

might have been dangerously cut. Howard Peters and A. D. Shisler, both students, and both living at 3419 Walnut Street, were the lads unfortunate enough to be caught by the officers. Their follow-students said that they were no more to blame than any others in the crowd.—*Philadelphia Press*, Nov. 28.

The following is the *New York Tribune's* report of a lecture delivered by Matthew Arnold in the Brooklyn Academy of Music:—Practical people talk with a smile of Plato and his obsolete ideas, and it is impossible to deny that his ideas do often seem impracticable, especially when placed in contrast with a great working population, like that of these United States. He regards such trade and mechanical work with disdain, but what becomes of the life of a great working community if you take the trade life out of it? Trade, says Plato, brings about a fatal decay of nobler growth in a man, and as he has his body marred by grimy labor so his soul within him becomes broken and decrepit. Nor do the working professions fare any better at his hands. He speaks of the bondage of the lawyer whose toll makes him so small and crooked of soul, that, not possessing the courage to stand by honesty and truth, he becomes without any soundness in him whatever. We cannot but admire the artist who draws these pictures, and though they belong to an age so widely differing from our own, they yet command the respect of minds. They descend from a period when the warrior and the philosopher were held most in honor, the lower classes being principally slaves whose work consisted of trade and business. They were handed on from Roman to feudal times, when, also, the warrior and the priest were mostly honored, and the majority of the people were next to slaves. Yet education is still mainly governed by ideas of men like Plato. We are apt to consider such an education as his fitted only for leisure and unsuited to the practical and matter-of-fact issues of life. Especially unsuited to the masses who are bound to industrial pursuits, and whom this kind of education makes dissatisfied with those pursuits. Yet Plato's views are in reality sound enough, for he says that man should prize those studies which result in his soul's attaining to soberness, righteousness and wisdom. Men will not complain of such an ideal of education as this. It is solidly good, whether our future destination be a hereditary seat in the English House of Lords, or the pork trade in Chicago. Plato had no idea of such a community as the United States, which shapes its education to the standard of its requirements, and if one kind is discovered to be unsuited, very speedily adopts another. The question now is much raised, whether to meet the needs of our age we ought not to substitute the cultivation of belles-lettres for science. Nowhere is this question so eagerly and ardently discussed as here. It aims at abasing literary attainment in favor of scientific, which is said to be more adapted to modern requirements. The present question which I shall discuss, is whether belles-lettres ought to be excluded from education, and whether the present onslaught made upon them will prevail. I anticipate the objection that may be made to myself, whose education has been almost wholly confined to belles-lettres, discussing scientific questions, and I shall make my remarks with becoming caution. My small attainment in science will, however, be visible, and no one will be taken in. You may remember a remark of mine that we ought to know the best that has been taught and said. Professor Huxley, quoting this remark and emphasizing it, says the civilized world may be regarded as one great federation, working for a common result, and having for its outfit a knowledge of Greek, Roman and Egyptian antiquity, and of one another. I assert that literature contains that which will enable us to know ourselves and the world. But, says Professor Huxley, "this knowledge will not conduce to culture, neither will a nation, nor an individual attain to this without knowledge of science." It is very necessary to have a plain comprehension of the precise meaning of terms. Professor Huxley thinks that the study of belles-lettres is elegant and ornamental, but not useful. Renan speaks, too, with contempt of "a superficial humanism," which is taught in our schools, as if we all intended being poets and orators and teachers. Now when I

speak of Greek and Roman antiquities, I mean all that we can know of the Greeks and Romans, their life, their morals, their politics. All teaching is thus scientific when followed up to its source. All learning is scientific which is systematically laid out. To know the Greeks and Romans means more than so much vocabulary, or grammar, or extracts from authors. It is the same as knowing our own, or other nations, by which we arrive at a knowledge of ourselves. The distinctive characteristic of our times, lies in the part played by physical science. It commands more of popular sympathy than the study of literature. I have said that we ought to know the best that has been taught and said in literature. Literature is a large word. It may mean all that has been comprised in books. By literature Prof. Huxley means belles-lettres, and considers that this is no sufficient equipment for a criticism of modern life. As by knowing Greek, I mean the understanding of Grecian art, the habits and life of a people from whom we derived physics and mathematics, so to know the best that modern nations have taught and said is to follow the processes by which these results have been attained, and that is found in their literature. There is something, then, to be said on behalf of those who have been somewhat scornfully called the Levites of humane studies, in opposition to those who may be called their Nebuchadnezzar. The results have their visible bearing on human life. All knowledge is interesting to all men. The habit of dealing with facts is an excellent mental discipline. We do not accept a theory merely because it is said to be so and so, but are made to see that it really happens. For the purpose of attaining real culture, instruction in science is as necessary as instruction in literature. In natural science, the habit of dealing with facts is an excellent and valuable discipline. But when it is proposed to make the training in natural science the chief part in education, those who would do this leave out of their calculation the necessities of human nature. It would be hard to deny that when we come to commemorate the chief things that go to build up human life, as beauty and conduct and the powers of society, literature takes a greater and wider place. We need all these, none are isolated. In the generality of men there is a tendency to relate pieces of knowledge. As we acquire one piece of knowledge after another we try to connect them, and therein lies the hold which letters have upon us. We feel a need to relate these pieces of knowledge to our sense of beauty and conduct. The Sybil told Socrates that man had the desire that good should ever be present with him. Love is but the expression of his desire. Now there are some kinds of knowledge which cannot be related. I once ventured to assert in the Senate House at Cambridge that a little mathematics might be made to go a very long way. It is the same with certain things in natural science. Education lays hold upon us by relating our knowledge. The great mediæval universities came into existence because of the general desire in man that good should ever be present with him. We find that humane letters have the power to engage human emotions. Has poetry and its quence this power? They have. How, I cannot explain. If they have this effect on the universe, how are they to be used? The great philosopher Spinoza said that felicity consisted in a man's being able to define his own essence. But how different is the effect of this from the sentence: "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose himself?" Let us avoid comparisons between humane letters and natural science. I have shown that there is an underlying depth in human nature, which requires that knowledge should connect itself with our sense of beauty and conduct. The study of the humane letters does this. This many, nay most, will admit, but why should it be Greek literature? Have not the English-speaking race enough of great minds in their own literature? I answer that the study of Greek, against which the present outcry seems most strongly directed, affords symmetry of thought and idea. I think the lovers of Greek literature have nothing to fear; the time is coming when women will know Greek as did Lady Jane Grey, and when your girls will be studying it in your schools of learning in the far West. It should be remembered that the glorious beauty of the Parthenon at Athens was not