

as strikingly as any athlete. Far from constituting a manly nature, such courage may lead to those actions of savage and brutal violence which sometimes disgrace our contests on the campus. Athleticism is a good thing in its place. I should be sorry to be interpreted as saying anything in condemnation of college sports—so long as our games are manly and our contests conducted honorably; but there is a possibility of athletic skill being unduly exalted in our universities. The university exists to turn out men, not athletes. The athlete may be manly or otherwise. He may only represent animal courage—physical force and training. Indeed, a delicate constitution, incapable of athletic skill, does not imply the lack even of animal courage. Nelson was a courageous man; for when only fourteen years of age he attacked a polar bear with a handspike, and, when scolded by his captain for so doing, replied that he did not know Mr. Fear. But with his slight frame and weak constitution, he could never have excelled in many college sports. True manliness, too, may be found in a weak body; for its essence is not self-assertion, so loudly applauded in these days, but self-sacrifice, which is too often unrecognized. Thomas Hughes, in his admirable little work on "The Manliness of Christ," has drawn this distinction between courage and manliness, and has illustrated it by several incidents recorded in Napier's "Peninsular War." I cite some of these to make the distinction clear to you. At the battle of Coa, the "Boy" Stewart—nineteen years old and of gigantic stature and strength—would not recognize the French as victors. "So this is the end of our brag" he said, "this is our first battle and we retreat! The boy Stewart will not live to hear that said." Then, although all others had retreated, he fell upon the nearest enemy with his bayonet, and, refusing the quarter they seemed desirous to give, he died fighting in the midst of them. What a man he would have been

on the campus, with his indomitable will, his intense self-assertion, his defiance of pain and danger and death! But was his courage,—valuable and admirable though it was—was it after all the highest type of courage? Is not the following an example of nobler courage? During the same war, Sergeant-General MacQuade saw two men level their muskets on rests against a high gap in the bank, awaiting the up-rising of an enemy. Brown, a lad of sixteen years, attempted to ascend at the fatal spot. MacQuade—himself only twenty-four years of age—pulled him back, saying in a calm voice: "You are too young, sir, to be killed;" and then offering his own person to the fire, fell dead, pierced with both balls. Was not his a higher type of courage? And wherein lay the difference? The former is an example of proud self-assertion; the latter of sublime self-sacrifice. You all know, too, the story of the wreck of the "Birkenhead," when, rather than endanger the lives of the women and children in the boats, at the command of their captain, four hundred men fell in on deck by companies, knowing that the sea below them was full of sharks and that the ship could not float until the boats returned; but they stood calmly in line, and uttered not a word until the ship keeled over and they found a watery grave. Napier, admiring as he did physical prowess which shone in actual fight, yet gives the palm to these men when he said: "The records of the world furnish no parallel to this self-devotion." It was such an exhibition of self-sacrifice, self-restraint, in which rather than self-assertion all true manliness consists. Self-assertion is so useful in the contests which are becoming an important factor in university life that many are inclined to regard it as the essence of manly courage, and to look upon the youth as lacking in manliness whose physical constitution will not allow him to engage in the harder games. But let us remember that bodily strength