

Traditions Lecture, Tuesday, 3 September, 2013 (revised 11/09/13)

Henry Roper

This is advertised as a “traditions lecture,” and is scheduled on the same day as Matriculation and your first Formal Meal. The idea of “traditions” is an ambiguous one. According to the OED, a tradition is a “custom, opinion or belief handed down to posterity, especially orally or in practice, or “an established practice or custom.”

This definition raises a lot of issues. How long does it take for a custom handed down to posterity to become a tradition? Should customs be preserved simply because they are old? Traditions, I think it is obvious, can be a two-edged sword. They can be life-enhancing, if they contribute something positive to our sense of who we are now, to our sense of community, and the connection of that community with the past, or they can be deadening. This point is made in the writings of Dickens. Dickens believed in the necessity of maintaining an organic connection with the past. Like the 18<sup>th</sup> century political philosopher and politician Edmund Burke, he thought that revolutions are bound to lead to disaster, as can be seen in his novel *A Tale of Two Cities*. On the other hand, Dickens brilliantly exposed the consequences of adhering to tradition at the expense of justice in his great novel *Bleak House*, which you may have seen in its recent television dramatization. We need traditions, but we can also be stifled by them.

The history of King’s can be understood in the light of the dilemmas of tradition. The college was founded by Loyalists, fugitives from the American Revolution. They hoped to create in the colonies that had remained loyal to Britain societies that would be immune to the levelling tendencies of the newly independent colonies to the south, whose founding principles were encapsulated in the words written by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness “ In parenthesis, I need hardly point out that the words of the Declaration of Independence, and those of the U.S. Constitution of 1788, did not apply to the approximately 20% of the population of the new United States of America that was enslaved. As part of this parenthesis, I should also mention in passing that slavery remained legal in Nova Scotia until 1834. At any rate, to return to my subject, the Loyalists, who rapidly came to play a dominant role in the life of Nova Scotia, saw the creation of a hierarchical society in this province as the answer to Jeffersonian liberty and equality. At the centre of such a vision was an Established Church of England with special privileges.

The key figure in the founding of King’s was Charles Inglis, who had been a prominent clergyman in New York City as Rector of Trinity Church, which still looms over the end of Wall Street and is now probably the richest Anglican Church in the world because it owns a lot of the land on which the financial district is built. Inglis also served for a year as president of King’s predecessor institution, King’s College, in New York. A strong tory, Inglis fled to England in 1783 when New York was captured by the American forces; he was appointed first Bishop of Nova Scotia in 1787.

Inglis founded King's in 1789 for two purposes. The first was to provide a stream of clergymen for a revived Church of England; the second was to create a cadre of leaders for the Tory society Inglis and his fellow Loyalists wished to create in Nova Scotia. Without a college, Inglis and other Loyalists were afraid that the wealthier members of the community would send their sons to be educated in the newly-founded United States, at places like the Congregationalist Harvard College or the old King's College, New York, re-founded with the aggressively patriotic name of Columbia College. As Inglis put it to a friend: "One of my principal motives for pushing it [i.e. King's] forward was to prevent the importation of American Divines [i.e. clergymen] and American politics into the province. Unless we have a seminary here, the youth of Nova Scotia will be sent for their education to the Revolted Colonies – the inevitable consequence would be, a corruption of their religious and political principles."

Hence King's is the product of a belief in a hierarchical society, Anglican supremacy, and the need to educate an elite which would further and defend these objectives. In 1802, 13 years after its founding as King's College, Windsor in 1789, King's received a Royal Charter, a copy of which you can see in the Board of Governors Room of the Administration Building, and in 1803 the college's statutes were drawn up, using for the first time the name "University of King's College," the cumbersome title expressing the fact that King's College was now a "universitas," like Oxford and Cambridge.

The 1803 statutes followed those of Oxford in excluding non-members of the Church of England from "matriculating" or enrolling. Inglis recognized that this was unwise, arguing in favour of the more liberal practice of Cambridge where non-Anglicans were allowed to enrol. Even at Cambridge, however, students had to subscribe to the 39 articles of the Church of England to take a degree. Inglis won the support of the Patron of the College, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who happened to be a Cambridge graduate, but the original exclusionary statutes had already been printed, and a revised version did not appear until 1821.

I don't think this fiasco actually made much difference to the future of King's. How many non-Anglicans would have attended if they could not actually take a degree? Furthermore, left unaltered was the requirement in the 1803 statutes that all students had to attend daily prayers according to the rites of the Church of England and were forbidden to enter any non-Anglican place of worship. These restrictions bring me back to the slippery question of traditions. Those who were determined to exclude non-Anglicans no doubt believed they were on the side of tradition. However, it is worth noting that this policy was not followed by King's predecessor institution, King's College, New York, which enrolled students of all denominations, including non-Christians, i.e., Jews. Furthermore, unlike King's College, Windsor, King's College, New York, had non-Anglicans on its Board of Governors prior to the American Revolution. The decision to restrict enrolment at the new King's by following English rather than American practice was obviously motivated by the overarching political and social aims of the Loyalists who dominated the province.

The decision to locate King's in Windsor rather than Halifax, where most potential students lived, represented another break with the American past. It seems likely that Bishop Inglis hoped to isolate them from the temptations of a disorderly port town where taverns and brothels were rife. King's was placed at a distance from the capital in the tiny village of Windsor. The college's original

building, completed in 1789, and designed by Inglis himself, was based not on any structure at Oxford or Cambridge, neither of which Inglis had attended, but followed closely the design of King's College, New York, with three stories and five bays. It was built of wood, and survived until it burnt in 1920. With columns and a pediment, it looked a lot like the Administration Building as you can see by looking at the display cases outside Alumni Hall. Perched on top of a hill, it must have been horribly uncomfortable right from the beginning. As early as 1817, Lord Dalhousie, governor of the province, wrote in his diary: "The state of the building is ruinous; extremely exposed by its situation every wind blows thro' it."

When it came to the curriculum, the new King's followed closely that of Oxford, focusing upon classics. The leading secular member of the original Board of Governors, all of whom were Anglican, was Alexander Croke, a high tory English aristocrat, who held the lucrative job of judge of the vice-admiralty prize court in Halifax (and on whose estate, "Studley," King's and Dalhousie are now located). Judge Croke had a low opinion of King's students. In a satirical poem, "The Inquisition" (1805), which circulated in manuscript among his friends, he lampooned them as devoted to drinking and whoring in the lines: "Where friendly 'Windsor's' portals gape,/To Britain's youths emboldened by the grape,/And venal nymphs expose their Painted Charms,/To lure the novice to their hackney'd Arms."

Croke insisted that the president of King's must be a graduate of Oxford or Cambridge; this meant that the first president of the college, the Rev. William Cochran, who had briefly taught classics at Columbia but had the misfortune to have graduated from Trinity College, Dublin, had to step down, first in favour of the Rev. Thomas Cox, who died in 1805, and then the Rev. Charles Porter, both of whom were Oxford graduates. Cochran had to settle for the vice-presidency and for the next generation he and Porter did all the teaching. Perhaps not surprisingly, Cochran and Porter did not get along. In 1819, Lord Dalhousie, lieutenant governor of Nova Scotia, recorded in his journal after a visit to King's: "The President & Vice-President are at variance. They don't speak to each other... I never in my life met so violent a hatred in private circumstances as these two Rev. Gentlemen bear to each other... [W]hile these... are preaching all round the doctrines of peace & good will, they are striking examples of unchristian conduct to very inhabitant of the country."

To sum up, the founding of King's was a response of the Loyalists to the trauma of the American Revolution by attempting to foster traditions that would mould Nova Scotia in the pattern of 18<sup>th</sup> century England. This meant excluding non-Anglicans, importing a president from Oxford and focusing the curriculum upon Greek and Latin.

Unfortunately for the future of King's, this vision of the college and its mandate bore little connection with the life of the province the college was intended to serve. Only one-quarter of the population adhered to the Established Church of England. Furthermore, Nova Scotia differed from England in fundamental ways, which made the success of King's as designed by Inglis and Croke unlikely if not impossible, even with the financial support given by both imperial and colonial governments. In the late 18<sup>th</sup> century England, a wealthy, populous and dynamic society, had a landed aristocracy that was immensely rich and getting richer. The increasing profitability of agriculture benefited the Church of England, whose income depended upon the land; it also enriched Oxford and Cambridge colleges, most of which were large landowners in their own right. England was also developing the world's first

industrial economy. Many families who made their fortunes in commerce, such as those of Victorian statesmen Sir Robert Peel and William Ewart Gladstone, wanted their sons to become gentlemen, which meant educating them at Oxford and Cambridge. England, then the most vibrant country in the world, ruled by an aristocracy with vast wealth, but also containing a rising capitalist element, and with a heavily endowed Established Church, had no difficulty sustaining its only two universities. Cambridge and Oxford played a pivotal societal role in educating rich and/or exceptionally talented young men for the Church, the law or politics, as well as giving polish to those destined to live as gentlemen, pursuing the gentlemanly art of doing very little, or nothing at all.

Such a society, idealized by Loyalists like Inglis, could hardly have been more different from Nova Scotia. Despite the fantasies of a few government officeholders who tried to create landed estates around Windsor and elsewhere, Nova Scotia could not support a gentry living on rent rolls. Neither the quality of the soil, suitability of the climate, access to markets nor the existence of a compliant and abundant body of agricultural labourers made such a dream possible of realization. The few wealthy families were not necessarily Anglican in a colony in which the Established Church held the loyalty of perhaps one-quarter of the population.

One person who saw this clearly was an individual I have already mentioned, the 9<sup>th</sup> Earl of Dalhousie, lieutenant governor of Nova Scotia. (His nominal superior, the governor general of the British North American provinces, resided in Quebec.) Dalhousie, a Scottish Presbyterian who had served as a general with the Duke of Wellington and fought at the Battle of Waterloo, came to Nova Scotia in 1816, remaining until 1820 when he moved up to become governor general. While in the province, Dalhousie kept a most interesting and revealing journal in which he has this to say about King's in 1817: "The College is founded by Charter under the same rules at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge...It is not suited to the state of this Society, where the Church of England, tho' the Established Church, is not the most numerous; the far greater part of the population being divided in sects, Methodists, Anabaptists, Church of Scotland & dissenters from it; in Sydney County [i.e. Cape Breton] the highlanders along the gulf are all Catholicks, and in Halifax also there is a most respectable Catholic Congregation. All these classes are excluded from participation in this College.. .The number of students at present is only 14...In short there are a thousand objections to it & reasons why it should not prosper in its present situation, laws and conduct."

It is important to keep in mind that Lord Dalhousie was from Scotland, whose universities were not only non-sectarian but had broader curricula than either Oxford or Cambridge. His solution to what he saw as the inadequacies and exclusiveness of King's was to found a non-sectarian institution. In 1824, a union between his new Dalhousie College and King's almost came to be. However, the proposed merger was vetoed by the Archbishop of Canterbury as Patron of King's, on the advice of the Chief Justice of the province, S.S. Blowers, a Loyalist then well into his eighties (he lived to be over 100) and the Rev. Charles Cochran. Blowers argued the dangers of moving King's to the dissipated atmosphere of Halifax. He also feared the loss of classical education "in the more showy and dazzling employment of experiments and amusing pursuits. "

Meanwhile, the Presbyterians responded to the exclusiveness of King's by creating a liberal arts college, Pictou Academy (1816), which united with Dalhousie in 1838. When the supposedly non-sectarian Dalhousie decided not to appoint C.W. Crawley, a King's graduate turned Baptist, as its professor of classics, the enraged Baptists decided to found Acadia, in 1838; the Methodists followed suit with Mount Allison five years later. Meanwhile the Roman Catholics had founded Saint Mary's (1802) and St. Francis Xavier (1855). As King's had received provincial government support from its founding in 1789, political pressures from the constituencies backing its rivals meant that they all received subsidies from the province of Nova Scotia, even Mount Allison, although it was located across the border in New Brunswick. By 1860, Nova Scotia had ended up with perhaps more colleges per capita than any jurisdiction in the British Empire, and the "college question" became and would remain to this day a perennial issue in Nova Scotian politics.

In 1876, the province made an attempt to regulate standards by creating a federated college system modelled on the University of London. The government increased the annual grant to all colleges as an incentive to have their students examined by, and take degrees from, a new institution named "the University of Halifax." Lack of support from the colleges led to a total failure of the scheme. In despair, the government withdrew government support for higher education in 1881, and did not resume it for 82 years (1963).

Partly as a result of this proliferation of colleges, for which its exclusivity had largely been responsible, King's never really prospered during the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Although by 1828 regulations discriminating against non-Anglicans had been abolished, the damage had been done. Between 1807 and 1836, student numbers ranged from seven (1807-08) up to a high of 29 (1823-24), falling to a low of six in 1835-36. King's was handicapped by its location in Windsor, its emphasis upon a rigid classical curriculum deemed necessary for the formation of the divinity students who formed the backbone of enrolment, and, of course, by competition from other institutions. In 19<sup>th</sup> century Nova Scotia, a college education was a luxury for the few. By the year 1880, the last year the House of Assembly published statistics, as it had decided to end all college grants, Acadia was the largest college with 54 students, Dalhousie had 43, Saint Mary's 40 and King's 39. In that year, King's graduated three students with BAs.

Towards the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, attempts were made to broaden the King's curriculum by offering courses in science, engineering and languages. The college even admitted its first woman as a BA candidate in 1893; she graduated in 1897. As part of these efforts, Charles G. D. Roberts, one of the leaders of the Confederation school of poets and a noted writer of animal stories, became professor of English and French in 1885. He remained at King's for 10 years, despite his somewhat Bohemian private life. But what kept King's going was the need of the Church for clergymen to serve the diocese of Nova Scotia.

To make a long story short, when King's original building went up in flames in 1920, it looked as if the college would fold. At this moment, it was saved by American intervention. The Carnegie Foundation commissioned a report in 1922 on the condition of the various institutions of higher learning in the Maritime provinces, which, after revealing that they were deficient from the point of view of facilities, libraries and staffing, recommended that they all move to Halifax to form a federation with

Dalhousie at its core, on the model of the University of Toronto. King's was the only one to take up the offer of an endowment to provide professors who would teach in a joint Faculty of Arts and Science with Dalhousie, an offer that was made conditional upon the college raising a sufficient amount of money to erect new buildings on the Dalhousie campus. King's and Dalhousie formed an association in 1923. The Divinity Faculty, which, as I have emphasized, was the principal reason why King's survived into the 20<sup>th</sup> century, remained in existence until 1971, when it ceased to give degrees and was incorporated into the Atlantic School of Theology. The success of the Foundation Year Programme, founded in 1972 in the wake of the departure of divinity, and the School of Journalism, which opened in 1978, provided a basis for King's continuing existence as an entity separate from Dalhousie. CSP, HOST and Early Modern Studies were established somewhat later. And so we are all here today

That is the end of the first part and longest, part of this lecture. The second part deals with the connection between King's past and present. Can we really speak of the history of King's in the confidence that a common tie binds us with those who those who taught and studied here 200, 100 or even 50 years ago? The English writer, L.P. Hartley, begins his novel *The Go-Between* with the words: "The past is a foreign country. They do things differently there." This, I think, is, true. However, I also think to be true what seems to be a contradictory assertion that William Faulkner puts into the mouth of a character in his *Requiem for a Nun*: "The past isn't dead. It's not even past." I am going to approach this problem by engaging, or indulging, in personal reminiscence.

I first registered as a Dalhousie student 56 years ago. My tuition was \$290.00, an amount that could easily be earned by working for a couple of months during the summer. At that time, Dalhousie had around 1,100 students in the Faculty of Arts and Science, approximately 112 of whom were registered at King's, which also had a tiny contingent enrolled in divinity. The Dalhousie campus was overwhelmingly, but not exclusively, middle class and white, which, despite strenuous efforts to attract members of minority groups, remains the case at King's today. Women invariably wore skirts to class and men mostly jackets or windbreakers and ties. The present Alexandra Hall was not constructed until 1963; all women in residence were accommodated in what was then Alexandra Hall, and is now Cochran Bay. The men's residences, built on an optimistic scale when King's erected its buildings on the Dalhousie campus in 1930, were much too large for the number of males actually registered as King's students. Many of those living in the Bays were registered at Dalhousie, which has not prevented them from becoming loyal alumni, like Dr. John Hamm, former premier of Nova Scotia and present chair of the King's board of governors.

The college contributed eight professors to the joint Dalhousie-King's Faculty of Arts and Science. All the King's professors had their office in the King's administration building where they also taught their classes, which included both King's and Dalhousie students. King's professors wore gowns when lecturing, and divinity students wore gowns to lectures given at King's. Gowns were worn at every evening meal, which was eaten in what is now the Wardroom, as Prince Hall was not built until 1963, and also for all Chapel services. Whatever else has changed, gowns have remained a constant over the years.

In 1957, almost all King's students came from Anglican families. To my knowledge, and I did check into this, there was only one Jewish student registered at the college. The individual in question, who lived in residence, loved his time at King's. I know this because we later became good friends when we were colleagues at Mount Saint Vincent in the mid-1960s. The non-sectarian Dalhousie, however, had more appeal for the substantial number of Jewish students on campus.

What was expected of students according to college regulations reveals much about the time. According to the 1958-59 King's Calendar, "The introduction by or for any student of beer, wine, spirits or any kind of intoxicating liquor into the College is strictly forbidden." The Anglican character of King's is made clear by the following: "All students, divinity and lay alike, are encouraged to attend the daily morning and evening services in the College Chapel. On Sunday mornings, all are expected to attend the Chapel Service or some other service of their choice." Women were kept under the eye of the Dean of Women: "Women students wishing to be out after evening chapel must notify the Dean and state where they are going. Permission must be obtained from the Dean to be out after 11:00 p.m. and a record is kept of the hour of return of those who have received such permission."

It is interesting not only that these rules existed, but that in general my generation accepted them without question. Of course, men did smuggle liquor into the Bays, but in the mid-1950s we did not think of challenging the rules. That came along 10 years later, in the mid-1960s. The culture of rights had yet to be born; what was more prevalent was a culture of obedience and obligation.

This culture of obedience carried through to our studies, although others may remember things differently. The curriculum was littered with compulsory subjects. I was in the first class at Dalhousie-King's that did not have to pass two courses in Latin to graduate. However, everyone in Arts had to pass the same math course that was taken by science students, a science course, three courses in a language, and a pale substitute for the old Latin requirement called "Classical literature in Translation." Although we did write essays and tests, three-hour final examinations were of crucial importance, and in preparing for them we relied heavily on lecture notes and textbooks. The culture of obedience meant that too much learning was by rote; the system blessed a good memory and a knack for writing examinations.

I hope it is clear that I am not arguing, and do not wish to argue, the inane position that things were better in my youth. I am trying to make the point that only 55 years ago, let alone 100 or 200 years ago, differences were profound. This obvious point can be made in a myriad of ways.

Most people in this room have a cell phone, smartphone etc. Perhaps you have been texting each other. I don't care, because I realize that these days everyone engages in multi-tasking, and one can text message in silence. But I cannot get my mind around text messaging. This is not simply a matter of habit, or lack of technological expertise, but has to do with a way of thinking and or living.

If you believe the computer is simply a tool or instrument, you are kidding yourselves. Computers shape how we think and experience the world. A few years ago I tried to watch a movie called "Mission Impossible III," starring Tom Cruise. I simply could not take "Mission Impossible III," with its absurd, non-stop violence and incoherent plot. Others obviously feel differently because I discovered

from the Internet that it has earned \$173,000,000 world-wide. I understand nothing of the conventions of such films because I have no experience of video games, on which they are obviously modelled, and which, of course, the computer has brought into being, as it has made possible smartphones etc.

Information technology has in some sense made you into different people from my generation. But other changes have altered both thought and behaviour since 1957. Christianity was the unofficial religion of this country in the 1950s and was central to the culture. No one foresaw its rapid decline, as can be seen from the large, now redundant churches built after the Second World War by all denominations. Most people had a Church affiliation. It is platitudinous to point out that church-going has become a minority activity, at least for mainstream denominations. Fifty years ago almost everyone was acquainted with the bible, which meant that even people with little education were in contact with texts that have shaped Western civilization.

Today, Canada is no longer a Christian country. Sunday is a day like any other, as can be seen from your schedule when on Sunday, 1 September, a talk on Sex-Mental Health took place at the same time as the 11:00 a.m. college chapel service. The details of this talk are not given in this year's schedule, but in 2009, when I gave a different version of this lecture, there were three talks on sexuality on Sunday between 9:45 and 12:00: (1) a sex talk, (2) a frosh group mini-sex talk and (3) an optional oral sex workshop. I must admit that I was intrigued by numbers 2 and 3. What is mini-sex? What does a "workshop" mean in the context of oral sex? As people say, I didn't think then and don't now that I had better go there. At any rate, the content of these talks is irrelevant. My point is that they were and are scheduled on Sunday at the same time as the college chapel service and this is not thought peculiar. Fifty years ago it would have brought down the wrath of the college authorities.

To pursue further the question of sexuality, a fundamental difference between 1957 and today is that from a sexual perspective men and women were not on an equal footing, as illustrated by the rules governing female conduct I read a few minutes ago. I think it is impossible for you to grasp the transformation brought about by the birth control pill and easy access to other forms of contraception, which went hand-in-hand with the disappearance of traditional strictures against sexual intercourse before marriage. The pill brought about a revolutionary change in sexual relationships, brilliantly encapsulated by the English poet, Philip Larkin, whose poem "Annus Mirabilis" refers as well to the retreat of literary censorship with the publication of D.H. Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover* in the late 1950s:

Sexual intercourse began/ In nineteen sixty-three/(Which was rather late for me/ Between the  
end of the Chatterley ban/ And the Beatles' first LP

In other respects, the sexes were unequal in 1957. Although women attended university in large numbers, no one imagined that they would assume the position they now play in corporate and professional life, or that two income families, often with young children, would become the norm. There may still be a glass ceiling; it is not very much in evidence when an organization like General Motors has made a woman president of General Motors Canada and a woman has just become chairperson of



Canada's biggest bank. It is silly to see Kathleen Taylor of RBC or Marissa Mayer of Yahoo as typical, but their career trajectories would have been inconceivable when I was your age.

I could go on and talk about other ways the generation born in 1994 differs from that born, say, in 1940. I could talk about the civil rights and gay liberation movements, or the transformation of Canada by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, all of which have affected our thinking, aspirations and actions. I could say something about the environmental issues, to which no one, with the exception of visionaries like Rachel Carson, paid any attention. However, I want to return to our connection with the past, with those who studied here not 50 but 100 or 200 years ago. Is any history of King's really possible, if it is difficult to think of what it was like to be on this campus a half century ago?

Whether the past can be truly known has been a preoccupation of historians since the time of the Greeks. Thucydides, who wrote the history of the Peloponnesian wars, believed that the historian could only write about events in his own time. A narrative of events may tell us about facts, such as when King's was founded, but do events explain what really happened, what was the real life of an institution such as King's? In the words of T.S. Eliot in his play, *The Family Reunion*:

But how can I explain, how can I explain to *you*?/ You will understand less after I have explained it/ All I can hope to make you understand/ Is only events: not what has happened./And people to whom nothing has ever happened / Cannot understand the unimportance of events.

History is the product of the mind of the historian, who attempts to give a true account of what happened. No matter how skilled, can the historian's efforts achieve a different level of knowledge from that, say, of a novelist like L.P. Hartley or Faulkner? Powerful criticisms have been levelled at historians by postmodernist historians and literary critics. The more extreme postmodernists argue that history as traditionally understood is impossible, that historians can never transcend their own preconceptions, and that the evidence upon which they rely is incapable of telling us anything meaningful about the past.

These are crucial issues, and I hope that you think carefully about them during your years at King's. I am raising questions and not providing answers, as this is, after all your first university lecture. The first part of my talk presented an interpretation of the history of King's which, based on the evidence, is essentially my own. Another historian might see things differently after looking at the same evidence. The second part contrasted the world I remember with the one we experience today. Part two is not the product of historical research; it hardly qualifies as other than random impressions. My memory may be inaccurate, and my brief quotations from documents misleading. For a rounded history of King's it would be necessary to call in the skills of political, intellectual economic, social and demographic historians. However carefully the existing evidence is examined from all these points of view, a postmodernist critic may well argue that it is impossible to get beyond the documents to give a true picture of the world the documents and reminiscences purportedly describe.

In conclusion, I do believe, and this is an historian's faith, that there are connections between you and your predecessors at King's. Perhaps the most important is your willingness, like those who have gone before, to undergo the discipline of immersing yourselves in the texts of our civilization. You

are here, in the words of St. Paul to the Romans, to “be transformed by the renewing of your mind.” Although we may be different people in many respects from those whose ghosts walk these halls, living in a different world, we are engaged in a common pursuit which links past and present, for the words of St. Paul remain as true for us today as for every person who has been privileged to attend the University of King’s College since its founding over 220 years ago.