

The Nation

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE & ART

VOLUME LVII

FROM JULY 1, 1893, TO DECEMBER 31, 1893

NEW YORK

THE EVENING POST PUBLISHING COMPANY

1893

P 00583

one building was the material college. Under its roof the students lodged, studied, took their meals, worshipped, recited, and declaimed. It sheltered their literary societies as well. It still may be taken as the type of the institution. Solid, persistent, well founded, it is the centre about which a whole brood of halls cluster. Its old cupola has become almost a spire, leading further aloft with more grace if not with greater breadth; and as its long brick "entries" (typifying, perhaps, the hard but straightforward way to a degree) have been cut up by partitions into corridors that begin at a spiral stairway and run against a dead wall, so the old courses of arts and letters, approved of gods and revered by men, have been chopped up into electives that begin and end not dissimilarly.

A new Princeton has grown about the old, but the old nucleus is the core and the heart. It is not too much to say that the beautiful campus and the rugged background in some respects reflect themselves in the character of her graduates. Her older men have boasted that Princeton was a national college; her junior sons in somewhat different phrase repeat the claim. We believe it is true that the Princetonian is proud of his college, and that he often justifies the college in being proud of him. They hold, we think with truth, that it is a democratic institution, where in all college matters men stand on their own merits; and it is certainly a delightful feature that the class exclusiveness which marks another latitude is, barring a little discipline of Freshmen, not to be found there.

So far as this particular book is concerned, it is not unkindness to say that its most instructive feature is the illustrations. The village of palaces set forth is still inadequate to shelter the thousand scholars. This is the brick-and-mortar side of the extraordinary development of the last twenty-five years, the fruition of seed sown in President Maclean's later days. The text, so far as it goes, is fairly accurate, but the author in his next edition may care to change some statements. The literary societies after the conflagration of 1862 found their new rooms in the Library, now the offices, built in 1863, not in Nassau Hall again. There is no good reason to suppose that the cannon which is so essential a feature in the outdoor ceremonies of the College, played any part in the battle of Princeton. It was a siege piece, and as such could not have been used by either army in that engagement. It is much more probable that at some unimportant period a broken carriage determined its detention—for example, when the French marched north to return home. The dwelling in which Mercer died, in rear of the critical field of battle, should continue to be known as the Clarke house, in memory of those kindly and patriotic Friends who graced it through several generations, notwithstanding that its ownership is now changed. The enemy in that battle were not Hessians, but a brigade of British regulars under Mawhood. June, 1844, marks the date of the new Commencement; the resolution to make the change may have been in 1843. The writer, brought up in the atmosphere of modern sports, looks upon the play "with balls and sticks" objected to by the Faculty in 1787 as "the first appearance of base-ball at Princeton." That was a sheer guess, and a bad one. "Shinny" was thus aimed at, and it was not suppressed until sixty years afterwards, when the authorities planted the "back campus" with trees, beautifying the quadrangle and preventing the game. There is internal

evidence that our author is an American Whig, who inadvertently betrays one of his Hall secrets. These are little matters, but the babes and sucklings in local history should have their milk pure.

Whether calling itself such will make Princeton a university, may be doubted. It called itself a boating college, and "the university boat-house" is among the illustrations. There should be an affirmative born of two negatives, but this may be the exception to that venerable rule. To discuss seriously the influence of enormous classes, of costly dormitories, of multiplied electives, of the weakness that strains after "varsity" effects, would be placing too heavy a stress upon this slender span that would bridge the space between the graduate of to-day and the polished Jonathan Belcher.

An Elementary Treatise on Pure Geometry, with numerous examples. By John Wellesley Russell, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. 1893.

An Elementary Treatise on Modern Pure Geometry. By R. Lachlan, M.A. Macmillan. 1893.

Geometry in the Grammar School: An Essay. Together with illustrative class exercises, and an outline of the work for the last three years of the Grammar School. By Paul H. Hanus, Assistant Professor of the History and Art of Teaching, Harvard University. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 1893.

The two text-books cited above, one from Oxford, the other from Cambridge, are on a subject lately introduced into the university examination papers. Neither is of great merit. The Oxford book shows somewhat more mathematical and geometrical ability, and contains upwards of 1,500 examples, mostly of real interest. The elementary explanations of the Cambridge book are somewhat superior, and it deals with some interesting topics altogether omitted from the other treatise. It is, doubtless, the more convenient text-book for the teacher, though the less profitable for the earnest student. The great arbitrariness of the arrangement of both books is well shown by comparing them together in this respect. The theorems are pitchforked together upon no principle, and as for the examples, it is really curious to remark under what diverse heads one and the same proposition may be treated. The leading propositions of each book are mere illustrative examples for its rival.

The reason why analytical methods are more easily handled than the synthetical geometry is chiefly that the former arrange the whole subject in a perfectly definite and unmistakable manner. No wonder a pupil is puzzled to apply a theory consisting of some thirty fragments not connected by any intrinsic bonds. As long as this state of things exists, notwithstanding the infinitely greater elegance of the pure geometry, its great practical use will be to serve as a guide in the reformation of analysis. The older treatises upon modern geometry did not exhibit this loose articulation, for the reason that they dealt chiefly with projective properties, and introduced what little metrics they gave as corollaries to the projective theorems. This could no longer be thought of, yet it suggests the proper way of arranging the subject. No text-book of either synthetical or analytical geometry omits that grand proposition of Cayley, that every metrical fact is a projective fact about a certain fixed quadric, or in plane geometry about the section of this quadric by the plane; nevertheless, writers of

text-books put them together as if they did not really believe this. If it be true, surely an eternal fitness requires that the projective geometry of rectilinear diagrams and conics should precede all metrical matter, and that the Euclidean geometry should be taught as a particular case of the non-Euclidean.

Prof. Hanus's want of acquaintance with geometry, beyond what everybody knows, is very apparent. He applies general principles of pedagogy to give a few maxima too vague to be of much positive value, and upon that basis proceeds to pronounce *ex cathedra* upon perhaps the most difficult problem of intellectual education—the question of what, when, and how to teach in the first instruction in geometry. The illustrative exercises exemplify some methods in teaching applicable to many subjects and widely used in our schools. The course laid out could not well be much worse than it is, and is calculated to impart to the scholar ideas of geometry as confused as those of Prof. Hanus himself.

William Kitchen Parker, F.R.S., sometime Hunterian Professor of Anatomy and Physiology in the Royal College of Surgeons of England: A Biographical Sketch by his Son, T. Jeffery Parker. Macmillan & Co. 1893. 8vo, pp. 145.

RESEARCHES on the foraminifera and on the vertebrate skeleton have made a limited group of scholars familiar with Prof. Parker's name. A multitude of future students will owe him their gratitude and respect. His splendid series of monographs have prepared a welcome for the opportunity given by his son of knowing the man more intimately, of learning how it was he placed himself among the great men of science. The story is that of a dissatisfied farmer boy who became a druggist's clerk, a village physician, and ultimately a Fellow of the Royal Society. It is a record that might be cited in support of Dalton's conclusions "that no man can achieve a very high reputation without being gifted with very high abilities," and "that few who possess these very high abilities can fail in achieving eminence"; yet, from what we learn of his former ancestry, it is not an instance to support the theory of hereditary ability in general. Religious fervor, lasting from his fifteenth year till the end, and scientific enthusiasm, were most prominent characteristics of a truly amiable man. Our sympathy goes out to him in his struggles, his ill-health, his hours of depression or exaltation; and such particulars as how unsystematic he was or how talkative, detract nothing from our esteem. Some one, we are told, was reminded by the Professor's style of a dog going home, firm in his purpose and sure to get there, now on this side of the road, now on the other, now scratching at a hole, and now dashing across the field for a friendly or hostile sniff at another dog. There is also a lively anecdote of a visitor who, at mention of a skull, was carried off to the study, and, unable to get a dozen words, was overwhelmed by explanations, illustrations, and sketches for the entire evening, then accompanied to the door for a ten or fifteen-minute conclusion, and finally allowed to depart, while the Professor sank into a chair, ejaculating, "That's a most intelligent young man, but I thought he'd never go; I'm dead tired."

The author has done his work well, without overestimate of the great importance of his father's works. A letter from Sir William Bowman contains this summary of Prof. Parker's temperament: "He was a bright,

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY