

man himself. These principles differ from the laws of external nature in being laws of a being who lives in ideas and is always in process. Man not only acts, but by his action and in virtue of his power of comprehension, continually moves from a lower to a higher plane. The university has, therefore, to teach its students what are the principles underlying history in the widest sense of that term—including the history of societies and states, as well as the history of literature, art, religion and philosophy. Thus it corrects the one-sidedness of purely natural science, bringing to life the distinctive characteristics of man himself, as a being who is guided by reason, who is the arbiter of his own destiny, and who is able to share in a measure the self-consciousness of God. The university which at all approximates to this ideal will really educate its children.

Perhaps it may be as well to explain somewhat more fully what is meant by an education in principles, as distinguished from a merely utilitarian, or a merely instrumental, culture. It must not be supposed that the grasp of principles consists in familiarity with a few abstract propositions. Nothing, indeed, is more useless. To know a principle in any vital sense is to realize the living spirit which works and shapes a certain circle of particulars. Each subject has therefore its own characteristic principle. In science a principle is the fixed law of a given series of external phenomena; in philosophy it is the ultimate conception which gives meaning to all existence; in art it is the ideal meaning of life, and especially of human life. Take, for example, the subject of literature, whether it is classical or modern, and whether it is written in our own language or in the language of some foreign people. In the study of all literature, and especially of a literature which is not written in one's mother tongue, there is necessarily a long and irksome preparatory process, in which we are merely acquiring command of the language itself. But such a process is only preparatory. The object of all training in literature is to be able to enter into the mind of the author, to think his thoughts, and appreciate the form in which he has clothed them. All great literary products are the flower of the best minds of the country and age in which they are produced, and until we have got to the stage at which we can see that nothing else could have been said by a great writer but what he did say, or that he was expressing, and expressing in the most artistically perfect form the spiritual substance of his time,—we have not mastered the underlying principle which makes his work, in Wordsworth phrase, "inevitable." It is not a proper treatment of a great author to use him as a repository of striking sayings which may be woven into a political speech, a pamphlet, or a sermon; or to

dwell upon the beauty of particular phrases, or the haunting melody of his verse; his work is an organic whole, in which every part pre-supposes every other part; it is the visible soul of a man who is filled with the ideas, feelings and aspirations of his age, but who holds them in a pure and transparent medium very unlike the troubled medium in which the ordinary mind lives and moves. It is not possible really to enter into the spirit of a great author—to think with him, love with him, hope with him; to feel the pulse of humanity beating full and strong in everything he says, yet giving a specific form to his work—without a regenerative toil which is its own reward. It is true that the student may never attain the stage of complete sympathy with the masters of literary art; but, if not, the fault does not lie in them, but in himself, or in the imperfect development of the society in which he lives. And the same principle applies in all cases. The student of science or philosophy or theology must, like Newton learn to "voyage through strange seas of thought alone," but the realms he discovers are the realms of real being, not the half-real world of the senses. True education is therefore no mere external ornament; it is a new-birth, which results in spiritual as well as intellectual elevation. The university, then, has to keep before it, as its main end, the education of its students in the principles which give meaning to existence in all its forms. It would be a long task to show in detail how this ideal is in the highest sense "practical," and, in the few words I have yet to say, I shall deal only with its bearing upon man as a citizen.

Perhaps the main defect of a young country like Canada is the want of thorough self-consciousness. We have in this country the privilege of living under a system of government in which every man is recognized as a citizen. That this particular freedom is the *sine qua non* of all other freedom need hardly be said; but it is of vital importance to observe, that true freedom does not consist in the right to do what one likes—which, in fact, is the ideal of the child, the child in years or in experience—but in the privilege of doing what one ought. Try to imagine for a moment what would be the character of a community in which every man, woman, and child had a vote, and every one voted for what he thought at the time would bring most pleasure and comfort to himself. Obviously, a state based upon such an empty idea of freedom, could never come into existence, or if it did, would soon relapse into complete anarchy. Freedom, then, does not consist in doing what one pleases, but in the voluntary, and I may add, the joyous doing of what one ought. But what ought one to do? We ought to aim at making ourselves and others perfect citizens, i.e., citizens who