, New Realities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Laing, R. D. 1960. *The Divided Self: An Existential Study in Sanity and Madness*. London: Tavistock.
Larson, John L. 2010. *The Market Revolution in America: Liberty, Ambition, and the Eclipse of the Common Good*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Lears, Jackson, T. J. 2009. *Rebirth of a Nation: The Making of Modern America, 1877-1920*. New York: HarperCollins.
Lewis, C. S. 1952. *Mere Christianity*. p. 73. London: Geoffrey Bles.
McDougall, Walter A. 2004. *Freedom Just Around the Corner: A New American History, 1585–1828*. New York: HarperCollins.
McGilchrist, Iain. 2009. *The Master and His Emissary: The Divided Brain and the Making of the Western World*. New Haven: Yale University Press. Archive.org online version.
_____. 2021. *The Matter with Things: Our Brains, Our Delusions, and the Unmaking of the World*. United Kingdom: Perspective Press.
_____. 2024. *Ways of Attending: How Our Divided Brain Constructs the World*. Echo Point Books & Media LLC, audio edition.
McKendrick, Neil. 2018. *The Birth of Consumer Society: The Commercialization of Eighteenth-Century England*. Brighton: Edward Everett Root.
McLachlan, James. 1970. *The American Boarding School: A History*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
Muhlenberg, W. A. 1828. *The Application of Christianity to Education. Being the Principles and Plan of Education to be Adopted in the Institute at Flushing, L.I.* Jamaica NY: Sleight & George.
_____. 1831. *Christian Education*. New York: Protestant Episcopal Press.
_____. 1843. Letter from WAM to Samuel Seabury Jr. in New York, September 16. MS. in the Archives, General Theological Seminary, New York City.
Murray, Gilbert. 1921. The Value of Greece to the Future of the World. R. W. Livingstone, ed. In: *The Legacy of Greece*, pp. 1-23. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Newman, John Henry. 1841. Private Judgment. In: *The British Critic*, July 1841. Newmanreader.org.
_____. 1852/1976. *The Idea of a University Defined and* Illustrated. Ian Ker, ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
_____. 1871. Parochial *and Plain Sermons*, vol. I. William Copeland, ed. London: Rivington's.
Newbolt, Henry John. 1911. *The Twymans: A Tale of Youth*. London: William Blackwood and Sons.
Oakeshott, Michael. 1989/2001. *The Voice of Liberal Learning*. T. Fuller (ed.). Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
Pelikan, Jaroslav. 1992. *The Idea of a University: A Reexamination*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Prehn, W. L. 2005. Social Vision, Character, and Academic Excellence in Nineteenth-Century America: William Augustus Muhlenberg and the Church School Movement, 1828-1877. PhD dissertation, University of Virginia.
_____. 2015. A high Aim is Better Than a Low One. In: *The Head's Letter*. November.
Skardon, Alvin. 1971. *Church Leader for the Cities: William Augustus Muhlenberg*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Sellers, Charles G. 1994. *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1915-1846*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Smith, James K. A. 2016. *You Are What You Love*. Ada, MI: Brazos Press.
Taylor, Charles. 1989. Sources of the Self: The Making of Modern Identity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
_____. 2007. *A Secular Age*. Cambridge MA: Belknap/Harvard.
Ware, Kallistos. 1988. A Still Small Voice. Film produced by Owen and Julie Jones and Brian Boyer, and narrated by Bill Kurtis. Atlanta: Foundation for Faith in Search of Understanding.
Williams, Rowan. 2023. Review of McGilchrist, *The Matter with Things*. *Los Angeles Review of Books*. January 8. https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/a/a-brain-of-two-minds.