philosophies of Kant and Hegel, can serve equally well as exemplars of the other powerful university tradition, one that came to emphasize rigorous research and considerable specialization, though its original telos was a Protean self-fashioning, with a shared culture constituting the material of this self-fashioning. The university that grew out of this idealist tradition, as it depended more and more on the ethos of the university itself rather than on the life of the society outside the university, was transformed, paradoxically, into the modern university of specializations and fragmentary sub-disciplines. Of these two traditions of thought concerning the university, I value the English tradition for its amateurism and its playfulness, the clarity with which it has always set out its aims; the other for its (initial) emphasis on the culture of the whole person, and the seriousness with which it responded to the body of opinion we call Enlightenment thought, and especially to the egalitarian thrust of that thought. Schiller, the one thinker who seems equally sensitive to both these streams of thinking, becomes a crucial figure, and it is part of my argument that the movement towards professionalism on the one hand, and the posture of alienation from rationality on the other (among humanities intellectuals in particular) represent dangers that he specifically warned against; dangers that, in our time, have seriously impaired the university's capacity to carry out what may be its most vital function: to help us negotiate a modernity that can either fulfil or destroy.
Among twentieth century thinkers who have commented on education, apart from Leavis I have been most influenced by Lionel Trilling and Michael Oakeshott. Both men were dedicated fashioners of the self who managed to remain "exquisite amateurs and accomplished humanists" (as Pater tells us aesthetic critics should be). I benefited greatly from a late, but timely, exposure to Georg Lukacs's and Yvor Winters's courageous and unpopular opposition to aspects of mainstream modernism. Alasdair MacIntyre, Michel Foucault and Jurgen Habermas, whose arguments and formulations I have more often disagreed with than otherwise, have nevertheless proved remarkably stimulating.

It is perhaps practical, and certainly courteous, to state at the outset the various things this thesis is not. It is not an empirically based study of the Indian university: in fact the Indian university as a distinct historical or sociological entity does not make an appearance at all. It is not a rigorously researched history of the conceptual evolution of the university—-I very much doubt there is any such thing anyway (an evolutionary history, I mean, which traces the inevitable Hegelian march of the idea of the university from medieval seat of learning to liberal academy to technocratic multiversity). On the other hand, it is not, I hope, a purely impressionistic survey of arbitrarily chosen aspects of the university.

The first part of the first chapter ("The Parliamentary University, Liberalism and a Liberal Education"), which deals with `the parliamentary university,' was written largely as an
exercise in personal exorcism, and represents a reaction against what I can now only think of as an early and excessively idealistic understanding of the university's functioning. It surveys the writings of a group of thinkers who would like to characterize the university primarily as a place for formal intellectual conflict, or procedural justice, or negotiated verbal agreements (I also look at the writings of some who have opposed these characterizations). These concepts have an obvious family resemblance, and equally obvious antecedents in liberal thought, especially that of John Stuart Mill. Later in this chapter I try to explore the relationship between liberal theory and the `liberal education' traditionally promised, or offered, by the modern university. The second chapter ("Changing The Topic: Poststructuralism, The Humanities, English Studies") is concerned with the phenomena of poststructuralism and postmodernity in the humanities, and with the way in which these developments have altered the preoccupations of humanists. In the third chapter ("Modernism, Romanticism, and the English Accommodation") I discuss the familiar (in English studies) concepts of Romanticism and modernism, but I attempt to analyse them in terms of the categories of empiricism, idealism and realism rather than in the more usual aesthetic categories. In the fourth and final chapter ("Schiller and the Negotiation of Modernity: Considered Ambivalence, Play, and Self-Fashioning") I argue that the writings of Schiller (and Goethe) may help us to a better theoretical and practical understanding of the idea of
a university.

My preoccupations in these pages may appear to be too exclusively with the past, present and future of English departments to justify my claim to be discussing the university as a whole. There are two good reasons for what might appear at first sight to be mere parochialism, or worse, disciplinary hubris. First, I thought it would serve my purposes better to survey the complexity of the idea of a university from a relatively fixed vantage point, and moreover from a vantage point I could claim some familiarity with. Second, (and this is an altogether more controversial claim) I believe that English studies, for various reasons, has played a peculiarly important and influential role among the humanities, and therefore in the university as a whole, since, in my argument, it is the carefully regulated tension between the claims of the sciences and those of the humanities and social sciences that constitutes what is distinctive about the modern university.
NOTES

1. From "Education and the University: Sketch for an English School" Scrutiny Vol IX, No 2 Sept. 1940 (98-120).

2. For a discussion of the differences between, and mutual influence of, the Oxbridge and German (Humboldtian) traditions, see Jaroslav Pelikan's The Idea of the University: A Re-examination, pp 83-88.