

of mind from which literary discipline tends to set us free. Not chameleons alone, but political questions, social questions, religious questions present different aspects under different circumstances. Here then are two great results which may be expected to flow from all genuine literary training—first, openness of mind, that is, a readiness to admit ideas, however strange, and to comprehend and accept whatever of truth they contain; secondly, flexibility of mind, the capacity to seize a point of view not our own, to understand other men and other times—what, in short, we may call intellectual sympathy.

You will note that these qualities of mind are developed by the intellectual gymnastics of seizing the ideas of others, of putting ourselves at their standpoint; hence they are results that follow from the study of everything that can be called literature, however little inherent excellence it may possess. But we have further to consider the study of literature in its narrower, higher, and, perhaps, more usual sense. All presentation of thought which has maintained permanent vitality, possesses a certain power, fitness, or beauty of expression; for as thought, when once expressed, becomes common property, mankind naturally cares to preserve the words, not of him who expressed it first, but of him who expressed it best. In these treasured utterances, we have not the mere colourless presentation of an idea, or of an objective fact. There is an additional element of form impressed by the writer, and the literary student finds here wide scope for the interpretative function. To enter completely into the thought of the author in the case of purely objective statements, such as those of Euclid, was a simple matter. In Herodotus the interest and difficulty of our task were increased by the introduction of a

subjective element. And, in general, it is true that the less purely objective the thought is, and the more the author impresses on it his personality, his emotions—sets it before us, not exactly as it is, but as it appears to him, the more does the student of literature find himself concerned with it. This subjective factor in literature makes itself generally felt through the manner, the form; and the most pervading manifestation of form is style. Style is that in the written thought which corresponds to the personality of the writer, and is the outcome of that personality. Two narratives may, as you are well aware, affect the reader very differently, although the framework of fact in each case may be the same. The difference in effect cannot result from the matter; it arises from the manner or style, and that, in turn, comes from the attitude of the writer toward the facts, an attitude which he reproduces in his reader. As that attitude may be analyzed into two elements—the permanent element of character, and the transient element of mood, so style, reflecting the varying mood of the writer, is pathetic, or humorous, or indignant; and yet, behind all that, there is a constant element of individual characteristics which serves to distinguish one author from another, and to which we refer in speaking of the style of Demosthenes or of Virgil, of Burke or of Milton. "*Le style*," says the adage, "*c'est l'homme*." To the competent literary critic the genuine stylist depicts himself with unconscious fidelity in lineaments adequate and unmistakeable.

Through style, then, we come in contact with that which is greatest in man—character, that unity of tendency and impression which springs from all his moral and intellectual forces. Those who have been fortunate enough to encounter in life a great and noble personality, know