

IRISH
UNIVERSITY EDUCATION :

AN ACADEMIC STUDY.



BY

J. P. PYE, D.Sc., M.D., F.R.U.I.

Dublin :

SEALY, BRYERS AND WALKER,

94, 95 & 96 MIDDLE ABBEY STREET.

1897.

ONE SHILLING.

Houses of the Oireachtas

IRISH UNIVERSITY EDUCATION:

NOTE.

The Trinity College Statistics at p. 19 are from the Report of the Royal Commission of 1853—the only official statement I can find of such details. It has been pointed out to me that the number 218 quoted at p. 19 does not occur in that Report. It is the average of the numbers given for the three Terms of the College year; but I learn that an average does not represent the true conditions, and that any inferences based thereon are erroneous. I therefore give here the Term Returns from the Report.

Number of Students allowed credit for Lectures in Michaelmas Term, 313; in Hilary, 247; in Trinity, 93.

The point intended to be made was, not a criticism of Trinity College but, the bringing out clearly of two facts. 1. That the Queen's, condemned to death by Government as "simply an Examining Body," was a University of an academic type more strict than Trinity; and, 2. That while Degrees may be obtained by Examination only in both existing Irish Universities, other conditions inevitably lead to widely different estimates of the Academic Value of these degrees.

Dublin:

SEALY, BRYERS AND WALKER,

94, 95 & 96 MIDDLE ABBEY STREET.

1897.

Houses Of the Oireachtas

IRISH
UNIVERSITY EDUCATION:

AN ACADEMIC STUDY.

BY

J. P. PYE, D.Sc., M.D., F.R.U.I.

Dublin :

SEALY, BRYERS AND WALKER,

94, 95 & 96 MIDDLE ABBEY STREET.

1897.

IRISH UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

SOME help, it has occurred to me, towards the solution of a difficult problem, may come from an academic study of Irish Universities—that is, an examination of them in which no assumption of peculiarities in Irish nature is made. If it should be found—taking the constitution of successful Universities elsewhere as a criterion—that defects exist, then it may be profitable to inquire further how far academic remedies for these defects would avail in removing the discontent that is admitted to exist.

An assumption of peculiar circumstances in Ireland formed the basis of Peel's legislation in 1845. "I admit at once that I think the system we propose inapplicable to England and Scotland, I justify it (in Ireland) by the peculiar and unfortunate character of the religious differences which there exist." (Sir R. Peel, *Hansard*, Vol. 80, p. 1283.)

Looking back over the history of Universities—and not confining our view to Irish Universities alone—it is impossible to resist the conclusion that theories, however plausible or however confidently put forward, do not afford firm ground for legislation. Successful Universities are, without exception, the result of slow growth and natural evolution. When a new University succeeds at once, it is found that the constitution of an older successful one has been closely copied.

Two great failures at once suggest themselves, both

based on very plausible theories, the University of France, and the University of London.

Probably no more favourable conditions for experimental legislation could be named than those present in these two cases.

The old Universities of France, including that most ancient and famous foundation, the University of Paris, were suppressed by a decree of the Convention in 1793. Napoleon found a clear field before him when he decided to revive them a few years later. But, led away by the supposed advantage of the uniformity that would result from centralization, he decided to create a University of France as a great central authority to which the separate academic foundations or faculties, as they were called, should be subjected. This central authority (practically a Government bureau) was to dictate the course and method of instruction to be followed for a degree. Austerlitz had just been fought ; and it is easy to recognise in the constitution of the University founded by the Emperor at the height of his power the same dominant idea of Centralization which guided his policy elsewhere.

The result is well known—failing prestige, want of individuality, extended from the course and method of instruction to the prelections and researches of the teachers and then to the students, defect in creative power and decadence generally, brought out into strong relief by the vigorous life of the neighbouring Universities in Germany.

The autonomy of the latter is complete. They have grown to be what they are without much external direction ; and amongst their characteristics the most notable one is, perhaps, the freedom claimed for teacher and student (*Lehr- und Lern-freiheit!*) and the complete subordination of examination to teaching. German

degrees could be bought a few years ago, but whatever other effect the transaction may have had on the buyers and sellers, it did not operate to damp the ardour of German professors and students in the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake. It is well known that the majority of German students do not take a degree, and that comparatively few are earnest students, but these few go far. The examinations of the University of France were rigorous. But still it is admitted that, on the whole, the German University system has been successful, while that of France has proved a failure.

The failure is admitted in France itself; where a Bill for restoring the autonomy of the "Faculties" (again to be called Universities) has just become law. The University of Paris, which formed the model for every University in Northern Europe, is a name to be heard again. It is free, or nearly so. I am not discussing the French elementary or secondary school systems. They formed part of the educational schemes of the Convention and Empire, but other considerations apply to them.

The University of London was founded as a teaching College and University for English Dissenters. Theoretical views suggested the detachment of the University from the College, and the establishment of the former as an independent examining body. The theories were plausible, and circumstances were favourable for the experiment. Dissenters were excluded from Oxford and Cambridge, and might be expected to present themselves at the new University; while the position of London as the capital of the empire was exceptionally strong.

But, tempted by the theory of the sufficiency of Examinations, the founders made the fatal mistake of constituting Examinations the sole test for graduation.

It is now admitted that London University has had the

effect of starving the academic life of London and of driving students elsewhere in search of education.

There is a consensus of opinion that a Teaching University must take its place; and the life of the present University of London is probably to be reckoned by months.

If theories form an unstable foundation, modern Irish University Legislation is peculiarly unfortunate; for it is based, not alone on theories, but on theories that are inconsistent with one another, and that, in one remarkable case, depend on an evident misapprehension of facts.

Modern legislation dates from 1845, when the Queen's Colleges' Bill was introduced by Sir Robert Peel.

These Colleges were in their very essence Teaching colleges. Attendance at lecture was strictly prescribed; and the Charter which combined them into one body, under the name of the Queen's University, for the purpose of conferring degrees, expressly restrained the Senate from conferring a degree on any person who had not complied with this condition of regular attendance at lecture.

It was the strong point of the whole system. Thirty years after the foundation of the Queen's University there were over 1,000 students in its Colleges complying with this condition. In strict accordance with it over 3,000 degrees had been conferred. Catholic students were prevented by conscientious objections from taking advantage of these Colleges, but the objections were not directed against the system of a teaching University. Nobody, as far as one can gather, asked for a change in that respect; while there was not a graduate of the Queen's University who was not proud of its combined system of residence and examination.

The University had watched the progress of University evolution elsewhere; the great debates in Parliament which

led to the reform of the Oxford and Cambridge systems had engaged the attention of the Senate. These debates took place in 1854; and the presence at the Irish Office in 1859 of Mr. (afterwards Lord) Cardwell, a statesman who had taken an active part in the legislation which followed the exhaustive inquiry into the constitution of the English Universities, was a fortunate circumstance which enabled the Senate to procure from the Crown, under his direction, an amended Charter embodying the more advantageous constitution and provisions which had been shown to be attainable. This healthy process of evolution was going on when, in 1879, without the slightest warning to the Colleges, Government determined to make the degrees to be given to their students depend on examination only. The Bill was introduced late in the Session when the Colleges were in vacation. The Professors hurried back to consult, but almost before they could arrange a meeting the Bill had become law. The new University Act did not alter those parts of the Queen's College system which the Catholic Hierarchy had declared objectionable. Nor did it concede the Catholic claims for a separate University. What it did do was to sweep away the residential character which, it has been shown, was of the essence of the Queen's University system, directing that the graduates who had qualified under that system should forthwith become (by Act of Parliament) graduates of a purely Examining University to be created by the Act; that the Queen's Colleges should cease to be University Colleges, and that evidence of attendance at lecture should no longer be required for a degree. It is almost incredible, but it is a fact, that this legislation which destroyed a University—an event almost without precedent in modern history—was based on a radical misconception of the constitution of that University.*

* See Appendix : Statement of Graduates of Queen's University.

The object aimed at by the legislation of 1879, whereby the policy of 1845 was reversed, was undoubtedly a concession, or intended to be a concession, to Catholic claims.

A Catholic grievance was admitted. With things as they stood, every other party in Ireland was well satisfied. The Presbyterians accepted the Queen's University; the Church of Ireland, if it did not adopt the Queen's University for itself, at least recommended it as an ideal system for others. But it is noticeable that the principle of an Examining University found favour with no party. The Presbyterians, it is notorious, were most active in opposition to its establishment. Educated Protestant opinion may be gathered from the language lately used by a learned Fellow of Trinity College with reference to the value of an Examining University :—

“Examining bodies which assume the title of a University, though lacking every single distinctive feature connoted by that ancient and once unambiguous term An examining body, styled the Royal University, established by the side of the old and real University of Dublin. . . .” (Mahaffy, “Sham Examinations,” *Nineteenth Century*, Jan., 1893.)

And leaders of Catholic opinion have repeatedly declared that an institution which merely examines is not a University in the true sense of that word.

It is well known that the Catholic objections had reference to the absence of certain conditions laid down as indispensable for safeguarding the faith and morals of Catholic Students.

The memorial of the Prelates of Ireland, adopted at a meeting on 23rd May, 1845, and forwarded to Government, after a statement of the “disposition of the memorialists to co-operate on fair and reasonable terms with Her Majesty's Government and the Legislature in establishing a system

for the further extension of academical education in Ireland," declares—"that the circumstances of the present population of Ireland afford plain evidence that a large majority of the students belonging to the middle classes will be Roman Catholics; and memorialists, as their spiritual pastors, consider it their indispensable duty to secure, to the utmost of their power, the most effectual means of protecting the faith and morals of the students in the new Colleges."

The amendments suggested in the Colleges' Bill were :--

"That a fair proportion of the professors and other office-bearers should be members of the Roman Catholic Church, whose moral conduct shall have been properly certified by testimonials of character, signed by their respective prelates. And that all the office-bearers in those Colleges should be appointed by a board of trustees of which the Roman Catholic prelates of the provinces in which any of these Colleges should be erected, shall be members.

"That the Roman Catholic pupils could not attend the lectures on history, logic, metaphysics, moral philosophy, geology or anatomy without exposing their faith or morals to imminent danger, unless a Roman Catholic professor be appointed for each of those chairs.

That if any president, vice-president, professor, or office-bearer in any of the new Colleges be convicted before the Board of Trustees of attempting to undermine the faith or injure the morals of any student in these institutions, he shall be immediately removed from his office by the same board.

"That, as it is not contemplated that the students shall be provided with lodging in the new Colleges, there shall be a Roman Catholic chaplain to superintend the moral and religious instruction of the Roman Catholic students belonging to each of those Colleges; that the appointment of each chaplain, with a suitable salary, shall be made on the recommendation of the Roman Catholic Bishop of the diocese in which the College is situate, and that the same prelate shall have full power and authority to remove such Roman Catholic chaplain from his situation."

An authoritative declaration delivered by the constituted authorities of the Catholic Church, I do not criticize.

I confine myself to saying that the constitution of the Queen's University, in its relation to religion, was unknown elsewhere as a University constitution. It was based on a theory, that a liberal education in its highest form could be carried out without assigning any place to theology or religious training in the regular course of study.

The supporters of this theory must have been deeply impressed with its value, when, in order to put it into practice, they determined to dispense with support which they had elsewhere declared to be "almost essential."

As to whether their own forecast of the probable effect of the loss of that support was correct, I offer no opinion, but reproduce here the words of a critic, friendly to the Queen's Colleges, the late Dr. Porter, sometime Professor of Biblical Criticism in Assembly's College, afterwards President of Queen's College, Belfast:—

"Without the absolutely necessary connection with the adjacent Theological College of the General Assembly, Queen's College, Belfast, would have been a failure like its sisters in Cork and Galway." *

When Dr. Porter speaks of the success of Belfast, it is noticeable that he cannot refer to that kind of success hoped for by the founders of the Queen's Colleges, "The advancement of learning amongst *all* classes of Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland"—to quote the words of the Queen's Colleges' Act—unless he takes a very low view of the intelligence of his Catholic fellow-countrymen. The average number of Catholic Students in Belfast College, taken from the returns of 10 years before me, is 16, out of a total average attendance of 417

* Life of Dr. Cook, p. 450.

The population of Ulster is :—Protestant, 874,955 ; Catholic, 744,859.

It has been pointed out that the Government undertook, under the powers of appointment reserved to the Crown, to do some of the things asked for by the Catholic Hierarchy.

Sir Robert Peel (Hansard, Vol. 82, pp. 366, 367) “ speaking as Minister of the Crown,” said :—

“ Why, for whom were those new Colleges intended ? Who will derive benefit from them ? In the North, the Presbyterians ; in the South and West the Roman Catholics. You ask us to tie down the discrimination of the Crown by an enactment. Do you think that the same spirit that presided over their establishment will not induce the authors of the Bill to seek to found them on principles which shall be acceptable to the body for whom they are intended ? Have we ever denied that the cordial co-operation of the Roman Catholics would be almost essential to their success ? Do you think that we would lightly disregard any reasonable proposition which they should make ? I refer now to the course which we pursued with respect to the Charitable Bequests Act ; and I say that there was more real conciliation, more benefit derived from the conduct of the Executive in acting fairly and unfettered by enactment in carrying out that law, than if we had consented to your proposition, and had fettered ourselves by an enactment.* I consider that true conciliation, and concert, and co-operation are more likely to arise from the free action of the Executive Government in a friendly spirit, than from the introduction into laws of this kind of an enactment which leaves nothing for the discrimination of the Government.”

The first appointments to the Colleges appear to have been made in accordance with this policy ; but the character of subsequent appointments would lead one to infer that no official Minute was left on record by the Government of

* The concession referred to by Sir R. Peel is one whereby, under an Executive Minute, certain canonical privileges of the Catholic Bishops were recognised. It would probably have proved impossible to secure the insertion of such a provision in the Act itself.

1845 for the guidance of their successors in office. I cannot further discuss the matter here.

The question of the best mode of appointment of professors and other office-bearers gave rise to much discussion in 1845. Government declined to accede to the proposition of the Catholic Prelates that a fair proportion should be Catholics whose moral conduct should be certified by their respective Prelates, though Ministers undertook that the matter would not be overlooked in the exercise of the patronage of the Crown. It is well known that, practically, the responsibility now rests with the president of the College to whom the testimonials of candidates are submitted by Government. No doubt, moral fitness is not overlooked in these negotiations, though, owing to the exclusion of the advice of those who are peculiarly qualified to form an opinion, the method can hardly be considered satisfactory.

Moral conduct is not a novel qualification for public appointments.

The Civil Service Commissioners must be satisfied of the moral fitness of candidates for the public services; in the University of Dublin a candidate for degrees must be certified to be fit, *tam moribus quam doctrina*. A successful competitor for a Fellowship in the same University may be objected to *propter mores*.

As an illustration of the inadequacy of the information at the disposal of Government under the present system, I may mention a case reported to me by an eye-witness. An official, entered on a Parliamentary Return as a "Lutheran Protestant," (in Ireland) was found to be, in vacation, a devout member of the Jewish Synagogue at home.

A point on which the Government professed itself unable even to understand the Catholic position was that referring to the religion of certain Professors.

"I confess I was surprised, and seldom have I been more surprised, when I perused that public document recently set forth wherein it is contended that a Roman Catholic pupil cannot receive instruction through lectures given by a professor of geology, or of anatomy, or of history, except he be a Roman Catholic. . . Can you suppose that a Professor will terminate an Anatomical lecture with a sly sarcasm against Martin Luther, or a covert attack upon the Council of Trent? Such a thing is really ridiculous." (Sir R. Peel, Hansard, Vol. 80, p. 1289.)

Now, a professor of anatomy will admit that it is scarcely possible to lecture, even for one day, on human anatomy to University students—to Honor students, at least, though the limitation is hardly required—without having to face the difficulty of how to deal with problems of evolution without leaving inferences to be drawn by his pupils that go wider than his subject. At every step problems of development, of rudimentary or supernumerary structures, the explanation of abnormalities by their regular occurrence in animals lower than man, occur. The arguments have shifted entirely from design to evolution. This is not the place to suggest how to deal with the difficulty. I merely mention it to show that the demand of the Hierarchy had more substance in it than the Government knew.

The Catholic authorities were not alone in the assertion of the necessity for care in selecting teachers.

The Chancellor of the University of Dublin used these words—which may be taken as the highest expression of non-Catholic academic opinion in Ireland at that time—before a Royal Commission in 1853, eight years after the date of the Memorial of the Catholic Hierarchy:—

"The universal feeling of Christian parents has ever led them to wish that their sons should be brought up under the eye and care of the ministers of religion. . . . And this because the qualifications that fit a person for the Ministry are essentially the same as those which would best enable him to superintend the

morals and conduct of youth. The Statute, therefore, of Trinity College on this subject is only in harmony with the general sentiment which prevails in every Christian country.

“It is true that the enforcing of this rule may sometimes deprive the College of the services of some distinguished Mathematician, who may have a distaste for entering into Holy Orders ; but the very fact of his having a repugnance to becoming a Minister of the Church seems to be itself an indication that he is not possessed of those religious qualifications which would render him fit for the office of a tutor, to whose care a body of young students are to be committed *at the most critical period of their lives.*”

So far, the examination of the Acts of 1845 and 1879 goes to show that the legislation of 1879, while it destroyed the strong individuality of the Queen's University, by breaking down the elaborate combination of teaching and examination which had grown up as a result of intelligent experience, and reducing the Colleges to the position of detached provincial schools, did not touch at all those parts of the Queen's College system which had proved a hindrance to its acceptance by Catholics.

More than this, the foundation of the Royal University has distinctly complicated the problem.

The Queen's University had done the work committed to it, had done it well, and its members resented the punishment inflicted as undeserved.

But the Royal University has also done its work, and done it well ; and its members, too, may reasonably complain, if the reward of that work is to be the suppression of the University.

Yet it must be confessed that its continued existence, as the permanent form in which Irish University life is to be expressed, can hardly be defended. Nobody defends the constitution of a University that merely examines. It is not denied that examinations, taken in connection with

teaching, are admirable things, and that they furnish evidence of good teaching ; but it is denied that they are proof of good teaching, or even evidence of some of the most valuable parts of teaching. I shall put this as shortly as I can, for there is practically a consensus of opinion on one side. It will not be hard to show, further, that the weak points of the examination system become particularly evident in Ireland.

Examinations are found to stimulate teaching, but, at a certain point, the stimulus becomes unhealthy, in so far as it destroys the independence of the teacher by forcing him to follow the tone of examination papers, instead of his own deliberate and independent judgment. It is quite consistent with this statement that the examiner may be a better man than the teacher.

The stimulus becomes unhealthy for the pupil when his interest in a subject exactly coincides with its possible "value" as a means of gaining "marks" for some ulterior purpose. The teacher at this stage becomes, often most unwillingly, a "grinder," and the student one who does not follow learning for its own sake.

Now, a very large portion of the benefit to be secured from University life arises from the personal intercourse between teacher and pupil, and that indefinable thing—the tone of the University.*

These things do not count for "marks," nor is the personal influence of, say, a "grinder" for the Army or Civil Service, the highest form of influence, nor the tone of his establishment the best tone.

A system of education, the dominant feature of which is examination, conducted by an authority external to the teaching body, necessarily involves the degradation of the

* This is alluded to at more length in an extract from a lecture given in the Appendix.

teacher, and this again is destructive of the good influence that should attend his relationship to his pupils.

"In all systematic education there must be indeed a mechanical organisation, but the vital element is free human action—the main good which the pupil gets is from contact with a superior mind. If the teacher can give no play to the bent of his own intellect, if he have only to drill the pupil in a prescribed course, if his own thought or views can find no place in the examination, he will not care to occupy his pupil with them, and the pupil will not attend to him if he does: so after a time the teacher will keep his thoughts to himself, or possibly he may cease to think; at any rate the pupil will only come into contact with the husk of the man, and not with the real human being himself.

"It is one of the drawbacks to the use of examinations in general, that they tend to crush spontaneity, both in the pupil and the teacher; and this tendency is far greater when the examination is supreme and external to the teaching, than when the teaching and examining bodies are one, or when in some way each can influence the other.

"The French have exaggerated and perfected the mechanical element in education, . . . but in so doing they have destroyed the human element, and they are beginning to find out that it is only men that can make men, and that a piece of machinery worked by wires from a centre, however ingeniously it may be constructed, turns out but poor imitations of humanity."—(Latham: *Action of Examinations*, p. 65).

I think it was Thiers who said that it was the German Universities that won in the late Franco-Prussian war. Billroth of Vienna (*Lehren und Lernen an den Deutschen Universitäten*, p. 481) says it is a wonder to people in Germany how any trace of real scientific interest in his subject can be retained by a French student.

"The system of public instruction assumes no capacity on the part of the student to regulate his studies by his own energy or convictions; there are rules for everything." That good work is done, nevertheless, is a fact, he declares,

which "reflects the highest honour on French genius, thereby shown to be irrepressible!" Billroth adds that the French system may have this advantage (?) that only talent of the first order can develop itself under its influence.

In Ireland the existence of an Intermediate Education Examining Board makes it peculiarly undesirable that an Examining University should follow. It is difficult to see in what respect the Intermediate system differs from that of the Royal University. One continues the other, and from twelve to twenty years of age there are set before boys and girls questions by examiners whom they may never have seen, and, except that at seventeen or eighteen, the answer books and questions are labelled "Royal University," instead of "Intermediate Board," there is no difference except one of comparative difficulty, and even that, very often, is not perceptible.

It is cheerless and barren work, and if it is to be the last word on Irish Education, Irish parents must turn elsewhere in search of the liberal and generous influences that find no place in the creations of modern legislation.

There is also in Ireland the ancient foundation of the University of Trinity College, Dublin, to which we may turn in search of more satisfying conditions.

The Constitution was, according to the original Charter, modelled on that of Cambridge, the Cambridge of 1592, when the system of Halls had disappeared, and the Colleges had acquired the entire teaching and the greater part of the governing power of the University.

Accordingly, Trinity College is a University as well as a College, and the whole government of the College and of the University is vested in the Provost and Senior Fellows of Trinity College.

The Provost, under the original Charter, was elected by

the Fellows, and the Provost and Fellows were empowered to make laws for the University and to confer degrees.

In 1637 a new Charter was granted by Charles I., whereby the appointment of Provost and the power of making College Statutes were reserved to the Crown.

Senior Fellows (7) are co-opted from the junior list, the senior on the list being almost always elected.

The Charter provides that the students *ad colendam virtutem et religionem adjuventur*.

Religious instruction is given by Catechetical lectures, from attendance on which Catholic students were specially exempted in 1807, but the Reverend H. Lloyd, D.D., Senior Catechist, in his evidence before a Royal Commission in 1853, says:—"Although attendance is required only of members of the Established Church, yet they (the lectures) have been attended in some instances by Roman Catholics."

Religious tests were abolished by Fawcett's Act in 1873. That Act made no other change. The government of the College and University remained in the hands of those who had attained their positions under the old system.

The original Charter of Elizabeth provided specially that the liberal arts should not be taught elsewhere in Ireland by any person without the special license of the Crown.

(Et presertim ne artes liberales quispiam ullis aliis in locis publice profiteatur aut edoceat intra regni nostri Hiberniæ limites sine licentiâ nostra speciali.)

The University of Dublin can only confer degrees when asked to do so by the Provost and Fellows of Trinity College. The University has no corporate existence. All its powers have been conferred on it by Trinity College. The Provost and Fellows present candidates to the University, and the University (which is the creation of the College) must admit these candidates to degrees, and can admit no other. The Senate has the power, rarely

exercised, of postponing the degree, but only to the next commencements. At any time the Provost and Fellows can dissolve a meeting of the University by simply retiring from the meeting.

The conditions for graduation in the University are, then, the conditions for keeping terms in Trinity College. In that College all terms required for graduation can be kept by examination only. Residence or attendance at lectures or other instruction is not required.

In a Return before me, of 1,217 undergraduates of the University of Dublin, only 218 were allowed credit for lectures; the rest qualified by examination. 118 resided within Trinity College; 518 returned themselves as residing in the city or suburbs.

These figures can be compared with the statistics of the Queen's University where, it will be recollected, there were 1,000 students, all in attendance on regular courses of instruction on a professorial system. As in the Royal University, candidates for medical degrees must attend professional lectures, a fact that would appear to reduce still further the proportion of students in attendance on lectures in the Faculty of Arts.

It might be thought that the two existing Irish Universities are on a level as regards character of degrees, apart from considerations of the prestige of ancient foundation, as compared with a modern one; and that the relative value of the degrees, apart from that consideration, might be estimated by the nature and extent of the University examinations. But this is not so. Though Trinity College does not require residence, it makes elaborate provision for it. There are extensive College buildings where chambers and commons are provided for students who have the advantage of the supervision of resident tutors; lectures are delivered by eminent professors; there is a magnificent

library ;* the religious training of students is in the hands the learned Divines of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Divinity school of which is within the walls of the College.

The character of Trinity College as an ancient foundation with all these elements that go to create prestige stands high in public estimation, and deservedly so. This prestige is undoubtedly extended to its non-resident students who proceed by examination only. The public do not distinguish between the resident and non-resident students after graduation, and both enjoy the reputation connected with a residential degree.

On the other hand, the best known and most striking feature of the Royal University system is the express prohibition in the Act and Charter against requiring evidence of residence or instruction. The Senate must proceed by examination only, and the degrees are, in public estimation, non-residential, though many, probably a majority of the candidates who present themselves, have been students attached to the Catholic University College in Dublin, or the Queen's Colleges in the provinces where residence is strictly enforced.

Again, the Royal University, to compensate in some measure for the absence of evidence of instruction, is compelled to make its standard of examination exceptionally high. It follows that its graduates are submitted to tests almost of necessity more severe than those to which Trinity College students are subjected, while the estimate formed by the general public of Royal University degrees cannot fail to be less favourable than that formed of Trinity College degrees.

It would not be difficult to formulate theoretical objection to the Trinity College system. But the dominant

* Entitled under the Copyright Acts to receive a copy of every book published in the British Dominions.

feature of the whole system is its development in accordance with the wants and wishes of its members. The autonomy of the College is complete; for, although the statutes are formally enacted by the Crown, they are really the product of that autonomy, and it may be assumed, that what is good for education will not escape the attention of the governing body.

The question has often been raised—it was the basis of Mr. Gladstone's University Bill of 1873—whether other Colleges within the University of Dublin, acceptable to Catholics, might not be founded or recognized. It is true that in several Acts and Charters reference to other Colleges “to be of the University of Dublin” is made. The Charter of James I., which enabled the University to send two Members to Parliament, recites, as a reason for conferring that privilege, that Trinity College is a University as well as a College, and that Bills are occasionally brought before the House affecting that College and other Colleges or Halls to be established afterwards in that University.

The Act of Settlement, 14 and 15 Chas. I., c. 2, sec. ccxix., empowers the Lord Lieutenant in Council to establish another College, to be of the University, to be called King's College. Power is given to raise a sum of £2,000 per annum on the settled lands for the use of the new College “which shall be governed by statutes to be made by the Crown.”

33 Geo. III., c. 21, sec. 7, enacts:—“That it shall be lawful for Papists . . . to hold or take degrees or any Professorship, or to be Masters or Fellows of any College to be hereafter founded in this kingdom, provided that such College shall be a member of the University of Dublin, and shall not be founded exclusively for Papists.”

These powers have not been acted on, and Trinity College is not alone the sole College of the University,

but claims to be the authority from which University powers are derived. The University of Dublin, apart from Trinity College, has no corporate existence, and a new College to be founded within the University could only exercise its functions by favor of the Provost and Fellows of Trinity.

Again, it has been suggested that as Trinity College is now free from religious tests, Catholics may now freely enter. But Fawcett's Act, it will be recollected, made no other change than the abolition of tests. Even if Catholics entered Trinity and competed successfully for Fellowships, many years must elapse before a Catholic could be co-opted Senior Fellow, and become a member of the governing body. Trinity College has been a Protestant University since its foundation, and will probably remain so. It is claimed by its friends, that it is to-day as Protestant in tone as at any period in its history. The changes that would cause it to be otherwise, would amount to a revolution; and would probably entail the loss of the Protestant support it now enjoys.

The attitude of Trinity College towards Catholics, at a not very remote period, may be inferred from the words of the learned historian of that University, Dr. Taylor:—

“If members of the Church of Rome would have the good sense and proper delicacy not to meddle with a question of high education on which this class is not by habits or instruction capable of affording any valuable or useful information, much time would be saved.” (Taylor: *History of the University of Dublin*, p. 538. This work was published in 1845.)

As to the prestige to be gained by a Catholic College from a union with Trinity, the argument is one which no self-respecting Catholic can entertain.

Protestants were granted a monopoly by Elizabeth's

Charter, it is true—a monopoly that continued in full force till 1845 ; and a history of 300 years does confer prestige, but the overtures for such recognition of Catholic claims as would constitute Trinity College a National University must come from the Protestant side.

Irish Catholics say that they, too, have traditions. The authority to which the oldest Universities in Europe owe their origin is still at the head of the Catholic Church. The lamp of learning was lighted in Ireland by Catholic hands before Trinity College was thought of ; and Irish students were then of no mean repute. The light has been handed down under conditions of sacrifice, which, though of bitter memory, have yet an ennobling value. The succession of Doctors is unbroken in the ranks of the Catholic Hierarchy. A University supported by the traditions of the Catholic students of Ireland, and so constituted as to express the full intellectual life of the Catholic Church, need not concern itself with question of the prestige of other bodies.

But the monopoly created by the State, and enjoyed so long by Trinity College, does throw on the State now an obligation of relieving Catholics from the consequences of that monopoly. Not alone were there no public endowments for Catholic University Education, but private ones were forbidden or suppressed.

Trinity College itself occupies the site of an ancient Catholic foundation, the Priory of All Hallows. The public endowments of Trinity College, in addition to that site and buildings thereon, chiefly erected by votes of the Irish Parliament, include grants of confiscated lands in seventeen counties, extending over 200,000 acres, having a valuation of £92,000 a year.*

* By a system of renewable leases and fines the rental has been brought down to £40,000 ; but this reduced rental is of the nature and security of a head rent. The fines were, I presume, applied to College purposes.

It is not unreasonable to say that the College to be provided for Irish Catholics should be placed on an equality with the Protestant College, so far as public endowments are concerned.

In the Royal University Act of 1879 there is a clause providing that the Senate, when establishing Fellowships and other prizes out of public moneys, shall take care to avoid any possible injury to Trinity College (Sec. 9, par. 3). The policy of that provision might serve as a precedent for the financial relations to be established between Trinity and the new College.

It is most important for the success of a modern University that it shall enjoy the advantages of a metropolitan position. Berlin University, founded in 1809, has outstripped many older German Universities.

The Statutes should be, like those of Trinity College, the product of College autonomy, safeguarded against abuse by the need of procuring the formal approval of the Crown.

There would thus be in Dublin two Universities fully representative of Protestant and Catholic thought.

The Presbyterian students of Ulster remain to be considered. Everything that has been said of Catholic claims for expression of full intellectual life applies with equal force to Presbyterians, and the same treatment is due. They ask for full University powers for Belfast College, and it is difficult to see on what grounds the demand is refused.

To send students from a town of the population of Belfast, the capital of Ulster—a Province of marked individuality—to be examined at every stage of their College course in Dublin, is not a defensible proceeding. A University of Belfast, the history of Belfast College shows, would hold its own in rivalry with Trinity College or a Catholic College.

Three Universities would not be too many for Ireland. Scotland has four. The relation of population to Universities in Scotland and in Germany is shown in a table in Appendix.

There would remain the Queen's Colleges of Cork and Galway, of which it may be sufficient to say that if the declaration of their founders—that they were intended mainly for Catholics, and that it was essential almost for their success that they should receive the support of Catholics—be kept in mind and acted on, there would be little doubt of their success. They would naturally be friendly rivals of the Catholic University of Dublin, just as Belfast University would be a rival of Trinity College. Rivalry of that kind would be a very different thing from the ungenerous competition now going on in Ireland.

Some experience in the West of Ireland leads me to believe that if a College career were open freely to Catholics in the provinces—to the best students even from village schools, who would naturally go, in the first instance, to adjacent provincial Colleges, results similar to those that obtain in Scotland would follow. I am not advocating indiscriminate University training, but the search for proper subjects for that training must be wide if it is not intended to confine its advantages to the children of the rich. It is well known that Scotland has kept the 'career open to talents'; while, in England, University foundations, intended by pious founders for poor students, have been converted into "hauts lyceés" for the rich.

This argument I was endeavouring to develop before the Board of Visitors of Queen's College, Galway, in March, 1896. I was endeavouring to point out that a reason advanced by the learned President of the College for the small number of students—namely, the small number of superior schools in Connaught—was inconclusive, inasmuch

as boys who had not had the advantage of superior school instruction might have become successful College students if the College were freely open to them. The Visitors ruled my explanation out of order.

The suggestions I offer are academic. The solution of the problem concedes what the members of the Church of Ireland and the Presbyterian Church demand for themselves. Whether it would be accepted by Catholics, I do not know. It appears to correspond with what an Englishman of much academic experience thinks they ought to have:

“The Irish Catholics, who are the immense majority in Ireland, want a Catholic University. Elsewhere both Catholics and Protestants have Universities where their sons may be taught. Catholic France allowed the Protestants of Alsace to have the Protestant University of Strasburg.

“Protestant Prussia allows the Catholics of the Rhine Province to have the Catholic University of Bonn. . . . I call Strasburg a Protestant and Bonn a Catholic University in this sense; that religion and the matters mixed up with religion are taught in the one by Protestants, and in the other by Catholics. This is the guarantee which ordinary parents desire, and this at Bonn and Strasburg they get. The Protestants of Ireland have in Trinity College, Dublin, a University, where the teachers in all those matters, which afford debatable ground between Catholics and Protestants are Protestant. The Protestants of Scotland have Universities of a like character. In England the members of the English Church have, in Oxford and Cambridge, Universities where the teachers are almost wholly Anglican.

“Well, the Irish Catholics ask to be allowed the same thing.

“There is extraordinary difficulty in getting this demand of theirs directly and frankly met. . . . They are told that they have the Queen’s Colleges, invented expressly for Ireland. But they do not want Colleges invented expressly for Ireland; they want Colleges such as the English and Scotch have in England and Scotland. They are told that they may have a University of the London type, an examining board, The world, in general, much

prefers the Universities of the London type, Universities of the type of Strasburg, Bonn, Oxford; and the Irish are of the same mind as the world in general."—Matthew Arnold; *Mixed Essays*, 1879.

Fifty years have passed since Peel's legislation of 1845.

Amongst the wasted opportunities of Ireland may well be reckoned the dwarfed intellectual life of a generation which has given demonstration that Irish love of learning is subordinate to feelings of a higher order.

The demonstration may be said to be now complete. One's sympathy with the people is not lessened by finding that the system which, on these higher grounds, they have declined to accept, is in itself academically imperfect, and that these academic imperfections coincide closely with the features objected to by the people on conscientious grounds.

Non-Catholic criticism appears to have finally concentrated itself into the statement that the interests of learning are likely to suffer by the obscurantist tone which, it would appear, is a distinctive characteristic of Catholic teaching. There appears to be no doubt about the obscurantism, and various checks are benevolently suggested for its cure, though some non-Catholic critics are inconvenienced by discussions amongst themselves as to the proper work of a University. A correspondence of experts carried on in "Nature" with regard to the constitution of the proposed University for London (Professors Fitzgerald, Ayrton, and Thiselton Dyer) reveals at least six suggested definitions:—

1. A University should be a mere examining body.
2. It is a place for the cultivation of good breeding, gentlemanly behaviour, and athletics.
3. At a University should be taught classics, mathematics, and pure science.

4. The Professors should teach *useful* subjects (like mechanical and electrical engineering, medicine, &c., as at Cambridge).
5. The true function of a University is the teaching of *useless* learning.
6. It is no part of the business of a University to *teach*.
(This startling proposition is explained by adding that everybody should *learn* there.)

Common people who want to see a new University established may well feel despondent ; but there is hope to be got out of a firm grip of Mills' assertion that every definition includes an axiom inasmuch as it assumes the existence of the thing defined.

But here is an extract from an address delivered at a very modern institution—the University of New York State—the thought is almost mediæval if not obscurantist :—

“Remembering that the great ministry of education is not to make the body more comfortable but the soul happier, may this University, in all its departments and activities, cherish and promote education, not for its lower use, but for its higher influences.”

The unexpected sometimes happens, and it may be that a Catholic University of Ireland—if its unfortunate obscurantism be not *too* much checked—may yet do useful work and give help in time for the discussion. Irish scholars did something of the kind before. This is the account by a monk of St. Gall of what they did in Charlemagne's time. (Trans. of Mr. R. L. Poole, quoted in inaugural address before Johns Hopkin's University by President Gilman, February 23rd, 1885) :—

“When the illustrious Charles had begun to reign alone in the western parts of the world, and the study of letters was everywhere

well-nigh forgotten, in such sort, that the worship of the true God declined, it chanced that two Scots from Ireland, lighted with the British merchants on the coast of Gaul, men learned without compare as well in secular as in sacred writings; who, since they showed nothing for sale, kept crying to the crowd that gathered to buy. If any man is desirous of wisdom let him come to us and receive it, for we have it to sell. . . . At length their cry being long continued was brought by certain that wondered at them or deemed them mad to the ears of Charles, the King, always a lover and most desirous of wisdom; who when he had called them with all haste into his presence, enquired if, as he understood by report, they had wisdom verily with them.

“Yea, said they, we have it and are ready to impart it to any that rightly seek it in the name of the Lord. When, therefore, he had enquired what they would have in return for it, they answered: Only proper places and noble souls, and such things as we cannot travel without, food and wherewith to clothe ourselves.

“Hearing this he was filled with great joy.”

APPENDIX I.

STATEMENT with reference to the CLAUSES of the UNIVERSITY EDUCATION (IRELAND) ACT of 1879, which affect the Queen's University, prepared by the Annual Committee of Convocation by direction of the Convocation of the University.

“In the last days of the Session of 1879, an Irish University Education Bill passed through all its stages in both Houses of Parliament, and became law.

“This measure, vitally affecting the Queen's University, was hurried forward with such haste that, incredible as it may seem, no communication was made by the Government to the Queen's University, nor was any opportunity afforded to it of forming or expressing any opinion on the subject.

“The Act consists of two distinct parts: a constructive part creating an Examining Board in Ireland, with power to confer degrees; and a destructive part which declares that the Queen's University shall be dissolved.

“For the second of these, not only does there not exist any precedent, but, if it be maintained, it becomes itself an alarming precedent for the other Universities of the United Kingdom, having regard to the circumstances under which it was carried.

“It was not denied that the Queen's University had loyally, and with signal success, discharged all duties entrusted to it: the University was even commended on this ground; but in the hurry of the late Government the essential character of the Queen's University was misconceived—the Government had no time to inquire—they put forward a history of the University according with its supposed character, but quite at variance with its real history—at variance *with its history in respect of every particular* which bore on the legislation which they proposed—and they rested on these errors their recommendation to Parliament to dissolve the University. The Queen's University exerted itself to its utmost to get these disastrous mistakes corrected; but there was not time, the Session was on the point of closing, the Bill was urged through its last stages, and became law.

“Lord Cairns, in making the official statement of the Govern-

ment, on the 30th June, 1879, said (Hansard, Third Series, Vol. 247, col. 937 and 941.):—

“‘Now, what is the case with regard to the Queen’s University? My Lords, the history of the Queen’s University is this:—In the year 1845, there were founded three Queen’s Colleges in Ireland—one at Belfast, one at Cork, and one at Galway. They were founded, in the first instance, as Colleges, without any arrangements for conferring degrees. They were provided by Parliament with grants for building, and with considerable endowments for the foundation of scholarships and exhibitions. In a few years afterwards—I think in 1850—the Queen’s University was incorporated for the purpose of conferring degrees upon those who were students of those three Colleges. Now, your lordships will understand that the Queen’s University itself has, what I may term, no local or real existence beyond that of its corporate character. What I mean to say is, it does not undertake to teach; it has no Professors, it has no Fellows. It is not provided with any scholarships or exhibitions—it is simply an examining body. But, then, your lordships will observe the peculiarity of this examining body is that—it does not examine for the purpose of conferring degrees at large, but for the purpose of conferring a degree only on those who pass through a curriculum or course of study in one of the three Queen’s Colleges.

“‘The question then arises, what do we propose with reference to the Queen’s University? Your lordships will remember that the Queen’s University itself is but an examining body; but it is an examining body simply for the purpose of examining those students who are members of the three Queen’s Colleges. It appears to the Government that it would be an arrangement not only inconvenient, but without precedent, to establish in one metropolis three Universities—Trinity College (the University of Dublin), the Queen’s University, and the University which is proposed to be created by this Bill—and that it would be still more indefensible to adopt that course, when you consider that two of these Universities would be performing exactly the same functions—namely, examining for degrees—with only a trifling distinction. We, therefore, propose that as soon as the University to which I have referred is constituted by Royal Charter, steps shall be taken for the dissolution of the Queen’s University.’”

“‘Now, so far from the Queen’s University being an afterthought grafted upon the original design of the Queen’s Colleges, as represented to Parliament by Lord Cairns, it was an essential part of that original design. In introducing the Queen’s Colleges’ Bill, in 1845, on behalf of the Government, Sir James Graham, said (Hansard, Third Series, Vol. 80, col. 358.):—

“‘I should still leave the statement most imperfect if I did not glance at other important and peculiar circumstances connected with it. The Bill I propose to bring in does no more than propose to build and establish those Colleges in Ireland; but the great question that presents itself is—shall these three Colleges be associated together in one University? Or, following the example of Scotland, shall the Crown, in the exercise of its prerogative, endow each of these Colleges with the power of granting Degrees in Arts, Sciences, and in Medicine? Now, sir, it is not necessary—and, as I think it would not be expedient—in the present Bill, and at the present time, to fix and carry out any definite arrangement on that point. It is not necessary on the one hand; while, on the other, I hold it to be important that we should ascertain what amount of success attends this first step—and it is a large step—in advance, before that question is finally decided. At the same time I will not be so deficient in candour as not to state what is my own opinion of the matter. I

think that the advantages in favour of a Central University decidedly preponderate. . . . This brings me to the question, if we are to have a Central University for Ireland, with which these Colleges shall be in connection, where shall it be? Now, upon this point I am bound to say that, considering all the circumstances of the case, and having come to the conclusion that there should be a Central University, in which all these Provincial Colleges should be associated, I think that Central University should be in the metropolis of Ireland.'

"It thus clearly appears that the constituting of the Queen's Colleges a University was an essential part of the design laid before Parliament in 1845; and that the only question which the Government reserved was whether each College should have University powers, or whether they should be associated together. The view of the Government as to the necessity of the University was accepted by Lord Palmerston, who spoke as follows on behalf of the Opposition. (Hansard, Third Series, Vol. 80, col. 408.) :—

" ' Sir, I agree entirely with those who consider this Bill as only a foundation which requires a superstructure in order to make the plan complete. It will be found absolutely necessary to establish some Central point, probably in connection with Trinity College, Dublin, which will combine these different Colleges into one University, and will, if possible, connect Trinity College with it as a component part. When I consider all the difficulties with which the arrangement of the details must be attended, I am far from blaming Her Majesty's Government for not having made that aggregate University a part of their present proposal; but, at the same time, I must say their measure will be incomplete if, sooner or later, they do not combine with it a larger arrangement of that nature.'

"Accordingly, as soon as the Colleges were ready to receive Students, steps were taken to incorporate the University which was to complete them. The Act under which the Queen's Colleges were founded passed in 1845. Four years were spent in building and preliminary arrangements. It was not till November, 1849, that the Colleges were opened for the reception of Students, and in the following year the Queen's University was founded to unite them into one institution, and to complete the education which they give. There was no such interval of some years as Lord Cairns imagined. Even the short interval of months, rendered necessary by the formalities that had to be gone through in preparing the University Charter, was provided for by the creation by the Government of a Special Temporary Board, which discharged the University functions for the time, whose regulations were acted on in the Colleges from the beginning, and were adopted as the first ordinances of the University as soon as it was constituted. Thus, from the very first, the Colleges started as parts of one great organization, and neither in the original design, as laid before Parliament, nor in the actual order of events, was there any foundation for the representation made by Lord Cairns.

"Lord Cairns was equally unfortunate when he ventured the statement to Parliament that the Queen's University was 'simply an examining body.' Nothing can be further from the truth. In its initial conception, by the terms of its Charter, and in the way in which it has been worked, the Queen's University is not a mere examining board, nor is it a distinct institution from the Queen's Colleges, but they together form one institution, the main and important function of which is to teach. The buildings of the Queen's Colleges are not colleges in the English acceptance of the word, *i.e.*, they are not buildings in which students reside. They are the lecture halls in which *the instruction of the University* is given at three distinct stations, and they thus correspond exactly with the University buildings of the Scotch or Continental Universities.

"To mark emphatically that instruction in the Colleges is the instruction of the University, the University Charter provides that the Professors in the Queen's Colleges are Professors of the University; and the maintenance of this relation is ensured in the most substantial way by the duties imposed upon the University Senate. It is this central authority which prescribes what shall be taught, whether at Belfast, Cork, or Galway, as a condition for a degree; in what order the studies shall succeed one another; how long each shall be pursued, and what option shall be allowed to the students; and this teaching, so prescribed by the Senate, is given simultaneously by the University Professors in the three Queen's Colleges. The University Senate also lays down the examinations which the students are to pass in common; and for that purpose brings together, in Dublin, nearly its whole staff of Professors, and forms them, along with some external examiners, into Boards of Examiners, by whom the students are examined. The University has thus been in a position to weave its teaching and examining into one consistent whole, and this it has done with the utmost care.

"So far from the Queen's University being 'simply an examining board,' as alleged by Lord Cairns, it is a University of the strictest academical type that has yet been seen in the British Isles. To teach is its predominant function, and it has, with signal success, applied itself to subordinate its examinations to its more important function of teaching; to render its examinations such as will best co-operate with the instruction instead of controlling it; and to do what in it lies to counteract the baneful effects on higher education of 'the examination fungus,' which is abroad. Its examinations, as already explained, are mainly conducted by its teachers; its regulations for these examinations are largely based by its governing Senate on reports received from these teachers. Its examiners, being experienced teachers, are of the class who make the most efficient examiners, and they are subjected to the best checks yet contrived for insuring the full

discharge of their difficult duties, inasmuch as they are the persons most interested in improving the examinations entrusted to them ; and inasmuch as they fulfil their functions under the observation of colleagues as expert as themselves. The University examinations, and the instruction given to the students in the Colleges, have thus been brought by the experience of thirty years into such healthy relation, that they together tend in an eminent degree to promote the higher forms of instruction, and to discourage cramming.

“ It is this support given by the examinations and the instruction to each other, and the combination of both in the case of every candidate who obtains a degree, which are the distinguishing features of the culture of the Queen’s University, a system of culture every part of which is in broad contrast with that which it has been made the duty of the new University to evolve. It was, therefore, an entire misapprehension on Lord Cairns’ part to suppose that the new University and the Queen’s University, if allowed to co-exist, ‘ would be performing exactly the same functions with only a trifling distinction.’ ”

“ It appears from the Act of 1879 that it was not the intention of the Government or Legislature to injure the Queen’s Colleges ; and it further appears that the legislation in its present form was carried under an entire misapprehension of the true relation of the Queen’s University to the Queen’s Colleges. If the importance of this relation had been sufficiently appreciated, it may, perhaps, be questioned whether Parliament would have inflicted so great an injury upon higher education in Ireland, or interfered so seriously with the personal rights of individual graduates.

“ Convocation feels so strongly the injury which would be inflicted on the members of the University (in some cases expected to lead to pecuniary loss),* as well as that done to the cause which they have at heart, that it earnestly desires a reconsideration of the position of the University, taking into account the real facts of the case.”

* Very serious pecuniary losses have been sustained by several Professors, but the Act having been drafted under a misapprehension, no redress was provided.

Lord Cairns (Hansard V. 247, p. 942) said :—“ Our intention and anxiety has been not in any way to interfere with the Queen’s Colleges ; we do not touch them in any respect, and if there is any change it is for their advantage.”

In my own case (Professor of Anatomy and Physiology) the diminution of official income amounts to £300 a year, or to a total sum of £4,500 since the abolition of the Queen’s University in 1882.

Under the Queen’s University system attendance at lectures in the Queen’s Colleges was compulsory on candidates for degrees.

The Scottish Universities Act, under which the constitution of these bodies has been recently remodelled, provides compensation for Professors whose fees may be interfered with ; and nearly all the Chairs have been assigned a minimum fee income under that provision. There is no doubt that Parliament would have made similar provision for Queen’s College Professors if the real facts had been known.

APPENDIX II.

INAUGURAL LECTURE ON "UNIVERSITY LIFE," delivered before Queen's College Students' Debating Society at the beginning of Session. (Short-hand Report from *Galway Pilot*, November 28, 1896.)

"Although I cannot lay claim—as our Chairman, Sir Thomas Moffett, may properly claim—to be one of the founders of the Society, I can claim one merit, and that is that I served in the ranks of the Society at a very early age (applause). I was thinking of beginning my remarks with welcoming the members of the Society who are present here to night, and I am inclined to think I should include myself as one of the new members, it is such a long time since I addressed this Society. When your secretaries informed me that the Society had done me the honour to elect me President for this Session, I was informed, politely, but firmly, that the duties of the office included the delivery of a lecture. Well, I give a good many lectures, and one more or less is not a great task; but I hardly think that kind of lecture is what was contemplated. I rather gather that a discourse provocative of debate, containing propositions which the Society may reject or affirm, is what you want. I shall try to do this. I am glad to see from the programme which has been issued—if the programme is carried out in its entirety—there will be little to complain of in the way of activity on the part of the Society during the coming Session. Rumours have reached me of a certain curtailment of the freedom of debate which in my early days would have been resented. The words of a Professor, it is said, should not be criticised. In his formal lectures a Professor has you at his mercy—you must listen to him and you have no right of reply: but here, let us have a clear field and no favour. When Professor Blackie visited Cambridge he put a question to his host—one of the great men of that University—and received a reply which he very likely thought was not entirely satisfactory. 'What do they say of me in Cambridge?' was the question, and the reply—'I don't recollect hearing anyone speaking of you.' In the old days we maintained as one of the undoubted

and most cherished privileges of the Society the right to criticise any speaker, especially a Professor (cheers). Indeed we subjected our convictions to a severe test. When some difference of opinion arose as to free criticism and we were refused the use of this Hall, we, after anxious deliberation, decided to make a levy on the members of the Society to procure a room elsewhere. It was an anxious moment, but the call was well responded to (cheers). Often since when watching the career of one of our members—the late Financial Secretary for Bengal—whose services were too soon lost to his country, I thought how he must have recalled now and again his early financial efforts as our treasurer at that time of stress in the Society. Well, I suppose it would be becoming in me and my duty at this, our first meeting, to say a word of welcome to the younger members, and especially a word of cordial welcome to the lady students (great applause)—who are the first lady scholars of the College, the first too, I am sure, of a long line. Another reminiscence—but I am afraid I am indulging in reminiscences rather than giving a lecture (no). Twenty years ago I advocated the admission of lady students to the College. I was in a minority—indeed my colleagues tell me I am always in a minority (laughter)—but such as it was, we did our best in what we thought a good cause—and I have no objection to be classed in such a minority. Sometimes I find that my minority becomes a majority, and then I perhaps may find that my colleagues, who I quite acknowledge are as earnest as myself—all classify themselves under the safer head of a majority. I am certain that a proverbially generous sex will not judge our efforts by their result at the time, but will accord some measure of approval to our efforts of twenty years ago, although it is only now we have fully succeeded in having our aims carried out (applause).

“We are here as University students, and we have selected this western town as our place of study. Just before I came away, I was looking at a periodical published in a neighbouring University, in which it is asserted, with all gravity, that no University, present or future, can claim the social status or prestige of antiquity enjoyed by that fortunate institution. ‘Social status!’—well, we must bear up against our unfortunate defects! Let us examine the other matter more seriously. The prestige of antiquity is only so far valuable as it leads up to and is a factor in present conditions—is, in fact, a living force. If I am correct in this, I venture to advance the proposition that there is, in the environment of this western town, something which may challenge the boasted antiquity of our neighbour, or even of Universities which were old before it was thought of. We do not, of course, enjoy the advantages of position of such a place as Edinburgh—that beautiful University town where one can receive education at

almost every step. And there are others that will occur to you. But there is one neglected factor in our environment (and nobody will deny the powerful influence of environment in education)—a factor that should be our strength, but which we set down as of no value. We are living in the midst of a Celtic people, the depositaries of traditions as faithfully transmitted by oral record as more ambitious historical work—a people endowed in full measure with the glorious imagination and poetry of their race, speaking as a living tongue the language which scholars in Paris and Berlin are laboriously studying; and we ignore it all. Scholars come, as you have known them to come, to study Celtic language and legends in this, their last stronghold in Europe; but we have no help to give them in this College. We can only tell them that we have suppressed our Celtic Chair. In sight of Aran, on the shores where Brendan voyaged, we are placed; and we have suppressed the one slenderly-endowed foundation which, of all others, would have been a strength to us. I would like to enlarge on the subject of these legends. I would like to submit to you that they are of far higher value than that which is commonly and lightly assigned to them. The Homeric legends are invaluable for insight into the social life of their times. Have ours no value? May they not be looked on as abstract conceptions, embodying in that form, with idealized personages, the essence of what took place in actual fact? I do not know that Shakespeare's *Henry V.* is an actual historical record, but I am satisfied to take my impressions of that time and of many other times from Shakespeare.

“May we not fairly say that we get the very soul of history from these idealized records, as we see the facts of any time through the pictures of a great artist? Our artists are the story-tellers, and well have they done their work. All I am saying is qualified by my proposition that antiquity is only valuable in so far as it is a living factor. If it is important to know Ireland—Irish people—then along the lines that show the development of the life and thought of the people some guidance may be found in the solution of problems of the present day. ‘To understand the Poet one must go into the poet’s country’—the country is here at our doors. Perhaps I am glorifying the Celtic imagination too much, but it is a great gift. There is one safeguard against its undue influence—another gift which is possessed in equal measure—Humour. It is a great endowment this double gift—recollect, after all, I am making out a case for people who have suffered much, who have little other riches, and who would be thought by our University critic sadly deficient in ‘social status.’ Besides, the vast domain which these products of the imagination occupy must be filled somehow. I have often wondered how our powerful neighbour across the Channel proceeds to fill it. A study of *his* abstractions would, I am confident, be instructive. But we have a still more powerful

corrective in this College in the presence of the hardy race of Northerners who descend on us as the—well, as the other Northerners descended on degenerate Rome—and carry off all our scholarships every year. Their imagination is not, perhaps, as vivid as ours, but the combination is a splendid one, and affords good promise of a strong and wide University foundation. There is no need to say how our Northern friends are appreciated in our Western home—everybody knows what friendly relations they establish with their Western hosts (cheers). Property has its duties as well as its rights, and environment has its obligations as well as its advantages.

“We are here met by another element in University life—the influence of Association. I do not know anything more remarkable in the whole range of Psychology than the influence of a crowd on the individuals who compose it. A school of modern philosophers are engaged in the investigation of the effect of mind on mind at a distance; I am inclined to think that if, instead of investigating rare cases of *actio in distans*, they were to turn their attention to the psychical manifestations of the first crowd they meet in the street, they would find abundant material for study. They would find indications of the passing of individual Wills into one common and intensified Will, something well worth closer study. It is a powerful influence for good or for ill—this Association force, and every University student must come within its range. I can only throw out this as a suggestion. I cannot enlarge on that subject, and I am bound to take heed of the criticism that is to follow—especially of those who are endowed with that wonderful quality—the confidence and assuredness of youth (applause). With this environment, then, and this association, what are we doing here and now? I suppose the junior student would answer with Mr. Verdant Green that he is now a University *Man*.

“There is much in the answer, as we shall see afterwards. But we must go closer. To be a scholar and a gentleman—that would not be too high an aim. I shall not say anything about a gentleman; I have known many gentlemen who were not scholars. I have many friends amongst the peasants of the West, and there are many gentlemen amongst them. A scholar is a fine title, and, as the abuse of a very good thing is always a particularly bad thing, it is a most objectionable thing when scholarship degenerates into pedantry.

“Are we then found to be scholars when we have read certain books? (No.) I notice particularly the limitations of these books—so many books of Virgil, so many books of Euclid. A student stops there. The rest do not seem to interest him. Of course, he is thinking of the ordeal we all have to undergo—Examinations. We must do more than this. Recollect I am

only thinking out the subject. Thinking over the subject, I can find nothing better, as a description of scholarship, than that superb definition of truth well known to the scholastics—*Adæquatio intellectus et rei*. The scholastics are not quite as often heard of in Universities nowadays as they were at one time; but I think it would be possible to learn something from them still. Let us apply their criterion, as I have adopted it, to some disputed point in the life of a student—whether or not the study of Greek is necessary to the formation of a scholar, for instance. The criterion is that the intellect must be made adequate to the subject. It is a splendid criterion, of universal application, and, if accepted, would make short work of some modern attempts to apply certain weights and measures to subjects that are not measurable, and cannot be weighed by these standards.

“Do you want to know Greek? That means, do you want to study the poetry, the art, the sociology of that people? If you do, the means must be fully employed to that end. The language must be mastered. If you can afford to leave out what I have enumerated, the language is not necessary. I think you will find a great blank, and that you will have lost, not Greek poetry or philosophy only, but a great deal of all poetry and philosophy, or, what is a poor substitute, be obliged to get your knowledge at second-hand. If there is anything that would help to fill the blank it is the substitution of Celtic—the finely-shaded and half-elusive Celtic sentence has something Greek in it—and I am glad to say, in this connection, that this College has decided to allow, in the first year’s scholarship programme, an alternative of Greek or Celtic (applause).

“Recollect, I stand by my principle. Do you want to know anything, is it imperative to know it?—then a scholar must know it thoroughly—no compromise with knowledge—you must do the work well. A curious side-light was thrown on this question a few years ago at Berlin. That University decided to allow for ten years’ students from the Real Schools—where ancient languages are not compulsory—to enter the University, as well as the usual Gymnasium Students who must know Greek and Latin. In almost every case the Real School Students were beaten and outstripped by the Gymnasia Students even in the very subjects in which the Real Schools had trained them in advance. It was a fine instance of inductive reasoning, and I decline to disturb it by entering into a discussion as to the explanation. We might extend this enquiry over the whole range of University work, but one instance will suffice—those remarks must come to a close some time. One observation I may make—another reminiscence. Many years ago in the Society, some of us struck with the marvellous power of language—determined that we should cultivate the greatest care and precision in using that powerful weapon. Sometimes I think

I can recognise in the style of a leading journalist of the day the effect of that early resolution adopted when he was a member of this Society. It is a profound truth that our own language by a reflex process powerfully affects ourselves. What we do we must do well. Can we stop there? I think we must do something more to obtain the coveted title of scholar. There must be a certain range over which the intellect must exercise itself. The great domain of Art for instance. It is almost, if not entirely, neglected in modern study. Yet is it possible to exclude from our view that great field which engaged so much of the attention of the people of the Middle Ages when much that is well established now was still in process of slow formation? To know the present, one must often go far back into the past. But, if my canon be sound, the knowledge must be thorough, and herein I fear, lies a difficulty. This I have not time to discuss. I am making suggestions—little more. I know I shall be told that one must learn useful knowledge. On the other hand, I have heard it said that a University is a place from which useful knowledge—useful for making money of course—is excluded as such. I am rather inclined to defend that proposition—paradoxical as it may seem. (Laughter and applause.) But, again, I haven't time. It would take me far out of my way. (Laughter). I haven't given you any advice yet. (Laughter). I am going to finish with some. I hope it won't meet the fate of all advices that are not asked for. I have put before you a high ideal. Never lower your own ideal if you have formed one. I suppose everybody does form one, and the greatest danger in your whole career, believe me, is to allow that ideal to be lowered by cynical or irreverent criticism. Any influence that tends to lower it is an evil influence. You have all heard how Cervantes laughed away the chivalry of Spain. The Spain of to-day is not the Spain of Cervantes. And even Molière—the altogether delightful Molière to whom we must pardon anything, did a great deal of mischief in France. His *Femmes Savantes*, and other charming works of the same kind, put back the education of French women two hundred years. They were just beginning to be learned, as we are here (applause) and these charming satires of his made them drop it all. But France is improving. The other day at the Théâtre Français, I listened to a play of Victor Hugo's which was laughed off the stage when it was first produced, on account of what were thought to be its high flown sentiments of honour. It is received now with every mark of approval. France is going back to some of its ideals. Would that it would go back to all of them." (Cheers).

| Country. | Universities. | University Town Population. | Number of Students | Total Endowment. | State Portion of Endowment. | Professors and Assistants | Maintenance of Institutes. |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| Ireland 4,704,750 | 1. Trinity College 2. Royal U'iversity 3. (?) - - | | | £ | £ | £ | £ |
| Belgium 6,410,783 (Census, 31 Dec., 1895.) | 1. Brussels - - 2. Ghent - - 3. Louvain - - 4. Liège - - | 190,313 157,214 41,547 163,207 | 1,361 672 1,650 1,470 | | | | |
| Baden 1,725,270 (German Empire Statistics are from Provisional Census Returns, 2 December, 1895.) | 1. Freiburg i.-B. 2. Heidelberg - | 53,081 35,139 | 1,571 1,206 | 30,000 38,421 | 23,000 35,000 | 15,000 23,000 | 10,000 13,000 |
| Bavaria 5,797,414 | 1. Erlangen - - 2. Munich - - 3. Wurzburg - - | 20,891 407,174 68,714 | 1,164 3,798 1,442 | 32,000 49,300 88,000 | 23,000 35,000 | 25,000 | 30,000 |
| Prussia 31,849,795 | 1. Berlin - - 2. Bonn - - 3. Breslau - - 4. Göttingen - - 5. Greifswald - - 6. Halle - - 7. Kiel - - 8. Königsberg - - 9. Marburg - - | 1,677,135 44,560 373,140 25,513 22,775 116,302 85,668 172,758 12,668 | 4,735 1,391 1,238 770 747 1,472 589 712 866 | 127,900 56,900 50,000 57,000 38,000 70,332 42,200 48,000 40,000 | 107,325 45,300 45,800 19,000 14,400 35,000 30,000 40,800 30,000 | 34,000 19,000 19,000 17,417 | 70,000 27,000 24,000 41,480 |
| Saxony 3,786,936 | 1. Leipzig - - | 399,969 | 3,208 | 92,050 | 73,000 | 29,000 | 25,000 |
| Wurtemberg 2,080,898 | 1. Tübingen - | 13,989 | 1,449 | 43,000 | 40,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Hesse 1,039,388 | 1. Giessen - - | 22,932 | 546 | 38,500 | 28,000 | 13,000 | 22,500 |
| Mecklenburg 596,883 | 1. Rostock - - | 49,899 | 420 | 16,600 | | | |
| Saxe-Weimar 339,217 | 1. Jena - - | 15,499 | 634 | | | | |
| Switzerland 2,917,754 (Census, 1 Dec., 1888.) | 1. Basel - - 2. Berne - - 3. Freiburg - - 4. Geneva - - 5. Lausanne - - 6. Zurich - - | 88,853 48,678 12,938 80,782 39,422 149,081 | 435 617 197 388 416 670 | | | | |
| Alsace-Lorraine 1,641,220 | 1. Strasburg - | 135,608 | 1,000 | 50,000 | 46,000 | 26,000 | 17,000 |
| Scotland 4,025,000 | 1. Edinburgh - 2. Glasgow - - 3. Aberdeen - - 4. St. Andrews - | | 3,064 2,080 912 112 | 46,548 31,836 36,669 | | | |
| Austria 23,895,413 (Census, 31 Dec., 1890.) | 1. Czernowitz - 2. Graz - - 3. Innsbruck - - 4. Krakau - - 5. Lemberg - - 6. } Prague - - 7. } 8. Vienna - - | 54,171 112,069 23,320 74,593 127,943 182,530 1,364,548 | 255 190 736 1,125 1,009 1,177 2,490 3,913 | 11,000 10,000 30,000 47,213 17,727 42,000 40,000 100,000 | | | |
| Hungary 17,463,791 | 1. Agram - - 2. Buda-Pest - - 3. Klausenberg - | 37,529 491,938 32,756 | 313 3,772 644 | 78,000 | | | |
| France 38,343,192 (Census, 12 April 1891.) | There are 16 "Faculties" in process of conversion into Universities.* | | | | | | |

* The Faculties of Paris (now the University of Paris) have 10,000 students, and an annual State

Owing to difficulties in procuring the latest University Budgets, the year 1894-5 has been selected for uniformity. The figures have been reduced from the official coinage of each country and stated in round numbers. It is to be recollected that the Budgets vary slightly each year, and that the number of Students varies slightly in each Semester. No account has been taken of non-matriculated students. The Budget for Wurzburg in 1894-5 was unusually high, more than double the average, owing to special grants. There are two Universities in Prague, German, founded in 1348; 1,177 students: Bohemian, founded in 1882; 2,490 students.

Appointment of Professors in Germany. Formally in the hands of the Crown. Nowhere is there formal autonomy; such rights as the Universities have exist only by courtesy. The University is a department of State, in theory, though in actual working autonomy is conceded. When a vacancy occurs either by the departure of a Professor to another University (a very common occurrence, practically a system of promotion) or by death, the official connected with the Faculty concerned brings the names of candidates before its members. A vote is taken, and one name (occasionally two), selected. The Report (with all documents) is brought before the Senate (in case of urgency to the Pro-Rector only), and then sent to the Government who communicate directly with the candidate, generally after confidential correspondence with the Faculty.

Valuable as the German Universities are as examples of good work, it must not be forgotten that, as Jacob Grimm says, they are plants that have become specially attached to the German soil, and are not transplantable elsewhere.

There are Theological Faculties in all the Universities; Catholic at Freiburg, Munich and Wurzburg; double (Catholic and Evangelical) at Bonn, Breslau, and Tubingen.

The cost of a modern University may be taken at £40,000 per annum. The cost of permanent buildings, if "Institutes" of the German type are provided, may be taken at half a million sterling. There are 55 distinct "Institutes" in Leipzig. The Anatomical Institute cost £28,000. The Chemical Institute in Bonn cost £25,000; in Zurich £14,000. The new buildings of Strasburg University (practically rebuilt by the German Government since the annexation), cost (including purchase of ground), nearly £700,000 sterling.

A University which may be studied with the greatest profit, is the Johns Hopkin's University of Baltimore, established by private endowment in 1876. It stands high in public estimation already. The foundation capital is about six millions of dollars; half for University work, and half for a hospital in connection. The strong points of its system are *Graduate Classes*, to which eminent men from all parts of the world are invited as lecturers (Professors Sylvester, Cayley, and Sir William Thomson, for instance), and *Publications* issued by the University, in exchange for which it receives those of other learned bodies.

It publishes a Journal of Mathematics, a Journal of Chemistry, a Journal of Philology, Studies in Biology, Studies in History and Politics, University Circulars and Reports. It receives over 700 Periodicals in exchange.

One word in conclusion. I have spoken elsewhere of Association Force. It is no doubt possible to found a University which shall consist of separate faculties, schools, or individuals and nothing more. Those who founded the early Universities took care that, in addition, there should be a unifying principle at once animating and binding together those detached individualities. What I wish to say is, that whether formally recognized or not, Association Force will develop such a principle. To exclude theology is not to leave a neutral tone.

