

Science teaches us to conquer nature, to apply its powers to the needs of the human race, and enables us to meet the realities of life; Art unfits man for the duties of life, by making him dreamy and visionary. Science ameliorates the sufferings of mankind; Art portrays them, and intensifies them by presenting to them a mirror by which their images are added to their reality. Science is wholesome food for the mind; Art is an intoxication." So the wrangle proceeds; and neither Art nor Science, neither the processes nor the results of education, are in the slightest degree benefitted by it.

Now the commonest of these alternatives that are offered is that between Classical studies and Scientific. We are asked to look at the long lists which history affords of distinguished statesmen, orators, judges, soldiers, sailors, poets, scholars, divines,—great men that a classical education has produced. We do look on them, and we are proud to think they are our fellow-countrymen. We are proud also to know that such honourable careers and enviable renown may still be the lot of those who have the ability and integrity to earn them.

But we are convinced that these heroes do not owe all their fame to their classical education. None of these men would have been less great if they had known more of Science; and the long lists would have been still longer if to many who have died without fame Science had been allowed to introduce the work which would have been congenial to them.

Very lately we noticed, in a leading review, this mode of stifling the plea for a better employment of Science as an instrument of education. We are to look at the claims of the literatures which have done so much in education, and "which have this other charm of proving that people who did not sell lakes for manufacturing purposes, or blacken the earth and sky with noxious vapours, yet led happy lives in perfect civilisation." The temptation to retort is great, but nothing is gained by this kind of controversy. We are not called upon—no one is called upon—to consider whether it is better to give an exclusively literary education or an exclusively scientific one. It has been said by a distinguished classical scholar, that "Classical education neglects all the powers of some minds and some of the powers of all minds." The same could be said of an exclusively scientific education. It is not therefore a question of one or the other,—we must have both. A liberal education will be scientific as well as literary as well as scientific. We are not called upon to choose between them.

There is a choice open under certain circumstances between a literary education purely ancient, and one that is modern. If a boy who has to go into active life at 15 or 16 comes to me at the age of 12 to be educated; it may be a question whether the literary part of his training shall consist in learning the elements of the Latin and Greek Grammars, or whether it shall make him acquainted with the standard Classics of his own language.

Milton's "Paradise Lost" may not be so grand an epic as Homer's *Odyssey*, or Virgil's *Æneid*—the odes of Dryden or Gray may not be so sweet, sublime, or rapturous as those of Horace or Pindar—the satires of Churchill or Pope may be less keen and less vigorous than those of Juvenal—Gray's *Elegy* may be insignificant compared with the elegies of Ovid—the poems of Shelly or Keats may be less melodious than the lyrics of Sappho—we may have no historians to compare with the Father of History, or with Livy or Tacitus, no orators to compare with Demosthenes;—nevertheless,

it is better for an English youth to know the works of Milton, Dryden, Pope, Burke, Macaulay, and the other Englishmen I have named, than that he should spend the time which would give him an acquaintance with them in learning the first steps only in the direction of that greater vigour, sublimity, or sweetness, the merest traces of which he will never see. He may know these works, and find time for other studies which will develop powers and strengthen faculties that studies of literature simply would never reveal. When our grammar schools were founded, we had no English Classics; happily our language has since then proved itself capable of expressing all the languages of Greece and Rome were ever able to express. No doubt this is due in great measure to the fact that the men who have had most influence in making the language what it is, have been careful, laborious, and successful students of the ancient masters. We are not deprecating a study of ancient literature, but we rejoice that a literary culture is within the reach of those who could never obtain it by means of the old languages. I cannot even hint that Shakespeare's palm is a borrowed one; but, with this exception, I am ready to admit that the best literary treasures in our language are but imitations. What follows? Let us go to their models by all means when we can; but it is better to be familiar with the imitations than to spend all our time in learning the way to the originals, and then to die without having seen so much as their shadows.

Davy has used this assumed inferiority of modern to ancient authors as an argument in favour of Science teaching. He says,—“Do not regard as indifferent what is your true and greatest glory. Except in these respects (*i. e.*, the achievements of Science), in what are you superior to Athens and Rome? Do you carry away from them the palm in literature and the fine arts? Do you not rather glory, and justly too, in being in these respects their imitators? In what, then, are you their superiors? In everything connected with Physical Science, with the experimental Arts. These are your characteristics. Do not neglect them. You have a Newton, who is the glory, not only of your own country, but of the human race. You have a Bacon, whose precepts may still be attended to with advantage. Shall Englishmen slumber on that path which these great men have opened? Say rather, that all assistance shall be given to their efforts,—that they shall be attended to, encouraged, and supported.”

The question that does present itself is, shall we, under certain conditions, of which time is the most important factor, take one form of literary training or another? Except as rival claimants for a portion of the time of the young student, Science and Classics are in no way opposed. Everyone who knows the claims of both will agree with Canon Farrar when he says that “Greek and Latin, taught in a shorter period and in a more comprehensive manner, should remain as a solid basis of a liberal education;” and at the same time will ask with him, “Why can it not be frankly recognised that an education confined to Greek and Latin is an anachronism?”

The lesson which these comments are intended to convey is this—let us not be seduced from earnestly endeavouring to place this agent at the service of our pupils by the invidious comparisons between Science and older branches of knowledge which are placed before us.

Sometimes, instead of a particular subject, some laudable effect or aim of education is mentioned, and it is tacitly assumed that Science has no share in it; for instance, we are asked,—“Are not breadth of view