

There were two D.D. distinctions; Rev. Mr. Torrance of Guelph, and Rev. Mr. Gray of Orillia, introduced respectively by Dr. Wardrope and Dr. Cochrane, with graceful but not fulsome praises. Both of the honored recipients replied with suitable feeling.

After these pleasant annual formalities had terminated, Dr. Caven announced to the audience Dr. Patton, who opened a speech with several sallies of playful humor. When he alluded to his old teacher (Professor Young) with the splendid compliment that "he was the greatest dialectician of this or of any age," there was an instant and almost dynamic outburst of cheering from the whole body of students, who venerate deeply that veteran thinker from whom so many of them had received an intellectual inspiration that will never cease to operate during their lifetime.

Dr. Patton assumed of course that the idea that learning disagreed with piety was past. Without any hateful quibbling, there is unquestionably no small element of truth in the by-gone idea. If by "learning" be meant the mere technique of study, then it does quench the spirituality of our nature. Those who are intellectual grub-worms, who slavishly devour the formularies and categories in dusty volumes, who imagine that the vocation of a college is narrowed to the intellect, these are crippled in every sense by the usual curriculum of studies. They are fettered. They enjoy no liberality of mind. They are nervously alarmed over subtle definitions. It is unavoidable. And it is this very fact—which it is folly to overlook—which is the secret why studies do confessedly so often deaden the spiritual feelings of students. They return to the college in October alive to the needs of men, and sympathetic with the deepest matters of the gospel. But when they have come to Christmas, the ardour has abated. Why? Because there is necessarily not a little of the external routine in study to be mastered by the student. There is a danger of becoming pedantic and scholastic. But when a larger and more generous idea is taken of "learning," then there is no truth in the "old idea;" when it means a generous appreciation of the various literatures, a patient strength to grapple with far-reaching principles, a width of culture, a growing sympathy with whatever is excellent in every department, a deepening knowledge of the world of the nineteenth century, an ability to distinguish between doctrines that are immortal and doctrines that excite noisier discussion but are of secondary value, these are qualities that compose true culture; and, in this sense, the more knowledge the more holiness.

The speaker then proceeded to sketch what we may call the "Academical Millenium." But what is an Academy for Theology? He tried to correct the current definition of a School of Divinity to the effect that it was an institution founded by the church in order to educate men for the ministry. The doctor disagreed with this definition, as being radically defective. The principal idea of a Theological College was simply a collection of gifted men who devoted themselves to the advancement of theological science. This is simply another form of the old Grecian college system. Men of strong intellectual propensities set themselves apart for their favorite studies. Plato and Aristotle philosophised. That was their life work, their vocation. If young and aspiring men flocked to hear their lessons of serene wisdom, so much the better for young men! But if they craved other enjoyments, the ideal philosopher was in no wise perturbed (—except when hard-driven financially!); he pursued his own course of arduous thinking, and was content with the solitary pleasures that reward a life of thought. Dr. Patton threw light on his view