I do not appear as an apologist for the university study of education. I regard the new movement as an involuntary product of the times, as something without which a rational progress in education cannot be profitably made, and also as a fulfilment of a primitive purpose of university organization. There is no teacher in the land who has not a personal interest in the educational movement that I purpose to discuss. Nay, if it affects one class of teachers more sensibly than another, it appears to me to be the class doing the heroic, and often unrequited, work of the primary school. For university recognition of a teaching profession is a certificate of character from the highest academic authority, and this honourable recognition is the greatest boon to those who need it most.

When, in 1876, a chair of education was established in the University of Edinburgh, there was not a teacher in the United Kingdom who might not have felt a new pride in his calling; and I know that more than one teacher even on this side the Atlantic worked under a new inspiration from that day forward. By the simple fact of such recognition the entire teaching profession has been ennobled; and now that there is a tendency in the universities of this country to follow a precedent of long standing in Germany, and of more recent date in Scotland, it is surely worth our while to reflect on a topic of common interest.

More than one college graduate has been puzzled to understand why the day that crowns his four years' toil is called commencement day. To him it seems more like an ending than a beginning, and in our present mode of academic life so it is. But it was not always so. Commencement day is simply the survival of a feature of ancient university life that has been in disuse for centuries. Anciently the terms "master," "doctor," and "professor" had the same significance. A complete graduate was a master of arts, because he had completely compassed the circle of knowledge offered for his study; he was a doctor because his master's degree was his license to teach; and he was a professor because in his teaching he pursued a given subject, that is, devoted himself to the teaching of a special topic, as philosophy or logic. When, therefore, a student received his master's or his doctor's degree he was said *incipere*, that is, to commence in earnest his vocation or calling, that of teaching.

The Bachelor, or imperfect graduate, could also use his degree as a license to teach, but only on probation

"In the original constitution of Oxford," says Sir William Hamilton, "as in that of all the older universities of the Parisian model, the business of instruction was not confined to a special body of privileged professors. The university was governed, the university was taught by the graduates at large. Professor, master and doctor were originally synonymous. Every graduate had an equal right of teaching publicly the subjects competent to his faculty; nay, every graduate incurred the obligation of teaching publicly for a certain period the subjects of his faculty, for such was the condition involved in the grant of the degree itself. The Bachelor, or imperfect graduate, partly as an exercise towards the higher honour, and useful to himself, partly as a performance due for the degree obtained, and of advantage to others, was bound to read under a master or doctor in his faculty, a course of lectures; and the master, doctor or perfect graduate was in like manner, after his promotion, obliged immediately to commence (*incipere*), and to continue for a certain period publicly to teach (*legere*) some, at least, of the subjects appertaining to his faculty."