One other innovative figure in the field of extramural education, Arnold Bennett, is rarely acknowledged for his pedagogical endeavours. He was not, after all, an English literature teacher in any formal sense; he gave no classes or lectures, and, unlike John Churton Collins, George Saintsbury, and Richard G. Moulton, Bennett was not affiliated to an educational institution. Nevertheless, the practical advice Bennett offered to urban working- and lower-middle class readers, in the pages of popular newspaper T. P.'s Weekly, was the basis for a practicable and hugely popular scheme that emphasised above all the pleasure one could derive from reading literature. This final chapter therefore explores a rather different set of guidelines on reading and studying literature; Bennett stood beyond institutional structures altogether, and his emphasis was on learning to enjoy books, rather than approaching them as a scholar. He did, however, encourage his readers to be more disciplined in their approach to texts, urging them to set goals for covering a certain amount of material; to read slowly and to make notes and annotations in their books; and to supplement their reading with secondary texts, such as critical works and biographies of their chosen authors.

Bennett was certainly not unique in offering advice on literature in the fin-de-siècle press; the sensation caused by Sir John Lubbock’s list of ‘100 Best Books’ in 1886 suggests that a newly-educated readership was actively seeking authoritative guidance on their reading, and the crowded market for reprints of classic texts in the late-Victorian and Edwardian periods demonstrated that publishers were efficient in their response to this social trend. That this chapter takes
Bennett as its primary focus, rather than any of the numerous other sources of literary guidance in the period, is in part due to his ability to forge a connection with his readership. We might attribute this to the fact that he had worked as a legal clerk in the early 1890s, and subsequently managed to carve out a hugely successful career for himself as a journalist and author. His navigation through the literary field from relatively humble beginnings accounts for the knowing, direct tone of his articles.

Bennett enjoyed extraordinary prominence on the Edwardian literary scene, testament to which stands the massive volume of both fiction and critical writing that he published in the period. This chapter draws upon only a small, representative sample of material. The ‘Savoir-Faire Papers’ were an early-Edwardian series of articles that Bennett was commissioned to write for new literary publication *T. P.’s Weekly* (*TPW*), and which he wrote under the pseudonym ‘The Man Who Does’. This was the first of many regular columns he produced for the paper, and appeared from the first issue on 14 November 1902, and lasted until 6 November 1903, when the column was renamed ‘A Novelist's Log-Book’. Taking advantage of this perhaps somewhat arbitrary dividing-line, focus will remain on the initial series of articles, supplemented with the more concentrated reading advice Bennett offered in *Literary Taste: How to Form It* (1909). As with the ‘Savoir-Faire Papers’, *Literary Taste* had appeared in *TPW* in an earlier incarnation as a series of articles, printed between 2 October 1908 and 15 January 1909, which were later gathered together and published as a book. The ‘Savoir-Faire Papers’ never appeared as a collection, although Bennett’s letters to his literary agent, J. B. Pinker, reveal that he was anxious to make this happen. This correspondence is worth reflecting on briefly, as the letters demonstrate that Bennett held the early articles in very high esteem. On 25 October 1903, he wrote to Pinker:

The *Savoir Faire Papers* finish in *T. P.'s Weekly* next week. (I am going to take up another feature for them by way of change, which I hope will be equally successful.) There will be 52 papers, but the last two I might probably prefer to leave out of a book. Total about 60,000 words. Can you do anything with this now? If so, kindly get the complete file from Whitten. My idea is a I/- book (pseudonymous), & if 60,000 words is too much, some papers might be omitted not unadvantageously. (1966b, p. 40)