

While science, which means both by derivation and by usage, simply knowledge, is primarily intellectual, involving the emotional only so far as the emotional can never be separated from the intellectual, literature deals with and appeals to both of these faculties. Shakespeare and Goethe were scientists, Huxley was no poet. But why do we rank Browning higher than Aristotle or Hegel in the literary world? Is it not because feeling, and not intellect, is the true basis of the personality? The lamp of science guided Hegel far into the dim background of cosmic and microcosmic life, but his inspiration groped further onward when the lamp failed, and Browning following in his steps reveals to men what the imperfect inspiration of Hegel could not express.

Of the three classes of literature—(1) intellectual and scientific; (2) intellectual and emotional in balance e. g. history; (3) emotional (the drama, epic, novel)—it may be best in a comparison with science to select the highest. In fact the struggle between literature and science often resolves itself into a struggle between intellectual and emotional literature. This emotional or æsthetical or ethical literature may be defined roughly as the written expression by great men of their interpretation of the higher emotional aspects of nature, the sum of their attempts to reach down to the basic verities of universal life.

The question of education is not summed up in the question "What knowledge is of most worth?" Rather, if we are to decide between the claims of science and literature to pre-eminence, we must ask, *which is of more worth, exact knowledge or true*

*feeling?* Spencer almost ignores the cultivation of feeling as a part of a necessary education. For him knowledge is all important, while the development of far the greatest element in our personality, the moral, appears as a sort of frill or furbelow, not to be put on until we have become accomplished sociologists. Plato was not so foolish, much as he exalted knowledge and chastised a poetry charged with unscientific generalizations, and therefore resting on false feeling. Spencer assumes also that a certain amount of science is the *first* requisite for self-preservation. But it is ridiculous to lose sight of the fact that the very instinct of self-preservation and of self-reproduction, has its rise in the moral personality. It is conditioned by feeling, not by intellect. All the science in the world will not prevent suicides or old bachelors. But a study of the Bible, or of Bunyan or Homer will stimulate and strengthen all the good instincts of our being, and help us to realize ourselves as social types.

Granting that science is a *first* requisite for life—and we all recognize its immense importance whether first or last—it does not follow that science is the *most important* equipment for true manhood. Man does not live by bread alone, nor principally. Feeling, which is the preponderant factor in personality, demands a proportionate education. Practically feeling is the personality, is the real life. Not what a man knows or does, but what he is—that is what we ask.

To bring the abstract down to the concrete, which is it more important that a child (or adult) should study, the Bible, Homer (translated), and