

accomplished only after the same sort of tedious struggle by which the new knowledges of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are now winning their way to academic recognition. The revived classical literature was vigorously and sincerely opposed as frivolous, heterodox, and useless for discipline; just as natural history, chemistry, physics, and modern literatures are now opposed. The conservatives of that day used precisely the same arguments which the conservatives of to-day bring forward, only they were used against classical literature then, while now they are used in its support. Let it not be imagined that the scholastic metaphysics and theology, which lost most of the ground won by Greek, were in the eyes of the educated men of twelfth to the sixteenth century at all what they seem to us. They were the chief delight of the wise, learned, and pious; they were the best mental food of at least twelve generations; and they aroused in Europe an enthusiasm for study which has hardly been equalled in later centuries. When Abelard taught at Paris early in the twelfth century, thousands of pupils flocked around his chair; when the Dominican Thomas Aquinas wrote his "*Summa Theologiæ*," and lectured at Paris, Bologna, Rome, and Naples, in the middle of the thirteenth century, he had a prodigious following, and for three centuries his fame and influence grew; when the Franciscan, Duns Scotus, lectured at Oxford at the beginning of the fourteenth century, the resort of students to the university seems to have been far greater than it has ever been since. We may be sure that these wonders were not wrought with dust or chaff. Nevertheless, the scholastic theology and metaphysics were in large measure displaced, and for three hundred years the classical literatures have reigned in their stead.

Authentic history records an earlier change of a fundamental sort in the list of arts called liberal, and consequently in the recognized scheme of liberal education. When Erasmus was a student, that is, in the last third of the fifteenth century, before Greek had been admitted to the circle of the liberal arts, the regular twelve years' course of study included, and had long included, reading, arithmetic, grammar, syntax, poetry, rhetoric, metaphysics, and theology, all studied in Latin; and of these subjects metaphysics and theology occupied half of the whole time, and all of the university period. But in the eleventh century, before Abelard founded scholastic theology, the authoritative list of liberal studies was quite different. It was given in the single line:

"*Lingua, tropus, ratio, numerus, tonus, angulus, astra.*"

Most students were content with the first three—grammar, rhetoric, and logic; a few also pursued arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy, if these grave names may be properly applied to the strange mixtures of fact and fancy which in obscure Latin versions of Greek and Arabian originals passed for science. It was this privileged circle which scholastic divinity successfully invaded at the beginning of the twelfth century, the success of the invasion being probably due to the fact that religion was then the only thing which could be systematically studied.

This hasty retrospect shows, first, that some of the studies now commonly called liberal have not long held their present preeminence; and, secondly, that new learning has repeatedly forced its way, in times past, to full academic standing, in spite of the opposition of the conservative, and of the keener resistance of established teachers and learned bodies, whose standing is always supposed to be