WITHIN COLLEGE WALLS

CHARLES F THWING

WITHIN COLLEGE WALLS

WITHIN COLLEGE WALLS

BY

CHARLES FRANKLIN THWING

President of Adelbert College and of Western Reserve University. Author of "American Colleges: Their Students and Work"; "Reading of Books"; "The Working Church"; Joint-Author of "The Family: An Historical and Social Study," etc.

NEW YORK
THE BAKER & TAYLOR CO.
740 AND 742 BROADWAY

ROBERT DRUMMOND, ELECTROTYPER AND PRINTER, NEW YORK.

TO

My Father and Mother.

CONTENTS.

I. The College and the Home..... 9

II. The Good of Being in College..... 21

III. The College Forming Character..... 34

IV. Certain College Temptations..... 53

V. College Government..... 70

VI. Play in College..... 94

VII. Simplicity and Enrichment of Life in College..... 115

VIII. The College and the Church.....125

IX. The College Fitting for Business..... 148

X. The Pre-eminence of the College Graduate..... 156

WITHIN COLLEGE WALLS.

I.

THE COLLEGE AND THE HOME.

It is a serious day when the child leaves home for college. It is serious for the child, serious for the home; serious too for the college. It is serious for the child, for the departure stands for an increasing independence and individuality, to result finally in absolute responsibility. It is serious for the home, for it represents the beginning of that change to which each family comes of the separation of its members in order to kindle the ancestral fire on new hearthstones. It is serious for the college,

for it lays on the college responsibilities which the parent has hitherto born. Glad day, too, if serious, is the day of departure. For the child glad, for he is able to enter into the best conditions in preparing himself for the highest work; for the parent glad, for he is able to offer to his child the best conditions; and for the college glad, for the college is to aid the parent and to aid the child in attaining the worthiest aims by the worthiest methods.

The purpose of the best home and of the best college is identical. It is the purpose than which none is more precious. It is the purpose of making the character of the student-child strong and pure and noble. The aim of every parent and of every college officer is, I venture to say, to give to each one committed to their charge knowledge without pedantry, self-reliance without arrogance, gentleness without weakness, hopefulness without creating visionaries,

a discipline of the intellectual nature without drying up the emotional nature, an enrichment of the emotional nature without making soft the intellectual, a training for life in this world without unfitting one to live in the other world, and a training for life in the other world without unfitting one to live in the present, an enlargement of the whole character without self-consciousness, the making of working power without the making of an incapacity for leisure. These are bare suggestions of the aim which the college and the home more or less consciously are holding before their younger members. They both write CHARACTER above their gates.

Yet it is possible that the college may be asked to receive the son or the daughter of a home in which such ideals do not command. Aims social or pecuniary may have ruled. Arrogance and weakness, strength of will without strength of judgment, self-consciousness

with smallness of character, force of appetite without force of intellect, may represent the outcome of the training of a home in its son or daughter. Such a son or daughter the college is asked to receive. The college is asked to receive them and, by a tacit if not a declared understanding, is asked to regenerate them. It is asked in four years of thirty-six weeks each to undo the doing of eighteen years of fifty-two weeks each; it is asked to remove many of the standards which parents have half consciously been holding before their children, and to erect noble and nobler symbols of life and duty. Some boys go to college and go to the—Devil. Some girls go to college and become simpletons. Is it any wonder? Some parents are asking too much of the college; they are asking what they do not ask of themselves. They are asking the college to do for their sons and daughters what they themselves have not done. The college cannot

do much in *un*doing parents' training. The college can do much in adding to parents' training. If that training has been the worthiest, the college summons all its resources of personal association and of intellectual discipline to continue this worthiest training. If that training has not been the worthiest, the college is still to call up all its forces to atone so far as possible for the past, to make worthy the future, of the student.

In gaining these aims, thus indicated as identical, the home and the college make use of the same means, measures, and methods. What may be called the atmosphere is recognized as equally valuable in each. Rules, too, in each have their place; and principles can no more be eliminated from the college than eliminated from the life of the individual. But the two comprehensive forces used alike in the home and the college are truth and personality. Truth, knowing things as they are, carries along with

itself a sense of sincerity and of reality, a contempt for sham which are, of the utmost worth in the formation of character. Personality, the influence of person over person, bears along with itself the strength of character and of love. Personality is formed by personality. We love those who love us; those whom we love love us. The college employs these two agencies—truth and personality; so does the home. In the books it sets for the students to read, in the teachings it offers to him, it impresses truth; but in the man who is the teacher, in the man behind and before and around the teacher, in the man who moves with the students, personality is the forming force. Lacking either of these elements, the college is weak; having them both, the college is strong,—and stronger as it has them in larger amounts and fitting proportions. The home, relatively to the college, influences more through personality than through the presentation of

truth. The college, relatively to the home, influences more through the truth than through personality; learning for knowledge and for discipline is more immediately present as an end. In both college and home, both truth and personality are necessary. Truth without personality is lifeless, of small worth in the development of character; personality without truth is a blind guide, leading either to the death of the precipice of sudden moral ruin or to the death of the desert of continued and hopeless wandering.

The relation of the college to the student, as the relation of the parent to the child, is suggested in the word trustee.

The college is a trustee of most important relations. It is put in trust of character. If to an Atlantic captain are intrusted the lives of his passengers for a week, to a college are intrusted the intellectual, ethical, spiritual interests

of human beings for four years. The college cannot be held responsible for these interests, as is the trustee of pecuniary trusts for the keeping of these trusts. These trusts have no power of their own. But college men and women have wills. No college can make character as the sculptor makes a statue. Yet it is true that the college is put in charge of the most worthy concerns of human spirits.

The boy or girl places his intellectual character in the keeping of the college. He has so great a confidence in the college that he believes the college can do better for his character than he himself can. The college is requested by the very act of his entrance to train the intellect to think—to think with comprehensiveness, with insight, with accuracy, with swiftness. The parent intrusts his child to the college because he is convinced that the college can do better for his child for a time than he can him-

self; the college can train the intellect better than can the home, the professor better than can the mother.

The college is also a trustee for the moral standards of the student. The differences among students of different colleges in respect to questions of moral conduct are most diverse. The standards in one college may be low, in another high. The men of one college seem hardly to be awake to the fact of moral differentiations; the men of another are more impressed with moral truths than with purely intellectual. The point of view is ethical. Their intellectual measurements have a moral element. It is not too much to say that a college fails, if it fail to reveal the path of duty as the way every soul should go in; that it fails, if it fail to magnify virtue and the virtues; that it fails, if it fail to teach the excellence of justice, the beauty of temperance, the nobility of courage, the grandeur of sacrifice for highest aims.

The college is also a trustee for the Christian character of the student. This trust it receives with hesitation and yet with rejoicing: with hesitation, knowing the seriousness of the responsibility; with rejoicing, for it already knows by a prophetic vision the greatness of the work it can do for the betterment of Christian character. The college is constantly called to stand in the place of the parent; but in no one relation is this vicariousness more constant than in respect to the ennoblement of Christian character. The boy of seventeen may come to the college with notions of Christian truth loose and vague; the man of twenty-one should leave college with ideas compact and distinct. The boy may come having narrowness of vision and blindness of prejudice; he should leave seeing in breadth of vision, with justice, with comprehensiveness. He may come bearing a faith feeble, hesitating—a crutch; he should depart having a faith which is a wing to

bear him. The Christian character becomes more Christian and more characteristic in the college. It gains solidity, force, vigor. The articulation of its parts becomes more exact—intellect, feeling, will, conscience becoming better adjusted to each other. It ceases to be a manufacture, beginning to be a growth. True it is that men have found college their Waterloo of defeat. But to the true soul it is rather a Waterloo of victory—a place of hard fighting with moral and spiritual enemies, but a place of triumph, of triumph whose issues are as lasting as life.

It may also be said that the college is the trustee of the future of the student. It is not true that these four years determine life with the certainty of foreordination. Men have wasted these years who have made the following years fruitful. But it is true that these years establish a probability of the nature of the following. It is true that these years

help to determine the nature of the following. Indolence in college becomes laziness in life; dissipation in college, intellectual, moral, becomes weakness in life; nearsightedness in college becomes blindness in life. Life is often the harvesting of college-sown seed. We follow no example so constantly as that set by ourselves. The qualities of endurance, patience, enthusiasm, accuracy, which a college is supposed to discipline in their callow stages, are prophetic of the possession of the same qualities as the bones and sinews of the body of character. Such qualities the college is set to train. The opposite of such qualities the college is set to crush. The college is therefore put in trust with each student's future.

II.

THE GOOD OF BEING IN COLLEGE.

WHAT is a college education good for? is the question often and bluntly asked. I make bold to answer it, and also quite as bluntly as it is asked.

College education lengthens the period of youth; it prolongs the time of preparation for life. If "to prepare us for complete living" is the function of education—and no one would find fault with this definition of Herbert Spencer—it is well to make that preparation as good as it can be. The more important the duty to which God calls any creature, the longer the time of preparation he gives. A lamb stands and walks from the hour of its birth; a child takes a year to learn. The height of any creature in the scale of

being is measured by the period of its adolescence. The lengthening or shortening of this period indicates and necessitates the raising or the depressing of the scale of being. The boy who does not go to college begins life at eighteen or before; the boy who goes to college begins life at twenty-two. The time of growth is lengthened four years—a large proportion of the whole period of growth. The worth of the means of growth is thus vastly increased. For the higher stages of culture are much more valuable than the lower. The more individual is a fine and strong and high individuality the more valuable are its best forces. For the development of the highest individuality time is needed. Every man should make the time of preparing for life as long as may be. College gives to him four years of preparation.

College gives this preparation through wise methods and under favorable con-

ditions. The book and the man are the college. The book has supplanted tradition. The book is not only the interpreter of the past, the book is the past. All past comes to the present in the book. The book is a timeless creation, or its only time is the present. The student prepares himself for the future through learning the past in the book. The book reads to him the experiences of the tens of thousands of men through the thousands of years. He becomes wiser than the ancients, for he has all their wisdom, plus the wisdom of his followers. The book is not simply, as Milton says, the "life-blood of a master-spirit"; the book is also the life-blood of the master-spirits of all the world, of all the past. The forty centuries do not look down upon the college man from their pyramidal heights; the forty centuries in the book enter into him, possessing, training, inspiring.

But the teacher as well as the book is

the college. The teacher is the force which makes the lengthening of the period of youth to be desired. It is not what is taught that makes the four years precious. It is not the teaching that has the highest value. It is the teacher which is the noblest power. Who would not like to have Socrates in the chair teaching even mathematics! It is to be said that no finer gentlemen are to be met with than those who occupy the chairs of instruction in our better colleges. And it is to be remembered that the young man or woman has these teachers as his intellectual guides in four of the most formative years. Is it not worth while to lengthen youth in order to come under such leadership?

College education is also good to take self-conceit out of a man. Strong personality is the good fruit of individuality, self-conceit the bad fruit; and the bad fruit is common among young men. Of course, we know that ignorance is

the cause of self-conceit, or it might be said to be the surname of self-conceit. If learning take away ignorance, it surely abolishes self-conceit; if learning increase the feeling of the learner's ignorance through enlarging the boundaries of knowledge faster than is the approach to these boundaries, it also—usually succeeds in wiping out this vice of self-conceit. The Freshman is often the embodiment of self-conceit. The Sophomore is often the embodiment of self-conceit and of incipient wisdom; the self-conceit appearing in the second and last syllable of his name —the fool part, and the wisdom emerging in the first syllable. The system of fagging and of hazing—outrageous and abominable as they are—have an originally worthy aim. Their foundation is the self-conceit which belongs to the novitiate in school or college; their aim is to take out this same self-conceit; their method is the imposition of menial tasks and of humiliations of various sorts. The

method belongs to barbarians; but the original aim is in the line of good education. I am the more inclined to write of this value of the college in the elimination of excessive self-esteem, for the ordinary opinion is that students are affected by this fault. I know that the bearing of students gives evidence that the ordinary opinion is true; they seem remote, haughty, at times supercilious. But when college men are subjected to the genuine tests of self-examination and of a willingness to do any work to which they are called, they are more free from this defect than any class of men. The high-school graduate shrinks more from putting on the overalls of apprenticeship than the bachelor of arts.

College education, further, gives a certain openness of mind and heart. Matthew Arnold said that a serious lack in the English nation was the lack of lucidity. Lucidity is an intellectual quality, but it has ethical and emotional affilia-

tions. The college man has this quality more than most. Mr. Arnold also divided society into three classes: an upper class, which is materialized, a lower class which is brutalized, and a middle class, which is vulgarized. From these three curses of being vulgarized, brutalized, materialized, the college tends to give freedom. And the method by which the college achieves this freedom I call a certain openness of mind and heart. This openness of mind and heart is akin to largeness of character; it is opposed to narrowness of any kind; it is freedom from the miserly spirit; it is a willingness to receive light; it is the appreciation of the best in men and things; it embodies sympathy; it is responsive to the best ideals and worthiest methods; it makes one liberal without looseness, and fosters the holding of opinions with firmness but without bigotry. The perils of the self-made man —and many self-made men have perished

in the making through these perils—are narrowness and hardness. They have bought their success at the cost of the largeness of their mental consitution and of the tenderness of their heart. Heavy price to pay—some would say too heavy, others that the success is worth the price. But the college man is seldom called upon to pay this price. He is able to win, keeping his intellectual vision large, his heart warm, and his energies strong, without any faculty suffering.

The worth of a college education is also seen in the high standards of character which it fixes. It tends to make right rules of measurement. It develops the sense of appreciation. It teaches the art of valuing. The college does this through its discipline of the intellect; it does this also through its conscious or unconscious emphasis on the temporal and eternal verities; it does this through its definite instruction, and also it does

this through its atmosphere. These standards which it sets up are, as I said, standards of character. They are not the idols of the forum or of the market; they are not reputation or wealth. They are justice, courage, charity, temperance, truth; they are the angular lines of the cardinal virtues, and also the curves and vanishing points of the graces of the best character. In his "English Traits," Emerson says:

"It is contended by those who have been bred at Eton, Harrow, Rugby, and Westminster, that the public sentiment within each of these schools is high-toned and manly; that, in their playgrounds, courage is universally admired, meanness despised, manly feelings and generous conduct are encouraged; that an unwritten code of honor deals to the spoiled child of rank and to the child of upstart wealth an even-handed justice, purges their nonsense out of both, and

does all that can be done to make them gentlemen."

Such may be said to be the work of the American college. It is at once the most aristocratic and the most democratic of all American institutions: aristocratic in the establishing of the best principles and standards as the ruling forces; democratic in treating every man like every other in respect to the duty of establishing these principles and standards in his own bosom.

I allude now to but one more of the advantages of a college training. College training fosters an intelligent and strong Christian faith. It is often whispered that the college is the hot-bed of infidelity. It is sometimes feared that as knowledge increases piety lessens, and that intellectual culture is the dry-rot of spirituality. Shame on such whisperings and fears! Shame that the study of the works of Omniscience should make men atheists! No; the college is the

place most favorable to the development of a faith strong as well as wise. President Patton, of Princeton, said, preaching to his own students:

"I regard the conditions of your training here as favorable in the highest degree to your religious life. You are receiving a discipline of your powers that should save you from the sophistries to which the uneducated fall such easy victims. You are acquiring a knowledge of the great subjects of debate, and an estimate of the men who have most right to be regarded as authorities respecting them, that will keep you from calling any man master whose only claim to such recognition is his entertaining declamation. Besides that you are dealing with secular themes under Christian conceptions, and your attention is turned to the specific evidences that accredit those Christian conceptions. There is also an undergraduate sentiment represented by the ripest scholars and the men of

highest intellectual rank among us that is not only favorable to Christian life, but also aggressively and earnestly interested in Christian work. So that if your religious life is not strengthened and stimulated by your connection with the college the fault will not be with the college, but with you."

The college represents a condition safer, far safer for the holding and developing of a Christian faith than the office, the shop, the factory, the board of trade. Intelligence is more pious than ignorance, and the college is the place of intelligence. Associations are more pure in the college than in any place where men most do congregate. The college stands by the side of the home and the Church in the fostering of an intelligent and strong faith.

What is a college education good for? It is good, lengthening the period of youth, to prolong the time of preparation for life; it is good to take away

self-conceit; it is good to give openness to mind and heart; it is good to fix high standards of character; it is good to foster an intelligent and vigorous Christian faith.

III.

THE COLLEGE FORMING CHARACTER.

THE college is to discipline character. Its duty is as broad as the humanity of each person. The college is prone to be content with giving an intellectual training simply. It is too much inclined to be satisfied with making thinkers, learners, scholars. What the student learns in college represents only a small share of what the college should give to him. The character, says Emerson, is higher than the intellect; and the college in educating the lower is not to neglect the higher. When Matthew Arnold says, "The true aim of schools of instruction is to develop the powers of our mind and to give us access to vital knowledge," he may be right and he may be wrong. He is right

if by mind he means man, and by vital knowledge, knowledge that relates to all life. The college, appealing immediately to the mental part, is yet to train every part. The college is doing its duty only when it causes men to regulate appetite, to crush passion, to guide desires, to quicken affections, to prevent wrong, and to stimulate right, choices. Which is the more important: for the student to know how to decline *virtus*, or to practise virtue; to know the fundamental ethics of Kant, or so to regulate his conduct that it may worthily become a universal rule; to demonstrate all the propositions of plane geometry, or to form his own character along the lines of righteousness? Shall the college teach us sciences, and never lift the ear to Him who is omniscient? Shall the college teach us philosophy and psychology, and never quicken us to heed the responsibilities of free volition? Shall the college teach us laws, and never whisper a syllable as to the

existence of the Lawgiver? Every institution should in fact illustrate the truth that conduct, which is the exponent of manhood, is not simply three fourths, but even seven eighths of life.

In this work of giving a complete equipment to manhood, it is not the subject of study which is the chief agent of the college; the professor makes the college more than the curriculum or the library. In forming character the college should have regard to the character and the life of those who sit in its chairs of instruction. Much that is suggestive and significant is to be found in the little volume, "How I Was Educated;" but to me the most significant feature is that several of the contributors emphasize the value of their teachers above the value of the teaching of these teachers. It was from the teachers that the inspiration that is more important than instruction itself was obtained. A university has been called a collection of books. The

remark is true; but the remark is not so true as that the college is a collection of men. Not pedants, or pedagogues, or buildings, but men, are to be sought. Character begets character; manhood creates manhood. "If," said President Mark Hopkins in an address at Williams College, "right character is to be produced in connection with an institution, it must be through the influence of those who have a right character." No name is more fragrant in the long list of teachers of this century on both continents than the name of Arnold of Rugby. Some teachers have been more learned, some have been intrusted with more conspicuous commissions; but none have done a nobler work for humanity in the formation of character. His breadth of vision, his tenderness of conscience, his sympathy with the boy heart, his self-forgetfulness, his hatred of the mean, his love for children and for God, made him the great teacher of our time. A man of

the type of Dr. Arnold should sit in every college. From him the student would receive not only instruction, but also inspiration for acting worthily in every part in life. It was not simply Mark Hopkins the teacher, or Mark Hopkins the philosopher, but Mark Hopkins the man, that formed the character of the graduates of the college in Williamstown.

In the current discussion as to the religious character and influence of college we are inclined to forget that, more than by all the methods and means and every form of management, the college is made Christian by the Christian teacher. If the professors be not Christian, neither required attendance at church and daily prayers, nor affiliation of the college with a sect, nor the use of text-books on theology, has much worth in making the college Christian. The power of the man behind the book or the subject which he teaches is much greater than the power of the book or the sub-

ject. In electing college studies, it has been said, one should elect rather teachers than studies. If this opinion be extreme, it is certainly true that the teacher has more influence in forming Christian character than his mere teaching.

Most colleges would no more elect as professor one opposed to Christianity, or even indifferent to its claims, than they would elect one notoriously ignorant of the topic he would teach. Atheists, sceptics, agnostics would not usually be selected as instructors in truth and righteousness. But it is to be said that it were well for the college to emphasize more strongly not simply a Christian profession, but also aggressive Christian manhood and manliness in the person of its professors, with a view to the training of Christian manhood and manliness in the person of its students. For the college should be Christian in no narrow or technical sense. It should be Christian in that the Christian attitude is that of the most vigorous

morality, the broadest philanthropy, and the wisest charity; in that it represents the noblest motives, the purest sentiment, and the most aggressive righteousness. The college should be Christian because Christianity is, on naturalistic grounds, the survival of the fittest in religion, and because, on other grounds, it is a divinely given system of truth for the control of conduct. It should be Christian because Christianity represents the finest type of manhood and of character.

I would not be interpreted as arguing that every college professor should be a member of an orthodox or of any other church. I would not be understood as implying but that very worthy teachers may be found who fail to accept the technical truths of Christianity. I would, however, be understood to affirm that, if the college is to be Christian in its influence, no wealth of learning should be suffered to atone for poverty in the moral elements of character. The very least which

a college should demand is that the general influence of its teachers be sympathetic with Christian movements and loyal to Christian principles. The simplest condition is that at least its atmosphere be Christian. This atmosphere is formed by the character of its teachers.

That the thought of thinking men is giving heartier assent to the proposition that the Christian teacher is the Christian college, I firmly believe. We are becoming convinced that no religious "ways or means" can serve as a substitute. The college, in its influence over students, should occupy somewhat the position which Agassiz declared should be the object of the museums of natural history. In 1868 this great teacher wrote:

"The great object of our museums should be to exhibit the whole animal kingdom as a manifestation of the Supreme Intellect. Scientific investigation in our day should be inspired by a purpose as animating to the general sympathy as

was the religious zeal which built the Cathedral of Cologne or the Basilica of St. Peter's. The time is passed when men expressed their deepest convictions by wonderful and beautiful religious edifices, but it is my hope to see, with the progress of intellectual culture, a structure arise among us which may be a temple of the revelations written in the material universe. If this be so, our buildings can never be too comprehensive, for they are to embrace the infinite work of Infinite Wisdom. They can never be too costly, for they are to contain the most instructive documents of Omnipotence."

If a museum of birds and fishes and brutes has as its chief object the "manifestation of the Supreme Intellect," a college, composed of young men and women, should have as its aim an object no less comprehensive or worthy. With its aim of the training of Christian manhood, it certainly should have Christian manhood

in the person of its teachers. The lack of this manhood vitiates all other agencies and methods; the possession of this manhood, worth more than all else, renders other agencies vigorous and other methods efficient. Whoever admits that the moral character of the individual is as important as the intellectual would probably also admit that it is the duty of the college to train the moral as well as the intellectual character of its students. If any one were prepared to deny that the college should endeavor to instruct and to improve the religious nature of its students, he would certainly not deny that the college owes a duty to those moral elements of manhood which are even more fundamental than the religious instincts. If any one should argue in favor of the removal of all those college laws which usually exist as aids in the control of students, and should affirm that complete liberty is the best condition and means of promoting this control, he would,

as the very basis of his plea, grant the importance of the moral character. If a man is more than a mere knowing animal; if he has feeling, appetites, desires, affections, instincts, passions, and the power of making choices; if, furthermore, the college is designed to minister to other than the demands of the intellect, if its purpose is broader than to afford facilities for the gaining of knowledge and mental discipline,—then it becomes the duty of the college to train the moral character of its students. Whoever either knows the history of American colleges, or considers the fundamental characteristics of human nature, and especially the demands which our modern life makes upon educated men, will be more than willing to grant it is the duty of our colleges to discipline the moral as well as the intellectual character of their students.

Yet, despite these axiomatic considerations, it is evident that a tendency exists among our colleges either to minimize

this duty or to neglect its performance. The enlargement of the courses of study over the improvement in the methods of instruction has seemed to degrade those characteristics of a college education which are not strictly intellectual. Religious impulses and influences have probably less strength than they have possessed at many periods. Endeavors to surround the students with a pure moral atmosphere have in certain colleges lost a vigor and constancy formerly possessed. But the custom of the selection of teachers and professors chiefly or merely upon intellectual grounds is perhaps the strongest indication that the colleges are inclined to abdicate their throne of ethical instruction. It is not to be said that those whose habits are corrupt or corrupting would be selected as teachers in any college; but it is to be said, and with emphasis, that the teachers are not chosen on the ground of their capacity for impressing moral ideas and ideals upon young men. Con-

sidered in some degree this capacity may be, but the degree is confessedly slight. The professor should be a man who lives such a vigorous and earnest moral life that his scholars will be attracted toward it; he should be one who entertains such ideals of character that his students will be urged toward their attainment.

In collegiate administration it should be noted that character and the ability of forming character ought to be regarded as a most important element in the selection of tutors and professors. This ability should not be subordinated, as too frequently in practice it is subordinated, to intellectual considerations. Not, of course, be it said, that professors shall have an intellectual armor less complete or less brilliant or less modern, but that they shall have a character more thoroughly fitted to arouse moral earnestness among their students. Not that there be fewer manly scholars, like Louis Agassiz, but that there be more men, and scholarly

men, like Mark, and Albert, Hopkins. The principles of the administration of a college, and of which President Hopkins's character furnishes a noble illustration, are well set forth in the semi-centennial address already quoted from. President Hopkins said:

"No formal arrangement without Christian men, no having or saying of prayers, will avail anything without men who pray. Christianity is not a mere set of dogmas: it is Christ revealed in His perfect character. He is the head of the race. He is not only the light of the world as a perfect teacher in all that relates to character and ultimate destiny, but also a perfect example. He is the man. In His religion is the hope of the world. The greatest boon that can come to any one is to be brought into personal relation to this, and sympathize with Him by voluntary commitment and by having a character like His. Herein is the difference between the place of Christianity in a theological semi-

nary and a college. In a college it should be so handled as to bear upon character without sectarianism. This can and ought to be done. Christianity is the greatest civilizing, moulding, uplifting power on this globe, and it is a sad defect in any institution of high learning if it does not bring those under its care into the closest possible relation to it, so far as it is such a power. Through it the students are to be trained in moral and spiritual gymnastics. Why not? We here reach the broadest and most philosophical conception of education. It includes the whole man. If man is to be educated physically and intelligently because he has a physical and intelligent nature, why should he not be educated and trained morally and spiritually because he has a moral and spiritual nature? I see no reason why there should not be in a college, and enter into the very conception of it, those who are engaged in the higher gymnastics. If men are to be

trained to be strong in muscle, why not to be strong in the Lord? If to wrestle with each other, why not with wickedness? If to carry on mimic fights and boxing, why not to fight the good fight of faith? If to gain the crown of victory in contests with each other, why not 'an incorruptible crown'? If to run races in the gymnasium and on the campus, why not to run the race that is set before them in which they are 'compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses'? Why, in short, if they are to be trained in bodily exercise, that 'profiteth little,' should they not be trained in 'godliness, that is profitable unto all things'? This broad conception of education has been the conception of it in this college in the past. If not personally recognized, it has pervaded its atmosphere, it has made ministers of the Gospel and missionaries, and has a general uplifting power. It is the conception of education here to-day. I trust it will continue to be. If not, the

glory of the college will have departed. If this college shall drop down into a merely secular spirit, in the training of the lower parts of man's nature, so that it shall cease to be in sympathy with Him whose object it is to train to a perfect character that world which is symbolized on the missionary monument, it will no longer be Williams College."*

It is the teacher, it is the man more than the teacher, which makes the college. An institution lately invited to one of its important chairs a young minister who had no special knowledge of the department he would teach. Surprise was expressed that some one thoroughly trained should not have received the appointment. The answer was: "We want, first and foremost, a man, and one who can make men." The answer was sound. For to the student the manhood of the professor is more significant than his scholarship.

* Address delivered at fiftieth anniversary of becoming president of Williams College.

The student is influenced more by the professor than by the professorship, more by the man than by the professor. Therefore that superintendent of public schools was wise who said: "I am not going to ask for deep learning as the first qualification of my teachers. I shall ask, first, for firm, high, noble character; second, for fine manners; third, for sound learning; fourth, for professional training."

In a few colleges it may be felt that the professor is overstepping his proper functions in either aiming at or endeavoring to give more than an intellectual training. With such a feeling we believe that no parent or guardian of youth sympathizes. The father sends his son to college less, far less, to read Greek and history, to study philosophy and mathematics, than to fit that son to occupy with dignity and usefulness any position to which he may be called. Every father knows that in the acting well his part in life the general character of his son is more im-

portant than any one element of that character, even if that element be intellectual. Instead, therefore, of doubting as to their right to influence college students along the line of moral character, we venture to believe it were well for professors to realize the duty which they thus owe not only to their students, but to the entire collegiate constituency and to the nation.

IV.

CERTAIN COLLEGE TEMPTATIONS.

THE college man is the best young man to be found beneath the sun. He is absent from home, yet he is at home with his companions. He meets few ladies, yet he has a knight's reverence for womanhood. He is obedient to what he considers proper rules, but rebels against what is deemed improper restraint. He is vigorous in intellect, strong in conviction, yet he is sympathetic with the best in all life. He is conscious that he is richly endowed with mental gifts, and knows well his privileges; but he is self-forgetful and self-sacrificing. Such a man must be subject to many and hard temptations.

In the manner of the old preachers, I would first say what his temptations are

not. It is frequently remarked that the college man is allured into the base indulgence of base passion. "The fast set" is supposed to be a set at once pretty large and pretty fast at the college. I have some facts, elicited with labor and compiled with care, proving that the college man is not as cold as ice. I wish the record were less dark than it is. But, despite this evidence, I do believe, and believe upon evidence, that the morals of the American college student are cleaner than the morals of the young man in the office or behind the counter or at the bench. His life and associations belong to the realm of the intellect, not to the realm of the appetite. His discipline is a training in that virtue the most comprehensive of all virtues—the virtue of self-control. He is able to trace more carefully than most the relation of cause and effect in the sphere of moral action. He recognizes the penalties of base indulgence. It is, therefore, my conviction that

the college man is at once less tempted to the evil satisfaction of evil appetites and less indulgent toward this satisfaction than are most young men.

The temptations of the college student belong to a realm which we think somewhat higher in moral value than the sensual.

One of the temptations which besets the man in college is the tendency toward intellectual scepticism. All scepticism is either more or less intellectual. The life of the student is pre-eminently an intellectual life: it is a life in its early part of scholarship and relatively little thought; it is a life in its latter part of relatively less scholarship and more thought. Upon him through both scholarship and thought are thrust for solution all those problems which lie at the foundation of being. The existence of God, the freedom of the individual will, the presence of evil in a moral universe,—to these and kindred questions he is compelled by the force of

his environment and of his own nature to give an answer. Such questions, put before him in a comprehensive shape, are new. The difficulties in the way of giving an answer such as would be in harmony with early convictions are many and strong. So many and strong do these difficulties often seem to be, that they are sufficient to move him from the intellectual position he has long held. From unreasoning faith he is flung into reasoning doubt. His age as well as his study contributes to this result. He may have as a professor—though seldom—one who promotes his intellectual restlessness. He finds books, scores in number and able as the ablest, presenting the side of doubt with a persuasiveness born of conviction as well as of scholarship. As a result he first becomes a sceptic in the original meaning of the word, and secondly he becomes a sceptic in its secondary meaning. This result is not to be understood as either inevitable or

frequent; but the tendency exists in most minds to a slight degree, in some minds to a strong degree, and in a few minds to an exceedingly powerful degree.

From this lamentable result, as unnecessary as it is lamentable, most college men are saved. They are saved from it by what may be called the perpendicular forces of their own mind ever tending toward belief in the spiritual verities. They are saved from it by the study of the best books upon these themes—and the books in favor of belief are better than the best books in favor of disbelief. They are saved from it by the personal influence and intellectual leadership of teachers. Scholarship is not sceptical; thought is not sceptical. The college man, therefore, in scholarship more thorough and in thought more profound, than is his brother living without college walls ceases to be the victim of intellectual scepticism, and becomes the representative of spiritual belief.

A second temptation of the college student is an inclination toward Christian lethargy or religious indolence. This is probably the most comprehensive and possibly the most dangerous allurement that assaults him. It is more common, I think, in the colleges of the East than in the colleges of the West; but it affects most students in most colleges to some extent. It arises from the attention which the college pays to things that are merely intellectual. The college is an agency for the training of character. One means of this agency, and the most conspicuous, is the use of the mind on certain subjects of knowledge. The college is ordained to train the intellect, but to train the intellect not for the sake of the intellect only, but as the intellect is a part of the whole man, which represents the supreme and largest aim. But the college student, and, indeed, the college professor, is prone to permit the purpose of the discipline of the intellect—a purpose more immediately present

than the ultimate aim of the edification of character—to conceal this ultimate aim. The college man, moreover, as every man, seems to have a certain amount of force to put into any service. Therefore, as he thinks himself obliged to devote the large share of his force to intellectual pursuits, he finds it easy for his Christian energies to become dormant. The emotional, the moral nature suffers for the time through this great attention paid to the intellectual. The same result occurs in the theological seminary. It is well known that the tone of piety among those preparing for the ministry is not so high as among those who are ministers. These undergraduates in theology are putting their forces into the intellectual aspects of Christian truth; the emotional sides of their character — sides in which piety seems most to delight to manifest itself—are suffered to remain uncultivated.

"I am pained to say I am losing my Christian enthusiasm," remarked a Senior

in a college prayer-meeting. "I think I have been losing it," he continued, "ever since my Freshman year." It is not unusual to hear college men express such a sentiment. I doubt not that most students believe they have less enthusiasm for Christian things on the day they receive their diploma than on the day they received their papers of admission. They are probably less inclined to support either through attendance or through speech the class prayer-meeting in the Senior than in the Freshman year. They also are probably less inclined to learn the "spiritual condition" of their classmates. Their own spiritual vision is probably less constantly directed toward themselves in the last term of the last year of the course than in the first term of the first year. Such conditions and circumstances have a certain value as evidence of the decline of the Christian enthusiasm of college men. Such conditions and circumstances college men, are inclined to

believe prove that their Christian enthusiasm has lessened; and they infer that the college education is the cause of the lessening.

It would be sad if the culture of the intellect should be coincident with, even if not the cause of, the hardening of the heart. It would be sad if the college which was established to train men as ministers should train men away from the ministry. It would be sad if the more college men knew, the less inclined they should be to include a knowledge of God within the circle of knowledge; and even if somewhat inclined to include a knowledge of God, it would be still more pitiable if they were less inclined to let the treasures of their love for Him increase with the increasing treasures of knowledge and culture. If a college education does tend to diminish Christian enthusiasm, the college education is either pursuing low ideals or is based on false methods or is employing unworthy agencies.

Yet the impression prevails that a college training does tend to lessen Christian enthusiasm. Superficial and circumstantial evidence tends to confirm the impression. But the impression is false.

Enthusiasm is at once a mental and an emotional quality. Emotional enthusiasm is forth-putting, vociferous, noisy. It is self-assertive, lacks self-control, adopts the fantastic as easily as the fitting form of manifestation. It is not supported by the judgment. It is raw, sensitive, "soft," as horsemen say of a colt. Such enthusiasm the college curbs, trains, lessens. Such enthusiasm the college ought to curb, train, lessen. Such enthusiasm, if doing some good, does also more harm. Such enthusiasm is the enthusiasm of the colt, spurring it to its death. Such enthusiasm requires control, guidance. The college gives control and guidance, forbidding its fantastic exhibitions, compelling it to run in proper channels toward proper goals. The controlling of such lawless enthusiasm

gives the impression of its diminution, and of its diminution to a degree greater than the fact indicates.

But Christian enthusiasm is also of the intellect and of the will as well as of the emotions. This enthusiasm is loyalty to Christian principle. It is willingness to follow the star of Duty, however remote the spot to which she leads or precipitous the path along which she gleams. It is the surrender of the whole man to the purposes of Christ. It is obedience to "the heavenly vision." It is the confessed obligation to preach "the Gospel to them who are at Rome also," even if Rome is to prove to be one's Calvary. This Christian enthusiasm is as silent as the movement of the stars, and as resistless, burning too with the steadiness of the planets. It has a sense of the fitness of things. It is not boastful. It puts forth no platform; it marches to no crusade; it flaunts no flag. Its onward goings are not thunderous, but of the still, small voice of truth. Such

enthusiasm the college not only does not lessen, but does even develop. If a college training means anything in America, it means loyalty to Christian duty—a loyalty as steady as time's flow, as hearty as the needs of humanity are desperate, as wise as a trained discrimination can teach, as mighty to overcome obstacles as are the obstacles great. Such loyalty the colleges, in the personal character of their officers no less than in the wisdom of the books studied, are daily teaching. Such loyalty is a principle more controlling of the Senior receiving his diploma than of the Freshman receiving his certificate of admission. Such loyalty is the larger and more precious part of Christian enthusiasm. Christian enthusiasm, in its essential and permanent elements, is not lessened, but magnified, by the education of the college.

I know that thousands of Christian parents are at this hour in distress by reason of the fear that their sons and

daughters in college are losing their spiritual enthusiasm. From time to time as these children return home fathers and mothers think they detect a waning in things of the Spirit. May I be suffered to assure such parents that (if no immoral offending have occurred) their distress is unnecessary, that their fears are groundless? The manifestation of the love of their children for Christ and for Christian things is changing, but the love itself is rather deepening than becoming shallow. Like the brook becoming the river, it is more quiet because it is deepening. The older children grow, the fewer the kisses they give their parents, but the more they love those parents; loyalty to them is more loyal at the son's age of twenty-five than of fifteen. The loyalty of the college man to his Christ in his Senior year is less effusive, less emotional, than in his Freshman year, but it is deeper, stronger, steadier, less selfish, more profound in its hold on prin-

ciple, and wider in the application of its forces. It is such loyalty, like the river,

"Strong without rage; without o'erflowing full,"

which the college thinks it a duty, as it is a delight, to develop.

The evil, therefore, of this temptation is usually transient. For the culture of the intellect results in the culture of the emotional nature, and the emotional nature becomes more tender, more reverential, more strong in its affections, more noble in its aspirations, more confiding in its hopes, and more rich in its satisfactions, because of the culture of the intellect. The enrichment of the intellect of the Christian man insures the enrichment of his piety. Spiritual lethargy and religious indolence are not the permanent results of the finest intellectual culture; rather they are the results of a culture which is neither fine nor broad, neither profound nor high; of a culture which has rather the conceit of

knowledge than knowledge, and of which the superficiality is excelled only by its arrogance. Genuine intellectual culture never produces spiritual atrophy or permanent spiritual lethargy. In time this culture gives force as well as wisdom to piety. We are commanded to love our God with our mind as well as with our heart.

The most serious problem which the Christian college has set before it in these recent years lies in this region—the co-ordination of increasing intellectual culture with increasing spiritual culture. The colleges must keep their windows open to all intellectual light. No truth should be discovered but that each college should claim some share in the possession of the new and priceless treasure; but the college is not for a single instant to lose sight of the fact that it is Christian, and that it was founded and endowed by either the munificence of wealth or the economies of poverty for forming Christian

character in its students. It is, therefore, so to hold the truth and so to impress the truth that the manhood which it moulds may be vital with the spirit of Him who called Himself "the truth." It is not to be feared but that this co-ordination will ultimately be properly effected; but it is to be feared that in the process of making this adjustment either the cause of scholarship or the cause of religion may suffer. We may apprehend that some colleges may become so intent on the discovery and exhibition of truth that they will forget their purpose of forming Christian character. It seems to me that Harvard was several years since in peril of obscuring this purpose in its interest for its "new courses" of study. It is a peril, however, which is far less evident to-day than a decade ago, and a peril which its president, its preachers, and many other officers are doing much to remove. On the other hand, we may apprehend that some colleges will be so

solicitous as to the moral and Christian culture of their students—though it would be hard to think of such solicitude being too urgent—and so content with methods which have succeeded, that they may unduly hesitate to welcome new truth and new methods which are superior to the old. The college which is the most wise will avoid both perils and possess both excellences. That college will have the eye of its mind open to all that is true in the enlarging province of thought and scholarship; it will also keep the right hand of its Christian faith firmly and gently resting in loving benediction upon the head of each of its students.

V.

COLLEGE GOVERNMENT.

ALL men like to be their own masters. College men are men, and therefore prefer to be their own guides in matters of conduct. The college man abhors being the object of espionage. His feeling toward the spy is a union of contempt, hatred, and shame. His feeling is a natural one. His feeling deserves and receives sympathy. It is also safe enough to say that espionage defeats itself. The student watched is usually able to circumvent the watchman. Prying watchfulness is a challenge for evading the watchman. The student's own sense of integrity is an inspiration to him to escape the spy, and the sympathy of his fellows in his evasion proves to be an aid and a comfort.

Every one, however, both officer and student, would affirm that some supervision of men in American colleges is necessary. Evidently to secure intellectual supervision is one of the fundamental and simple purposes of being in college. I think, also, there would be a general assent to the further proposition that supervision of conduct in at least a degree is wise. Young men between the ages of eighteen and twenty-two have not come to such power of judgment or self-mastery that it is expedient to fling them into the manifold and trying conditions of the college without some eye to see them or some hand to point out the worthiest paths. The law itself contemplates that the age of freedom shall not be earlier than the twenty-first birthday. In the absence of parental influence the college is to serve as guide, philosopher, and friend.

The American college is beset by two movements. One is a tendency toward

making the relation of the student to the authorities simply intellectual. In point of place this movement represents a relation between the officer and the student limited to the lecture-room; in point of time this relation represents a relation of officer and student limited to the lecture-hour. The student may be an imp of darkness in character or behavior, but if at the time of a lecture or examination he be an angel to receive and emit light of a proper quantity or quality, the demands of the officer are satisfied. Intellectual culture is, it is thus assumed, the aim of the university—to give it on the one side, on the other to receive it. The university, therefore, is doing its full duty in securing this aim. This purpose has its fullest finest embodiment in the universities of that country of great scholars, Germany.

The second of the two movements affecting our colleges is the extreme of this intellectual tendency. This movement

assumes that college men are, in the light of the law and also in the light of fact, infants; that the college is a nursery; and that the supervision of those of tender years and inexperienced is to be minute and constant. This movement shows its method and character by demanding that the lights in the rooms of students shall be put out at or before ten o'clock of each evening, and shall not be relighted before half-past five the next morning. It surrounds the daily conduct and belongings of the student with certain limitations; it forbids his going to the railroad station; it looks upon his departure from town as a moral transgression; it prohibits smoking under penalties which would seem to signify that the smoke of the pipe is the smoke of the bottomless pit.

These two extreme and antagonistic movements are acting with various degrees of force in all our colleges. It requires no profundity or length of state-

ment to show how unworthy each of these movements is. The German university is a model for the American college in many matters. It is a model in thoroughness of instruction, in completeness of equipment of a certain sort, and in the enthusiasm of the teaching force; but in certain other respects it is not a model. Chiefly it is not a model in respect to the freedom from personal supervision. The German student is more mature than his American brother; his work at the university is more akin to the work of the American professional student than it is to the work of the American college student. Furthermore, what I venture to call the laziness of the German student, and also certain immoral practices altogether too prevalent, are not proper objects of imitation for American students. It is known to every observer that it is not till toward the close of his course that the German student usually settles down to hard work. It is, further, not neces-

sary to assume that this indolence is the inevitable result of the lack of supervision; but it may be said that a college, even if having regard to only intellectual aims and methods, must, in securing these aims, be concerned with moral conduct and behavior. For we are learning that such is the integrity of each individual, such a unity is each man, that the abuse of any one of his parts leads to evil results in all parts. If the body is unduly stimulated or weakened, undue excitement or lassitude affects the mind. If the moral nature is injured, either through the cherishing of base ideals or the following of base methods or the adopting of base practices, the intellect suffers. Drunkenness is a crime against the laws of the intellect as well as a sin against ethical principles. Licentiousness is a sword which palsies the intellect as well as cuts the nerves of self-control. Therefore the American college, seeking intellectual results, seeking intel-

lectual results only, must conserve moral standards.

As to the second movement, concerned with the careful supervision of students, it is to be said that the American college is to free itself from giving a minute and constant watchfulness to its men. For the American college is not a nursery; its students are not infants. Rules minute and inquisitive defeat themselves. They cannot be enforced; and, even if they could be enforced, the enforcement would tend to do away with the fundamental purpose of a college, viz., to fit the student to be his own worthy master. For the purpose of the college is to guide the student, in the little world of the college itself, in such enlarging self-control that the translation from the college to the larger world will be attended with the least peril.

Every college has its "Rules and Regulations." It puts a statement of these rules and regulations into the hands of

every student entering. These laws differ in different institutions. Of the excellences or defects of such statements it is not necessary to speak in detail; but it may be said in general that all penalties for the violation of these rules should be based on the simple principle of naturalness. All laws should be made, so far as possible, self-acting, self-enforcing. The fracture of any rule should carry with it its own punishment. If a student break the law requiring attendance at recitation, the penalty should be simply the prohibition of his attendance. If the student violate the law of absence from town without permission, the punishment should be the prohibition of his remaining in the college town. If the student is falling below the required standard in recitations, he should have no opportunity to recite. Such penalties of the natural, self-enforcing sort do we exact in social relations. If a man fail to behave as a gentleman, he soon has no opportunity

so to behave; he is ostracised from the society of gentlemen. The college is a proper field for the application of a similar principle.

But in the supervision of college men the principle and the method of supervision are far more important than the rules and regulations, however wisely framed. The relation between officer and student should be made as personal and intimate as it can be made. It would be well to forget that one is a college superior and the other a college inferior. It would also be well for the student to be impressed with the truth—and it is a truth—that when he is discouraged he has no better friend than his professor, and that no one is better fitted to advise when he wishes counsel or to cheer when he is discouraged, as every student is at times prone to be. The student, I know, is inclined to think that the teacher is always busy; yet he should learn that no teacher is so busy but that he is happy to lay

aside all tasks, however pressing, to have a talk with the student. The student is inclined to think that the professor does not care for him and probably "looks down" upon him. Ah! he will, when he himself becomes a teacher, learn that there is no one whom the teacher so cares for as he cares for the student, and that his welfare is the constant object of his teacher's interest and solicitude. He is anxious not only to keep the student out of the bad, but also to aid him in securing the largest, noblest, and finest good.

Tholuck did a great work for the world by his walks and talks with his students. American professors may do a great deal for the world by putting themselves on terms of intimacy with their students; by sitting with them before blazing hearthstones till the hearthstones cease to blaze and the coals turn into ashes.

Some colleges appoint of their professors those who are called "advisers," to

be the special counsellors of the students. The method is simple: each student is assigned to some one teacher upon whom he has a special right to make claims for counsel. The method is a good one; but that method is a better one in which by certain processes of natural selection—not by arbitrary enactment—each student seeks out some professor and each professor seeks out students, and each becomes to the other a friend. It is not on the part of the student a toadying, or on the part of the professor an undignified lapse; it is on the part of each an act of noble gentlemanliness of giving and receiving help. Happy day that when in all our colleges such a relation of genuine helpfulness becomes the easily sitting custom! Happy day that when all teachers, not forgetting that they are to teach the humanities, also remember with love the humanity of college men!

The two foci whence one may draw the whole ellipse of good college govern-

ment and relationships are respect and sympathy. To maintain a proper control of students, college officers must have the respect of students. The securing of this respect is promoted by the high intellectual character of the officers. The scholarship of professors is to be profound, exact, noble; their power to teach adequate, their general training sufficient. The nobler their scholarship and the more able their teaching, the greater is the respect they receive. If their scholarship be slovenly, superficial, narrow, or if their equipment be weak, a class soon discovers such omissions, and converts such omissions into causes for fomenting distrust and disrespect. If the professor of history often tell his students that he will look up and answer a question unexpectedly asked, or if the professor of mathematics remark that he wants more time to think about a problem, the inference is swift that the professor of history does not know the authorities, nor

the professor of mathematics his subject. For men who, in intellectual affairs, are not what they either seem to be or ought to be, students have contempt, and ought to have contempt. But for men who are great, for men who, if not great, have yet proper scholarly fitness for their work, students have respect, and only respect. The counsel given by such men is heeded, their wishes regarded, their commands obeyed.

Respect on the part of students for college officers is promoted also through a high moral character in these officers. I emphasize the word *high*. Of course the college officer is moral, but there are degrees in the degree of even professorial morality. The soul of the teacher should be white. The atmosphere of his character should be holy, and yet without cant or pietism. His conduct should be based on principles rather than on rules. He should be pure and clean as are the angels, yet he should not give the im-

pression of gaining such purity through disembodying himself. He should not furnish reason for the belief that he is able to be an angel only through removing himself from the possibilities of such temptations as mortals are subject to. He should give the impression that he is a man; that he has conquered himself, and so has conquered the world. For a man of this character the student has respect, and only respect; but for the man who has a high moral character only because he has no stomach and no liver and no blood, the student has no great regard. Of course he cannot have any regard at all for the man who yields to the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil. In this high moral character which is necessary in the college officer the element of justice has primary value. Students are keenly sensitive to justice, as also, of course, by parity of reasoning, to injustice. They know the college rules, and their scent of any

wrong in any one of them is as keen as the scent of the hound; and also their alertness to detect any injustice in the application of these rules is as great as the alertness of the loon to the flash of the rifle. College boys can hardly pay a higher compliment to a college officer than by saying, "Professor A B is always square." College boys do not object to being dealt with severely, but they do object to being dealt with at all unjustly, even if the dealing be not severe.

Through the maintenance in the officer of a *humanly* Christian character is respect secured. Every college officer should be a Christian. He should love his God supremely. He should embody a noble Christian type, but this type should not be mystical. It should not be ghostly, however spiritual it may be. It should not be so other-worldly as to seem remote from this world. The officer should have a hold on things divine, but

he should not forget that, if his head is in the air, his feet still plod on the earth. College men are very much in the world, and they have small respect for the professor whose face and manners seem to be constantly and affectedly angelic, saying,

"I want to be an angel, and with the angels stand."

College men know it is more important for good folks to stay in this world of Satan and of Satan's imps than to stand and sing with the angelic choruses. For the man who is vigorous in Christian aggressiveness, whose type of the Christian character is of the wisely polemic sort, college men have the most profound respect.

The securing of this respect is promoted through the sense of gentlemanliness in the conduct and bearing of college officers. Students despise all eccentricities of dress on the part of their college superiors, whether arising from foppishness or from carelessness. All unfitting personal habits, too, are especially con-

temned. Every act of boorishness is held up for scorn. Avariciousness, in particular, vacates any respect which the student may have for his teacher. If the early surroundings and training of the college officer have been unfortunate, and if scholarly conditions have not removed the evidence of such unfortunate environment, a sense of pity may go from the heart of the student toward one in whom he expects to find every excellence; but this sense of pity is usually accompanied by a sense of contempt. The sentiment is, "He ought to behave and to seem as a gentleman."

When college officers embody these four elements—a high intellectual character, a high moral character, a humanly Christian character, and a noble gentlemanliness—the government in the college becomes a comparatively easy matter. These qualities act at once as an inspiration toward noble conduct in students and also as a repression toward evil con-

duct and the formation of evil character.

Yet when respect and respect only is secured, the ideal of college government is not gained; for respect does not necessarily imply that intimacy of relationship between the officer and the scholar which it is well to form. It can hardly be too often reiterated that the greatest possible intimacy is to be promoted between the student and the officer. Such intimacy should be of the greatest advantage to the student, and the professor should be prevented from enjoying it only by reason of what he regards as greater duties; yet duties that are more important than that duty of standing on intimate terms with the student it would be hard to find.

Therefore to the element of respect in the government of college students should be added the element of sympathy. The officer and the student should be on terms of cordial sympathy.

The relation of cordial sympathy is

promoted through a proper appreciation on the part of the officer of the magnitude of the tasks which he assigns to students. These tasks should be severe. The student comes to college to work, and the severer his work, within certain limits, of the greater value to him is the work itself. Yet the professor may assign too much work even to the best man. Such assignments tend to discourage the faithful student and to promote a sort of mental despair and possibly mental disintegration. The class comes to feel that the professor is trying, not to guide the students, as he ought, but to drive them, and even to drive them upon a gallop. Such an endeavor on his part usually results in arousing the *mulish* element in the students,—and they refuse to go. The result is a remoteness or a divorce in the relation of the class and the teacher. But if the teacher appreciate the powers of the class, giving the impression that he

wishes each member to spend a proper amount of time upon each lesson, and no more, the class is inclined to work for him with all the power that each member may have. The student comes to feel that the teacher appreciates the mental state and the conditions of the student, and in this resulting sympathy he becomes obedient to the will of his intellectual superior and supervisor.

Sympathy is promoted, too, through intellectual intimacies between the student and the professor. It is a happy condition in the American college life that such intimacies are becoming more numerous and also more intimate. What is known as "seminary work" tends to promote such closeness of relationship. In this work the professor ceases to be a professor and becomes a student, working with his students. These students are usually fewer than are found in the ordinary college class, and such fewness of numbers tends to promote personal and scholarly

intimacies. To the will of a teacher with whom a student is thus working, the student will naturally refuse to be disobedient. He comes to see that the college does not consist of rules or regulations, but of beings who are thoroughly human and a good deal like himself. He soon learns that every professor is quite as much a student as a professor. Intellectual intimacies promote personal sympathy, and personal sympathy promotes good government.

Such sympathy is further fostered through intimate personal associations. Intimate personal associations find at once a cause and a result in the long talks of professors and students. Such talks, if I may be allowed to make a personal confession, I like to have with students in whom I have a personal interest, or whom I wish to have a personal interest in me. If they feel that they get something from such talks, I surely feel that I get much more than I can give to

them. I thus come to know students: to know their strengths and their weaknesses; their aims and their methods; their environment and their principles; and I myself come to feel a deeper sympathy with them, and they also, I hope, come to see the desire on the part of the college for offering the very best opportunities for Christian, intellectual, ethical culture. They cannot fail under favorable conditions to be impressed with the desire on the part of every college officer to do the very most and the very best for each student. If action is taken by a Faculty or by a president which seems to them unwise, these intimacies of personal relationship help to provide good ground to prove to them the justice of such action. This intimacy tends toward the promotion of a particular advantage: college officers are thus able to come into the lives of students at the time of crises. The officers usually labor under the disadvantage of not knowing

when ethical or intellectual crises are occurring. But if they can know when men stand at the parting of the ways or in the stress of the storm, and if they may come closely into these lives, it is well for the student, it is well for the professor, it is well for the college.

Certain college officers have had the noble enjoyment of commanding the respect of students, and also of being in the relation of sympathy with them. No one has excelled Mark Hopkins in thus having the respect of his students, and also in being in sympathy with their minds and hearts. To college officers there is hardly a more interesting chapter in President Carter's life of Mark Hopkins than the chapter entitled "The Rebellion of 1868." This rebellion is among the most remarkable of all college rebellions. The whole body of students stood upon one side and the whole Faculty stood upon the other. The Faculty was, on the whole, right, as faculties usually are.

At the time, however, of the outbreak, President Hopkins was away from Williamstown. On his return and learning the condition, he so bore himself and so explained the condition of affairs that he commanded at once the respect and the sympathy of the students. He did not break down any college rule. He maintained the majesty of college law, but, while doing this, he so showed himself as feeling with the students in their misapprehensions, and also as so eager to make every adjustment that wisdom could dictate, that the rebels presently returned to their work. Few, if any, college presidents have certain conspicuous abilities which Mark Hopkins possessed, but these two elements of respect and sympathy should play the most important part in the government of every American college.

VI.

PLAY IN COLLEGE.

"I HAVE a son at Yale College at an annual expense of nearly $2000," says a New York father in beginning a letter to the *Evening Post*. He fears that the associations of his boy are so unscholarly and trivial, that he will be obliged to say at the close of his course with a slight change of the Scripture (Exodus 32, 24), "Behold, we have thrown gold into the fire, and there has come out this calf." The reports as to the training of the "crew" and of the "nine," as to the "boom in chess-playing," the "promenade by the Junior class," the "concert by the Glee Club," and "germans by the three upper classes," incline him to the belief that Yale College is a school of

professional athletes, singers, and dancers. He is filled at once with wonder and madness. And it is true, and most unfortunately true, that to the public eye the colleges appear primarily to be reduced to a "crew," a "nine," and a "foot-ball team." The usual reports, exclusive of Commencement season, that are made in the newspapers relate to contests of every sort, excepting intellectual. The reason is evident: the public which reads the papers is more interested in the exhibition of the muscles than of the minds of college men, and the papers collect the news in which their constituency is interested.

But, notwithstanding all the evidences to the contrary, it is true that our colleges are institutions of the higher scholarship, designed to train, and training, young men in habits of clear, prolonged, and profound thinking. Despite all diversions and distractions, I believe there has not been for a generation a year

when students were working their brains more constantly, more wisely, or more effectively than in this year of grace. The testimony of professors and of presidents, as I am privileged to hear it, is quite unanimous that the intellectual and moral earnestness of students is increasing. Professor George H. Palmer has pointed out that in the decade beginning in 1874–75 the scholastic grade of students at Harvard rose several degrees. In the Senior class of 1874–75 the average man had a mark of 67%; in the Senior class of 1883–84 the average man had a mark of 81%.* The three lower classes indicate a gain, though less than in the case of the Senior. The better students in the later years of the German university work perhaps as hard as the better students in our own colleges; but it is to be remembered that the average age of admission to the

* *The Andover Review*, article "The New Education," vol. 4, p. 400.

German university is two years ahead of the average age of admission to the American college. But our own men work more hours and are harder "readers" than English university men. Not a few students average for the four years sixty hours of work a week. The majority devote at least seven hours a day to their courses of instruction. Six hours a day of study represent less than the average. But at Oxford an average of seven hours is high; and it is said that by six hours' work each day, together with a proper use of vacation, a man can do himself justice in any study. Idlers are to be found in every college as in every factory and shop, who will get along with just as little labor as possible; and in the case of some colleges the labor necessary for receiving the first degree may be made very small. But poor scholarship, which once would have been regarded with indifference, is now despised, and the man who "tails"

the class, even though he be the crack oarsman or the best "rusher," is the object of either pity or ridicule.

Nor is this increase limited to the amount of work. The quality likewise indicates improvement. Intellectual independence is at once a characteristic and a result of the present methods of study in our colleges. The laboratory system is adopted in every field of study to which it is applicable. The student of history, of the classics, goes back to the sources of history, as the student of chemistry or of physics is brought into direct relation with the elements which he is to manipulate. The student becomes an investigator; he learns how to use books, to weigh evidence, and to judge of proportion. The student becomes a thinker; he is taught to compare, to discriminate; he comes to know that the reason for an opinion is more important than the opinion itself.

The high quality and large amount of

work now done in the college are depreciated, it seems to me, by that system which puts a far larger premium upon success in periodical examinations than upon daily work. This system has strong support; but to determine rank for a year's work by the manner in which one passes two examinations of three hours each is to influence the ordinary student to make the semi-annual "crams" take the place of daily learning and reflection. I notice that the lights in the windows of certain dormitories are fourfold more numerous at the time of the mid-year and annual examinations than at other periods.

But despite all this the college of this day is distinguished in public opinion more by its play and sport than by its intellectual service. The popular play and sport lie along the line of athletic exercise. Every large college, and many a small one, has not only its crews and ball nines, but also foot-ball elevens, la-

crosse and cricket teams, bicycle clubs, shooting clubs, tennis clubs, and I know not how many other athletic associations. At the basis of all discussion as to the worth or worthlessness of these sports lie several propositions upon which all agree. It is universally acknowledged that the body should be kept vigorous, and that proper exercise is a means to the attaining and retaining of this desired vigor. It is also confessed by all that athletic sports are not an aim of a college training, and that therefore they should be considered rather as the amusements of amateurs than as the labors of professional experts engaged in earning either bread or a reputation. It is further generally granted that these sports prove to be a guard against certain vices to which young men are especially tempted. There is also no lack of agreement upon the proposition that these sports tempt many engaging in them to excessive indulgence; an indulgence which

it is the duty of both student and officer to restrain. The question is chiefly a question of proportion.

Chief among the objections urged against the system of athletic sports is its effect upon the scholarship of the athletes. The time and strength which boating and ball men devote to these avocations on field and river are regarded as lost to their proper vocations. The charge has a basis in truth. But it is to be said, also, that many men of this sort would not in any instance give that time and vigor, now given to the sport, to study. They would spend their strength in amusements and diversions of a positively harmful tendency. It is, furthermore, not true that the brilliant players on the field, or the swiftest oarsmen, are the dullest dunces in the class-room. President Eliot states that, in the college of which he is the able and distinguished administrator, "of the eighty-four different students who were

members of the University crew, base-ball nine, or foot-ball eleven from 1873 to 1881, more than a quarter stood above the middle of their respective classes, and the average standing of the whole number was represented by seventy-two in a supposed class of one hundred. It may be said, moreover, for some of the very lowest scholars among the athletes, that the perseverance, resolution, and self-denial necessary to success in athletic sports turn out to be qualities valuable in business and other active occupations of after-life, even when they are associated with lack of interest in scholarly pursuits, or with dulness or slowness of mind." *

The cost in money as well as the cost in time and strength constitutes an objection to the system. The pecuniary expense, however, is not so large as is often represented. The athlete may make his training and his exhibition of physical

* Annual Reports of the President, etc., 1881–82, pp. 18–19.

powers either costly or cheap, as he sees fit. As a fact, his expenses are usually paid for him by the subscriptions of fellow-students. He is looked upon as their representative, and they pay bills for his uniform, travelling, etc. The annual expense of the Harvard University Boat Club, of a recent year of which the treasurer's report lies before me, is about $6000. Of this sum, $3300 was derived from members of the four college classes. The number of subscribers represented only about two fifths of the whole body of students; and the average amount paid by each subscriber was $13.75 in the Senior class, $10.09 in the Junior, $9.77 in the Sophomore, and $7.83 in the Freshman. The names of three fifths of all the students are not to be found on the list. In the case of Harvard the cost of sending a crew to New London or elsewhere, and of supporting aquatic sports, is certainly light for each student. In the case of a college of fewer students

and less wealthy, the cost is relatively much heavier; but the expenses of the crew may be made less, and in no instance need necessary expense be felt as a burden. In 1888 at Harvard the average amount given by each student to the support of athletics was $15.41. One quarter of the students gave nothing.* The students should not, and usually would not, lose caste or respect or position of any sort through poverty and consequent inability to add to the boating funds.

The fact is that most men in Yale College who spend nearly $2000 each year are spending about one half of this large allowance in ways less creditable than subscriptions to the boat club. The "ordinary annual expenses" at Yale are, at their extremes, set down in a recent catalogue as $350 and $1025, including instruction: room-rent, $140 to $250;

* Harvard College Report upon Athletics, 1888, p. 48.

board, $135 to $288; fuel, lights, and washing, etc., $30 to $70. Certain of these items seem to me altogether too low; yet that, beyond and above $1000, a student should spend another $1000, is certainly extravagance and waste, and may indicate evil indulgence. It is true that drunkenness is not so prevalent as formerly; but it is also true, as indicated by the clearest evidence offered by the students themselves, that lust is very common. In hundreds of ways, creditable or discreditable, honorable or shameful, students of large income fritter or squander their fathers' money. The college authorities would be glad to stop reckless expenditure; most fathers would be glad to put an end to it; the student who spends and the one who receives the money are interested in continuing it. But a persistent effort should be made to reduce the cost of an education to as small a sum as is consistent with the best use of the advantages which a

college offers. Thousands of boys are kept from college by the belief that a college education is far more costly than it need to be.

It is not to be doubted that certain features of athletic sports are demoralizing to manners and debasing to morals. The betting and the gambling which are fastened upon the result of these contests are corrupting, and only corrupting. The association of college oarsmen or ball men with professional players is not a benefit to the college men. The spectacle which may be seen at the intercollegiate boat-races and ball-games does not tend to impress beholders with the proper purpose or worth of undergraduate culture. These things, and many others, are bad, thoroughly bad. It is not possible, or, if possible, not wise, under present conditions, to interdict the annual boat-races; but if they could be stopped, the chief losers would be the hotel-keepers at the lake or bay where they are pulled.

Nor do I believe that this cessation of public intercollegiate contests would seriously diminish the participation of the large number of students in the exercise of rowing. In the case of rowing, and of sport of every kind, it were well for the contestants to be limited to students of their own college. The peripatetic base-ball nine of a college, playing games with nines from other colleges of several States, wins no permanent glory for its members or their *alma mater*. It may not now be wise to stop at once the series of games which the representatives of many colleges play each June; but would it not be well to put a narrower limit upon the number of colleges to be represented, and to take measures for placing the arrangements more entirely in the hands of the college authorities? The narrowing of the circle of athletic rivalry would not seriously, if at all, lessen the athletic enthusiasm of the majority of students. So far as possible,

"field-days" should be limited to the men of one college. The smallest college has students enough to awaken the excitement of competition. "Field-days," moreover, to be of the greatest worth, should be placed under the wise jurisdiction of college officers, and the contests should be worthy to receive the hearty approbation of professor and trustee.

Athletics have several direct considerations in their favor above exercise in the gymnasium. They are usually conducted in the open air, and exercise in the open air is far more conducive to health and vigor than exercise taken in the best-ventilated gymnasium. They are, further, of a more voluntary character than gymnastic practice: they spring from arrangements and endeavors made by the students themselves. Their rewards are rewards either in popularity or in "silver cups" given by the students or others. They are, therefore, more attractive and more heartily enjoyed. They

are, therefore, also of greater benefit to those participating.

The athletic system in some form has come into the college to stay. For better or for worse, the college must keep it, and by the discreet guidance of the authorities it may be made of great and lasting worth. Its sports lend themselves easily to differences of opinion between students and Faculty. Students should always recognize that these sports are not only of secondary but of tertiary importance, and that the college government has the right, nay, is obliged by duty, to use every measure to cut off excessive indulgence. It is also clear that the official boards should grant to students every right, every material advantage, which tends to develop, directly or indirectly, manly character. Committees from the students and from the Faculty, of permanent standing, have in several colleges so managed these difficult questions as at once to give pleasure and to maintain

self-respect. It is known that the ideal college man of to-day is not, as was his brother of a generation ago, pale, sallow, hollow-chested, bow-legged, and blear-eyed, but robust, muscular, vigorous in bodily faculty and functions. The gymnasium is a potent instrument in effecting the improvement. College athletics should carry forward this work to its perfection.

Of all the sports of college men, foot-ball is the most popular. It illustrates the bad side and the good of college athletics.

Foot-ball has its bad side. It breaks collar-bones, gouges out eyes, sprains ankles. It absorbs too much attention from certain students. But foot-ball also has its good side. It has intellectual relations and moral. Its playing demands mind as well as muscle, white tissue of the brain as well as red tissue of the chest. Foot-ball trains in a conspicuous way certain precious elements of character.

Foot-ball trains that supreme quality, judgment. The game is one of inferences. It teaches the art of weighing evidence. It is a constant and swift grasping together of many and diverse parts, and from this one conception drawing a certain duty to be swiftly done. It is a comparison—comparing strength with opposing strength. It is a ceaseless interrogation—what will the opponent do, how can he be beaten, where is his weak point, where his strong? Judgments made in foot-ball are made under the necessity of swiftness like the lightning's. The mind is alert to see, to infer. A second determines priority. No tiger springs more quickly on his victim than a foot-ball man "tackles." Fumbling is death.

> "If it were done . . . then 't well
> It were done quickly."

If it is not done quickly by one side, it is done quickly by the other. The

quicker quickness triumphs, the wiser wisdom wins.

Foot-ball is training in co-operative endeavor. Each player works with every other, knee to knee, shoulder to shoulder. One man runs, three men protect him from the tackling assaults of his antagonists. One man gets the ball by a trick, four men have aided him. Nine men are pushing nine other men toward a goal, bowed and buckled together into one manhood; two men stand without, ready for a swiftly made emergency. Each man is strong in himself, each man is strong for himself and for every other. Let our friends who are talking of a co-operative basis of society see a foot-ball game if they wish to know what real co-operation is. Eleven minds that think as one, eleven hearts that throb as one, eleven necks that bend as one, twenty-two shoulders that push as one, twenty-two hands, twenty-two knees, every man, every faculty of every man, all working

with each other and toward one aim—that's foot-ball.

Foot-ball is a discipline in the qualities of judgment and co-operation. It is a discipline in many other and excellent qualities; but let it suffice to say that foot-ball is a *discipline*. It is a training; it is a conversion of adipose matter, material, mental, into articulated forces. It promotes development; it promotes self-control, self-restraint; it promotes endurance; it promotes proper obedience. The discipline of the regular United States Army is an education which, if not liberal, is liberating. The years spent at West Point, even if one shirks his books, would be a training from boyhood to manhood. The rigor and vigor of foot-ball have a similar effect.

But I do not intend to eulogize foot-ball. I only want to point out certain mental qualities which it, as one part of college play, fosters. Athletics occupy an important place in American life; they oc-

cupy an important place in college life. We can "down" them on neither the popular nor the academic field. Their evil features, and evil features they have, are to be eliminated. These sports are to exist—to exist in larger ways, too, as wealth becomes larger, work more exhausting, and life more complex. To abolish them is impossible. To guide them is the duty of those who are set to control things. To get the most out of them, to cause them to minister to the body, to minister to the mind, to minister to the soul, in ever-increasing worth, is to be made the great endeavor. Foot-ball is to be made a game less for the foot than for the brain; it is to be made to minister more to the mind than to the muscles.

VII.

SIMPLICITY AND ENRICHMENT OF LIFE IN COLLEGE.

THE fear is often expressed that college life is losing its simplicity. College life may have a simplicity of various and diverse sorts—material, intellectual, social; but the loss or the lack of material simplicity is more apparent and impressive.

It is said that living is ceasing to be plain and becoming high, that thinking is ceasing to be high and becoming plain. No evidence of the suggestion is more striking than that furnished in the proposal to build for one of our colleges a dormitory at a cost of about half a million dollars. If this immense sum were given for the endowment of research or to erect a gallery of art, the evidence

would not be at all conclusive. But this large sum is given to build a home for college men; and a home for two hundred college men which costs five hundred thousand dollars is an indication of something other than simplicity in college life. Such an expenditure represents an elaborateness of furnishing, of personal and social luxury, quite unlike the life suggested by the old dormitory which, it is said, will be torn away to make room for this palatial home for students. I do not say that such a structure is proof of the lack of simplicity, but I do say it is evidence. The halls and houses of the fraternities which are found in many colleges are further evidence that college life is becoming elaborate. These houses are, in their exterior impressiveness and in their interior furnishing, somewhat removed from an environment of the sort which the sons and grandsons of the founders of certain of these colleges enjoyed. With a few singular exceptions

the structures built by colleges for scholarly purposes are solid, permanent, severe, economical; but fraternity houses and memorial dormitories are in peril of taking on an unfitting elaborateness.

I am no pessimist. I am a thorough optimist as respects the present and the future of the American College and of the college man; but I am inclined to think that the marble and the granite offer significant intimations that college life is losing a certain simplicity. I also seriously fear that the lives of the students themselves furnish evidence for a similar conclusion. Does not many a student in certain colleges pay a larger annual rental for his suite of rooms than his father spent for all purposes in his college course of four years? Does not the whole system of athletic sports suggest large expenditure and elaborateness of arrangement and condition? Does not the life which many of the fellows live in the fraternity houses, many of these

houses are mainly dormitories, indicate relations as manifold and as luxurious as the houses themselves are rich? What are we to think of the simplicity of the life of college students some of whom spend fifty dollars apiece for a fraternity pin? Does any one now believe that the "Hasty Pudding Club" at Harvard is content to dine upon porridge?

The student does not stand alone. He is a part of this age of ours. The age itself is an age of elaborate living. Therefore the living of the student is prone to be elaborate. It is hardly fitting to take boys from homes in which living is elaborate and to send them to colleges in which living is of extreme simplicity, it may be said. For better or for worse, it may be affirmed, the college is to be like the community.

Yet I am sure that every college officer and every parent look upon this peril of the loss of simplicity in college life with a very deep sense of regret. The

movement intimates that the idols of the market are driving out the idols of the temple of learning, that the idols of the parlor are expelling the idols of the library. It is well for the college to be democratic. Democracy means the rule, not of the higher or the highest people measured by social or financial standards, but of the great body of true and noble men and women. It is well for the high-born to live four years under conditions where dignity of birth shall not appear. It is well for the low-born to live four years under conditions where lowliness of origin need not depress the spirit. It is well for the boy of promised large inheritance to sit by the side of the boy whose only capital is his brain and heart. It is well for the boy who has only himself to sit by the side of the boy who has much besides himself. If we are not to maintain democratic ideals and to sustain democratic methods in the college, where on this globe are we to maintain

and to sustain them? The cardinal virtues here should have their full swing. Men are here to be judged by the standards of the Ten Commandments and of the Beatitudes. The qualities of firmness, patience, caution, energy, judgment, sincerity, honesty, are here to elevate, and the qualities of rashness, tardiness, laziness, falseness, are here to depress. Here every tub is to stand on its own bottom, whether the hoops of circumstances that hold the parts of each tub together are iron or silver or gold. Men are here to be as individual and independent as they are to be when they stand at the judgment-bar of God. Eternal verities are the college standards. If all college boys are to be in character as men, all college men are to be in their relation to each other as boys. Not, who is his grandfather? but, what can he do? Not, how much is his father worth? but, what does he know? Not, what happiness of condition will be his? but, what is he? These

are the college tests. Brain is the only symbol of aristocracy and the examination-room the only field of honor; the intellectual, ethical, spiritual powers the only tests of merit; a mighty individuality the only demand made of each, and a noble enlargement of a noble personality the only ideal. Such, I take it, is to be the simplicity of college life.

The peril in thus making college life simple is that it will become bare and barren. I know a college in which this peril does prevail. The life is indeed simple. I believe that sixty dollars a year, plus three and a half hours of labor each day, meets all annual charges. The rooms in the dormitory of this college which I visited were furnished as are furnished the rooms of an overseer in a logging camp in Northern Maine. The bill of fare was exceedingly plain. It is yet a college giving an education to many a boy who would otherwise be without it. It deserves honor and beneficence. I do

not doubt that in many respects it provides a good education; but the life seemed to me very bare and barren. I hesitate to imagine what Matthew Arnold would have said of it; but let us be thankful that Matthew Arnold is not the lasting arbiter in college questions.

The fact is that the simplicity of the college is to be a simplicity which shall lead to enrichment. The chief comprehensive difference between the impression which Oxford and Cambridge make on the student, and that which the new American college makes, is indicated, I think, in this word, enrichment. Life in an English university may be no more elaborate than the life in the New World; but it has a richness which the college in the New World has not. It is as hard to distinguish in words what this difference is as it is easy to feel the difference in spirit. It is the difference between wine two years old and wine twenty years old; it is the difference between the russet

apple in January and the same apple in April; it is the difference between the vigorous thinking of a young man and the thinking of the same man become old. So far as it is able, the American college is to give this enrichment to each student. Each student is to have the mind well stored, but the wealth he accumulates is not to be a mere mass; it is to be properly divided and assessed. He is to have a proper regard for each of the virtues and a fitting respect for the graces; but the content of each virtue is to be large and the significance of each of the graces is to be to him mighty. He is to make himself as a Greek statue, simple, severe, correct, but whose lines suggest infinite beauty and whose face is an intimation of divine truth and love. The life of the college man is thus to be a life at once rich and simple.

I know very well that simplicity of heart, of mind, of character, is perfectly consistent with elaborateness and luxury

in circumstance and condition. I know very well that many a college man who has all the gifts of fortune may in his heart of hearts be as simple as the child of poverty. As things of the mind are more precious than things of matter, so simplicity in things of the mind is of far larger worth than simplicity in things material. But it is not to be forgotten that the temptation offered by elaborateness in living is toward the lessening of simplicity in spirit. "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle" than for a man whose conditions are elaborate and whose circumstances are luxurious to live in his soul a life of severe simplicity; but this can be done. Rich men, and many of them, do enter the kingdom of heaven, we have reason to believe; and it can be believed that students of elaborate and luxurious condition may be in heart and mind simple.

VIII.

THE COLLEGE AND THE CHURCH.

EDUCATION and Christianity are sisters. The discipline of the intellectual character is intimately associated with the discipline of the moral character. The school-house and the church have stood side by side. Clergymen have founded the college, and the college in turn has trained the clergymen. The early history of the higher education in the United States is largely a history of the work of the ministry. With the exception of State universities, the colleges of the country have usually been founded either by ministers or for ministers. The oldest college bears the name of a non-conforming clergyman, who gave to it his library and one half of his property. Founded

in a colony where church-members alone were voters, it was thoroughly ecclesiastical. The second college founded in America was William and Mary of Virginia. A religious and clerical purpose prevailed in its establishment, as in the establishment of Harvard in the Bay Colony. In the enactment of the Virginia Assembly regarding the foundation of William and Mary, four purposes were named: to promote learning and the education of youth, the supply of ministers, and to advance piety.* The college authorities in Virginia were quite as pious in their purpose as the royal authorities in England were profane. When the Rev. Dr. James Blair went to Attorney-General Seymour with the royal note to prepare the charter, he was met by remonstrances against the expensive liberality. Seymour said he saw no occasion for a college in America. Dr. Blair replied that more ministers were

* Assembly's Enactment, 23 March, 1660.

needed in Virginia, that the people had souls, and that the college was necessary to educate ministers. "Souls!" remonstrated Seymour, "damn their souls! Let them make tobacco."* The third college founded in this country, Yale, was founded by a few ministers assembled in Branford, who established it by the formality of presenting a number of books with these words: "I give these books for the founding of a college."†

The clerical beginning of the higher education thus made has continued. The Presbyterian influence was felt in the establishment of the College of New Jersey, the Episcopal in the establishment of Kings (Columbia) in New York, and the Baptist in the establishment of Brown University in the Colony of Rhode Island. Dartmouth, says Professor Charles F. Richardson, was the legitimate outgrowth of the awakening in religious and literary

* Richardson & Clark's College Book, p. 55.
† Ibid., p. 63.

thought which distinguished the second half of the last century.* "Rutgers was founded," declares the charter, "for the education of youth in the learned languages, liberal and useful arts and sciences, and especially in divinity, preparing them for the ministry and other good offices;" and in the past as in its present government the Dutch Reformed Church rules. The name of Union College sprang from a desire to establish an institution free from sectarian influences, and yet with a hearty determination that full religious, if not clerical, purposes should prevail.

In the rapid establishment of colleges in the present century the clergy have had the first place. As the population has gone westward the college has followed. The Congregational, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, and the other churches, as they have endeavored to serve the people, as the people have

* Richardson & Clark's College Book, p. 141.

gone westward, have found that the Christian and, as they thought, the denominational college was an essential agency in their service. The old Western Reserve College, now Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, had its origin, remarks its second president, Rev. Dr. G. E. Pierce, "in a religious want deeply felt by the devout men who laid its foundations. It was to be the instrument for providing an able, learned, and pious ministry for the infant churches which pious missionaries were gathering and nurturing with untiring zeal and energy. It was a missionary establishment for planting the Gospel on a new field."* Those who co-operated in its establishment were, largely, missionaries of the Connecticut Missionary Society. In a similar spirit and motive were laid the foundations of Marietta College. Its first president, on

* This and the following instances are taken from the early reports of the American Education Society, founded in 1815.

his induction into office, was charged, in words still borne in Latin upon the shield of Harvard, to conduct the institution "for Christ and the Church." The founding of Wabash College of Indiana is a marvellous example of Christian devotion, sacrifice, and forethought. Painfully oppressed with the need of ministers in that State, a few home missionaries, after three days of consultation and prayer, resolved to make the beginning of a college. Thus determined, says one who was present at the meeting, "we then proceeded in a body to the intended location, in the primeval forest, and there, kneeling on the snow, we dedicated the ground to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for a Christian college." Thus was once again wrought the duty voiced in Lowell's sublime line,

"—— We ourselves must Pilgrims be."

Illinois College sprang into being from the

union of two independent movements, the one of home missionaries of Illinois and the other of a society of Yale College. Knox College was established in 1837 by a colony of Christian families, who wished to diffuse the influences of education and of religion through an important section. Beloit originated in the combined deliberations and action of the Congregational and Presbyterian churches and ministers of Wisconsin and Northern Illinois. Oberlin was founded by two men, John J. Shipherd and Philo Stewart. Shipherd was the pastor of a Presbyterian church in Ohio, but resigned his pastorate for the purpose of extending Christian education. Stewart was a missionary among the Choctaws in Mississippi. These two men so held a Christian ideal of education that they often referred to it as the pattern shown in the Mount. Iowa College was founded by the so-called Iowa Band, a dozen graduates of Andover, who entered that State in 1840.

The colleges that are founded in Minnesota, South Dakota, and Washington—Carleton, Yankton, and Whitman—are the outgrowth of the purpose of ministers and their official associates to secure a learned, vigorous ministry. It is, with the exception of State universities, seldom that the single motive of intellectual culture has been found sufficient to establish a college in a new community. The motive has taken on an ethical, religious, and even clerical aim.

But, further, the church has not only founded the college; it has also, in its early and usually feeble years, fostered the college. That it is well to subject a college to ecclesiastical control is a proposition no longer debatable. Neither church courts nor church councils are well fitted to conduct educational institutions. Such ecclesiastical and educational marriages have been, on the whole, not often solemnized, and when they have occurred, a separation has frequently

resulted. But, notwithstanding the lack of official control, the church has yet made its influence felt, and felt most powerfully, in the management of the college. In the denominational colleges, of which we have more than two hundred, prominent ministers and laymen of the respective denominations usually compose a majority of the governing boards. The funds are, to no small degree, drawn from members of the church which the college represents. But even if the college have no special ecclesiastical affiliations, the churches have representatives upon the board of trustees, and in their conventions receive reports of the institutions through their officers. It is, however, by means of societies formed by the churches, and which are the agents of the churches, that the colleges are the most frequently and to the largest advantage aided. For more than thirty years the Western College Society, as a distinct organization, fostered about a

score of colleges. This society came to the relief of institutions scattered from the Ohio to the Pacific when their distress was great. President Smith of Marietta College affirms that the few thousand dollars given to that institution "saved it to the church." President Sturtevant of Illinois College likewise declares that this "society has saved the college from extinction, and placed it in a position of great promise of lasting usefulness." The first college which was able to dispense with the assistance of the Western College Society —the Western Reserve—was a college one of whose early presidents, it is said, "had often, at the hour of midnight, lain upon his bed revolving in his own mind the best method of winding up the affairs of the institution, without having dared to lisp it to an associate in office." Thus did this society foster the colleges of the West.

While the church bears these impor-

tant relations to the college, the college bears relations no less important to the church. These relations may be comprehended in the general remark that the college gives to the church its most necessary factors and elements. The college furnishes the church with an educated ministry and an educated laity. The college not only trains the minister; it often "converts" the minister. Revivals are more frequent and more powerful in many colleges than in the average community. In them have hundreds of men been led to devote their hearts to Christ and their lives to His special service. It is made to appear from the induction of careful facts that, in many institutions a large share of whose graduates enter the ministry, fully one half of those who choose this calling become Christians while pursuing the collegiate course. In 1853, Professor W. S. Tyler, of Amherst College, wrote that of all the ministers graduated at the institution one quarter were hopefully

converted in college.* Among them are no less than thirteen foreign missionaries and no less than twenty-eight persons who have been officers of either colleges or theological seminaries. The list contains such names as Professor E. S. Snell, Professor B. B. Edwards, and Professor H. B. Hackett. No condition gives so great promise of a young man becoming a Christian as a four years' residence in a Christian college. College life contains fewer direct temptations than business life, and more and stronger inducements to the personal acceptance of Christ. The revival which often sweeps through not a few of the colleges, and which is at once the result and the cause of the religious tendencies of many students, is more common in Western than in Eastern institutions; but many men in the colleges of New England are thus moved. Dr. H. Q. Butterfield, formerly president of Olivet, speaks of a certain college

* Prayer for Colleges, pp. 131–145.

as "a revival college." Dr. G. F. Magoun, formerly president of Iowa College, writes of "five successive years of revival, and the very considerable number of students brought to Christ therein." This strong religious tendency of many colleges is evidenced in a remark of a professor in one of the daily prayer-meetings of the students: "My young friends, Jesus Christ is in the *habit* of visiting Iowa College." Without the religious influences of the college, the need of ministers would be far more dire than it now is. A reason of the relative increase in the number of theological students, in seminaries of the Congregational order, coming from the West rather than from the East, lies in the fact that the colleges of the West are, on the whole, more thoroughly pervaded with Christian influences than the colleges of the East. A cause, also, of the lamentable and constant decrease of the whole number of students in many theological seminaries in the last decade may be

found in the fact that revivals and other instruments of Christian work have not, in this period, been in such effective operation as at many other times.

Many students, also, who do not enter the ministry become Christians in college. The college is a centre of positive religious influence. About this centre every student moves, and touched by this influence he is and must be. Merchants and manufacturers, lawyers, judges, and doctors, bankers, architects, and teachers, who are now the noble support of many churches, were thus brought to a supreme love of God.

It is thus made evident that the relations of the church and of the college are fundamental and intimate. It would not be rash to affirm that neither institution could for a long time prosper without the other. In prosperity the one rises with the other; in adversity the one with the other declines. If the piety of the church is warm and aggressive,

the college halls will be filled with throngs of young men assiduously devoting themselves to Christian self-culture. If the piety of the church runs low, the college will at once feel the baneful influence of religious indifference. At the close of the last and at the opening of the present century the students of Yale College were notorious for their infidelity. In the year 1799, of the Senior class only two members had made a public profession of religion; of the Junior and Freshmen only one each, and of the Sophomore, if any at all, not more than one.* But in this respect the college was only the picture of the community. In the city of New Haven, in the last five years of the last century, outside of the college, there were only very few persons under twenty-five years of age who had made a profession of religion. The elder President Dwight, through his sermons, which are preserved in his system of divinity, con-

* Prayer for Colleges, pp. 147, 148.

verted the college to Christian standards, and, converting the college, helped to roll back the tide of scoffing doubt which was sweeping through the nation.* The college and the church thus act and react upon each other. The college gives the church its ministry; the church gives the college its presidents and not a few of its other teachers. The college helps to maintain a high standard of Christian education; the church sends the noblest sons of her noblest members to the college to be trained for usefulness. The college fosters that wisdom and discipline required for the efficiency and stability of the church; the church fosters the material and religious interests of the college. The church helps to make the college, and the college the church.

The imperative character of the recip-

* A considerable number of the first class which the elder Timothy Dwight taught "assumed the names of the principal English and French infidels; and were more familiarly known by them than by their own." (Dwight's Theology, Life, etc., p. xxxviii.)

rocal demands of the church upon the college, and of the college upon the church, is more evident in the West than in the East. The Christian influences of Western colleges are, as a body, stronger than the Christian influences of Eastern colleges. The graduates of Eastern institutions entering the ministry are few, and have been, until recent years, gradually becoming fewer. One half of the college graduates in the seven Congregational seminaries of theology, excluding one college from the list, are now from the West. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions depends in an increasing degree upon Western colleges for the enlarging and recruiting of its forces. In 1880, Dr. E. K. Alden, the Home Secretary, writing of the places of the education of the ordained missionaries then in the service, remarked: "Of one hundred and thirty-nine who received a collegiate education, thirty are alumni of Amherst; twenty-

two of Williams; fifteen of Beloit; seven of Dartmouth; six of New Jersey; five each of Bowdoin and of Oberlin; four each of Middlebury and of Hamilton; three each of the University of Vermont, of Western Reserve, and of Illinois; two each of Union, of Knox, and of Ripon; and the remaining sixteen represent sixteen institutions, one of which is Harvard and one of which is Iowa. While Harvard College has given us during the entire seventy years but four of its graduates, only one of whom is now living, Beloit, Wisconsin, which was founded only thirty-three years ago, has given us twelve, of whom eleven are in active service. Other Western institutions, nearly all of them quite young, have added twenty-three to the number."* The churches of the interior States demand ministers of the colleges of these States; but the churches of the East, and the

* Paper at annual meeting of A. B. C. F. M., 1880.

churches around the world, make the same imperative call.

These reciprocal demands of the church upon the college, and of the college upon the church, become further evident in view of the formative state of society in the newer commonwealths. Every people that moves into a new country is necessarily in a plastic condition. However old the settlers themselves may be, the new physical conditions necessitate a social order more or less new, adapted to the new conditions. A large part, therefore, of the newer sections of our New World is in a plastic state. The social order can therefore be formed, and formed with ease. In such a process of formation the college depends upon the church, and the church in turn depends upon the college. If either fails, both fail. If the church stands in the community as a monument to the worth of the human soul, the college stands likewise as a monument to the worth of the

human mind. If the church through the minister is to teach man in the things of God, the college must prepare the minister who thus teaches. It is not without meaning that from the very founding of the first Congregational church in America, and from the founding of the first Congregational college, Harvard, down to the founding of the newest college, and of the newest church, in a Pacific State, the college has always followed the church, and the church preceded the college. Both church and college have worked together; both have made and met reciprocal demands each upon the other, all for the formation of a Christian society within the bounds of the commonwealth.

It has sometimes been said that the colleges of the West are to save American Christianity. Whether the remark be true or false, it is evident that the star of Christianity, like the star of empire, moves westward. In membership

the churches of the West are approaching the churches of the East on a gallop. In benevolences several churches of the West are the peers and even the superiors of the most generous churches of the East. If the Western churches are to maintain this advance, and even to make further progress, the colleges and the churches must work together. The churches are to support the colleges by sending to them their choicest gifts of young men and women. They are also to support the colleges through gifts for endowment. In turn, the colleges should give to the churches young men and women with minds well disciplined, with hearts well founded in righteousness, with characters established in intelligent Christian principles. Such reciprocal giving and receiving represents the present condition in many States. In Minnesota, for instance, Carleton has the esteem of the Congregational churches, and these churches are sending to Carleton the

offerings of their sons and daughters, and also of their substance. These churches look upon the college as simply their agent, their clearing-house, their representative, in which and through which they are equipping laborers for the salvation of the world. Carleton College in turn looks upon these churches, from whom it has received great aid, as those to whom it is to extend its benefits in the upholding of a high type of Christian manhood and womanhood, and in the inculcation of a devout and aggressive and intelligent piety. The attitude of this college, like the attitude of every Christian college, is simply the exemplification of the motto of Harvard, that it is founded and exists "for Christ and the Church." Such reciprocity is customary: the one denominational college of a State is regarded at once as the child and the parent of the churches; the demands are reciprocal; the advantages are reciprocal. Each institution works through and for

the other, and both for the salvation of humanity in all righteousness.

It is well for men in college to know that the noble advantages which they are enjoying represent the noble sacrifices of the Christian people of this country. Without these sacrifices—usually offered with joy—most colleges would not have been founded, and without these foundations tens of thousands of men would have been denied an education. With a great price have they come into the freedom of a liberal education.

IX.

THE COLLEGE FITTING FOR BUSINESS.

THE prevailing prejudice against college men as candidates for business is at once reasonable and unreasonable. It is reasonable, in that it is based on the belief that college men are not willing to "shovel," to do menial tasks; and some college men are not willing. The prejudice is unreasonable, in that college men who are worthy sons of a worthy *alma mater* are willing to do any work, however menial, which it becomes their duty to do. Business is an art, and every art is to be learned by the practice of it. No art is thoroughly known if the humbler elements are unknown. Therefore the worthy college man who proposes to enter business is willing to "shovel."

The simple truth is that the college man entering business does not spend so long a time learning the elements of his calling as the boy whose formal education ceased at fifteen. The following concrete assumption does not put the question in a form too strong: Two boys are each of the age of eighteen; their abilities are equal; their training has been identical; both propose to become merchants or manufacturers. On leaving the High School John enters business; on leaving the High School Edgar enters college. Four years pass: John has become the master of many details and of the chief principles of his work. In these same four years Edgar has secured his college education. Each has become of the age of twenty-two. The day following Commencement Edgar puts on his overalls and begins where John began four years before. In six months Edgar will have come to know the business as well as John had learned it in the first year; in

the first year Edgar will have come to know the business as well as John had learned it in the first two and a half years; in the first two years Edgar will have learned more than John learned in the first four years; in his first four years Edgar will have caught up in knowledge and efficiency with John, knowledge and efficiency which John secured in his eight years; and from this time Edgar will go ahead of John with a swiftness increasing with each succeeding year.

In hundreds of factories and shops and stores this assumption is proved to be the absolute truth. And the reason of it is clear enough: the college man has been taught to see, to think, to judge. It is the question of the trained athlete against untrained strength, of the disciplined soldier against raw bravery.

When Mr. Andrew Carnegie says in his famous diatribe that the college man "has not the slightest chance, entering business at twenty, against the boy who

swept the office or who began as shipping clerk at fourteen," one is inclined to ask him respecting the graduates with whom it has been his misfortune to be associated. The facts as well as general reasonings too are against Mr. Carnegie's assertion. In a group of sixty-five graduates, whose homes or business relations are in the single city of New York, can be found eighteen bankers, fifteen leading railroad managers, ten manufacturers, ten merchants, seven presidents of chief insurance companies, and five conspicuous publishers. Mr. Chauncey M. Depew, the president of the New York Central Railroad, is reported to have said that hundreds of college men have begun in these last years at the bottom in railroad work and have soon distanced the uneducated boy and man. To attempt a catalogue of the men who have thus worked would be to name leading men in every department of industrial and commercial life.

I am not, of course, saying that the

lack of a college training is a prophecy of the lack of success. I am prepared even to allow that a man who has no college training may be able to secure a greater triumph than any man who has a college training. College training is only an element of the equipment. But I am saying that any man, however gifted by nature, becomes through the agency of a college training the better fitted for doing the largest service in a commercial or other calling to which he may devote himself. The college is not designed to train merchants or manufacturers, but it is designed to train men who, becoming merchants or manufacturers, will be better merchants or manufacturers than they could be without the training.

The advantage which the man in business receives from a thorough training is greater to day and is to become even greater to-morrow than ever before in the world's history. This advantage and the source of it are suggested in a letter to

me written by one of the managers of a great insurance company. He says:

"The training of a college course becomes more and more important as years roll on and business is conducted on a larger scale and with a broader field than formerly, and as judgment forms a larger and luck a smaller factor than in the earlier years of the country's history. A boy can learn to measure tape or retail groceries without a college education, but for the management of men and the control of large enterprises the more complete and thorough his training the more likely he is to be successful."

Consolidation and combination represent the modern commercial method. If individualism is becoming more important in civil and domestic relations, it is becoming less important in mercantile. Therefore the demand for knowledge which shall be both exact and comprehensive, for wisdom which shall be of details and yet not petty but large, for force

which shall be aggressive without rashness, is becoming more and more imperative. And where can one look for knowledge and wisdom and force with a surer hope of finding these noble qualities in their noblest development elsewhere than in the worthy American college?

But the one phrase, American college, has ceased to represent a single form of education. Individualism has touched the college quite as deeply as it has any department of life. The "elective system" is individualism applied by the college student. It is no longer true that the graduate entering business knows Latin, Greek, mathematics, and nothing else. It is true that what he knows outside of these three departments may include more knowledge than what he knows of them. If the purpose of a general training is the chief aim of a college, as I believe it is, this aim may be gained in pursuing certain studies which may themselves prove to be of immediate,

definite, and practical worth. If the college man find, in the middle of his course, that he will probably become a banker, why should he hesitate to concentrate his attention upon such studies as Political and Social Science, Finance, Administrative and Constitutional Law, Constitutional History? If the student discover that he has special aptitudes, why should he delay, when he has passed the half-way stone, to train these aptitudes? Let faculty be made facility. The student need have no fear of thus becoming narrow. His previous training will save him. College training should be broad, yet with special fitnesses for life's special work; college training should be training for life's special work, but it should be saved from narrowness. The college man proposing to become a merchant or manufacturer or administrator should have before himself the twin purpose of becoming a business *man* and a *business* man.

X.

THE PRE-EMINENCE OF THE COLLEGE GRADUATE.

I HAVE had an examination made of the six volumes known as "Appletons' Cyclopædia of American Biography." The work contains sketches, more or less complete, of fifteen thousand one hundred and forty-two persons. These persons are Americans. Most of them were born on our soil. Those who were not born here lived and worked here. The book is supposed to represent the most conspicuous fifteen thousand persons of our American history. It is necessarily subject to limitations. Many who have wrought better than these who are here sketched are not introduced. But it is the least incomplete of all collections of the lives of the more conspicuous Americans. Two of my

friends, students in Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Herbert Seely Bigelow and Alfred John Wright, have examined each of these more than fifteen thousand names. The facts which we set out to discover were: How many of these persons are college graduates, and how many are not? What is the education of those who are not college graduates? To what colleges are those to be credited who are graduates? To what professions do the graduates belong?

The following table represents the results of the examination. A word explanatory may be fitting. It can be best given by an example. Amherst College is represented in the Cyclopædia by one hundred and two graduates. Of these, twenty-seven are clergymen, four soldiers, twenty-four educators, and so on to the end of the list. A similar presentation is made in the case of each of the forty-three colleges named. The term "Non-College" and the figures following show the number of men

	Clergy.	Soldier.	Lawyer.	Statesman.	Business.	Navy.	Author.	Physician.	Artist.
Amherst	27	4	7	4	3	....	7	8	...
Bowdoin	24	3	15	15	3	1	15	8	2
Brown	53	6	33	21	9	....	9	12	3
Colby	5	2	3	3	....	...	2	2	....
Columbia	47	12	38	15	12	....	17	18	2
Cornell	1	1	..	1	1	....	1	8	1
Dartmouth	60	10	36	22	7	...	4	8	....
Dickinson	18	1	15	3	1	1	....	..	....
Georgetown	2	...	3	....	....	...	2	3	....
Georgia U.	1	....	7	5	...	....	1	2	....
Hamilton	20	..	11	4	2	....	9	1	1
Hampden-Sidney	14	2	4	5	....	....	.. .	1	....
Harvard	204	39	162	50	39	3	93	91	12
Hobart	12	....	6	1	...	....	1	3	...
Jefferson	19	3	7	8	...	...	3	2	4
Kenyon	5	...	3	1	....	.. .	1	1	....
Madison	9	..	....	2	....	....	4	...	....
Marietta	....	1	....	2	....	....	1	2	...
Miami	5	1	3	9	1	2	3	....	....
Michigan U.	...	3	2	2	1	.. .	....	4	....
Middlebury	28	..	6	9	1	....	5	....	..
Nashville	1	2	2	4	....	....	....	....	...
New York	21	..	10	1	1	....	6	...	2
North Carolina	6	1	12	17	....	....	1	3	....
Oberlin	1	1	.	2	..	....	1	. .	...
Pennsylvania	40	2	30	7	12	....	11	34	...
Princeton	100	15	59	44	4	1	21	23	3
Rochester	3	3	1	...	1	....	4	1	....
Rutgers	23	1	5	3	1	...	3	4	...
South Carolina	7	6	15	14	2	....	1	5	....
St. John	1	1	4	....	...	1	2	2	....
Transylvania	4	....	4	4	...	...	....	4	..
Trinity	22	1	4	2	2	1	4	4	1
Union	65	16	29	13	6	1	16	8	....
Vermont	6	1	7	2	2	....	3	3	1
Virginia	9	4	8	8	1	....	1	7	....
Washington	3	3	3	...	....	....	2	3	....
Washington and Jefferson	6	2	....	4	....	. ..	1	...	....
Wesleyan	16	..	4	2	1	....	1	3	....
Western Reserve	5	1	2	2	....	....	1	....	...
Williams	43	6	23	12	7	...	9	11	....
William and Mary	7	7	15	29	2	....	2	3	....
Yale	194	37	149	55	19	....	53	43	4
Small Eastern	71	9	13	13	4	..	12	11	..
Small Southern	57	13	32	25	6	1	21	25	8
Small Western	29	12	14	14	3	1	7	5	2
Foreign	211	20	25	10	17	2	54	51	20
Academy	59	436	68	65	60	34	39	36	39
Non-College	1080	1264	769	811	884	466	668	449	525
Total	2744	1752	1678	1310	1105	515	1124	912	630
Per cent representing college graduates	.58	.03	.50	.33	.17	029	.37	.46	.104

	Educator.	Scientist.	Journalist.	Public Man.	Inventor.	Actor.	Explorer, Pioneer.	Philanthropist.	Whole No. of Persons named in Cyclopædia
Amherst	24	12	1	1	3	....	....	1	102
Bowdoin	16	2	2	3	...	....	....	...	104
Brown	27	7	3	2	2	....	....	2	189
Colby	3	...	...	....	...	....	....	....	20
Columbia	21	10	1	3	...	....	1	1	198
Cornell	...	5	1	....	...	....	....	....	20
Dartmouth	44	9	3	4	...	....	....	1	208
Dickinson	7	3	1	2	...	....	....	1	53
Georgetown	1	...	...	1	...	....	....	....	12
Georgia U.	4	1	...	....	...	....	....	...	21
Hamilton	16	3	..	....	...	....	....	1	68
Hampden-Sidney	2	...	...	2	...	....	...	....	30
Harvard	95	37	14	32	1	....	2	9	883
Hobart	1	1	3	2	...	..	....	....	30
Jefferson	....	...	...	....	...	...	....	....	46
Kenyon	2	...	...	..	...	..	....	...	13
Madison	1	...	...	....	...	....	....	....	16
Marietta	1	1	...	....	...	....	....	....	8
Miami	....	...	...	....	...	. .	...	....	24
Michigan U.	....	1	...	....	1	....	....	....	16
Middlebury	5	2	...	1	1	....	1	1	60
Nashville	1	...	...	1	...	....	...	....	11
New York	6	6	2	1	...	....	....	1	57
North Carolina	4	2	2	8	...	....	....	....	56
Oberlin	5	2	...	....	..	....	....	....	12
Pennsylvania	7	21	2	7	1	1	....	....	175
Princeton	24	3	..	11	...	....	....	1	319
Rochester	6	2	1	.. .	...	..	....	....	22
Rutgers	2	1	...	....	...	....	....	..	43
South Carolina	4	2	1	3	...	....	...	....	60
St. John	2	1	1	1	...	...	....	....	16
Transylvania	..	2	...	....	...	....	....	....	18
Trinity	2	1	1	....	...	. ..	...	...	45
Union	22	6	4	2	...	...	...	...	188
Vermont	6	3	2	3	...	....	....	...	35
Virginia	8	3	1	3	...	....	....	1	54
Washington	2	...	...	....	..	....	....	1	17
Washington and Jefferson	....	1	.	....	...	....	...	....	14
Wesleyan	18	5	2	....	2	...	....	...	54
Western Reserve	1	1	...	....	...	....	....	....	13
Williams	26	14	5	1	...	....	....	....	157
William and Mary	5	1	2	7	2	...	....	...	82
Yale	83	38	15	14	3	..	....	6	713
Small Eastern	18	9	2	6	1	1	...	1	171
Small Southern	13	15	4	7	1	1	1	....	230
Small Western	17	19	6	3	...	...	....	....	132
Foreign	73	89	14	14	1	1	4	1	507
Academy	42	25	11	15	3	4	7	6	949
Non-College	345	164	206	605	144	99	233	145	8867
Total	1016	522	313	765	166	107	249	180	15142
Per cent representing college graduates	.61	.63	.30	.189	.11	.037	.036	.16	.35

in the specified callings whose names are found in the Cyclopædia who are not graduates. The "Total" stands for the number of all the men represented in the Cyclopædia. The last line represents the percentage of the graduates found belonging to each of the callings specified.

Of the 15,142 men named in the book, 5326 are college men, or slightly more than one third. Of them also 941 are what may be called academy but not college men. It is to me exceedingly significant that so large a proportion are college-bred. The whole number of graduates of American colleges from the beginning until the present time does *not certainly exceed* two hundred thousand. The number may be nearer one hundred and fifty thousand. Of these, five thousand have done such work as to deserve a memorial more or less permanent. According to the larger estimate, one man, therefore, in every forty men graduating has thus deserved well. I recently asked a distin-

guished Professor of American History how many persons had ever lived in America. He was unable to give me an answer. I assume that at least a hundred millions of people, who have lived and whose dust mingles with the common dust of this new soil, have not had a college training. Yet out of these hundred millions only ten thousand have so wrought as to deserve such recognition as is found in a cyclopædia of biography. Only ten thousand out of ten thousand times ten thousand! Therefore only one out of every ten thousand. But of the college men one in every forty has attained such a recognition. Into one group gather together ten thousand infants and send no one to college: one person out of that great gathering will attain through some work a certain fame. Into another group gather forty college men on the day of their graduation, and, out of these forty, one will attain recognition. It is not very hard to see how

far the proportion is in favor of the college man—two hundred and fifty times. I will not vouch for the mathematical accuracy of these estimates; but I do say that they are true in their general impression and significance.

We are not to forget that men who go to college are in a sense picked men. Many of them, without going to college, would have wrought conspicuously well. The abilities which impelled them to give themselves the best training for doing their work would have still proved somewhat efficient without the training. The circumstances and conditions which influenced them toward the college would have proved to be generous incentives for the rendering of noble service, were they bereft of the advantages which the college provides. But after all deductions are made, it is still just to say that the chances are vastly in favor of the man of college training rendering the ablest and most distinguished service to humanity.

Among the interesting questions upon which this survey sheds light is the question, In what vocations is found the largest proportion of college men? I may now say that the results of this examination were classified under seventeen professional divisions: clergymen, soldiers, lawyers, statesmen, business men, naval officers, authors, physicians, artists, educators, scientists, journalists, public men, inventors, actors, explorers or pioneers, and philanthropists. There are 515 naval officers sketched, of whom only 49 are college men, or 2.9 per cent. Essentially the same proportion is found among soldiers: of no less than 1752 names mentioned, 1264 do not represent a college training; 436 represent only an academical training. Of the 107 actors mentioned, only 8 are college-bred. The percentages found in the other callings are as follows: pioneers and explorers, 3.6 per cent; artists, 10.4 per cent; inventors, 11 per cent; philanthropists, 16 per cent; business men,

17 per cent; public men, 18 per cent; statesmen, 33 per cent; authors, 37 per cent; physicians, 46 per cent; lawyers, 50 per cent; clergymen, 58 per cent; educators, 61 per cent; scientists, 63 per cent.

One is tempted to linger upon these figures, to show in detail how they tend to prove the worth of a college training. Forty-six per cent of the physicians noted in this book are graduates. It is a notorious fact that the medical profession has very few college-trained members. The usual estimate is that one physician in every twenty has a college training. Now of all the physicians who do such conspicuous work as to deserve a place in a cyclopædia, almost one half are found to belong to this small five per cent; the forty-six per cent is found to belong to the five per cent!

The contrast is not so strong in the case of lawyers. It is probable that about one fifth of all the lawyers now practising are graduates, or twenty per

cent. But of the lawyers whose names appear in this Cyclopædia, fifty per cent are college-bred. In respect to ministers, too, we find the same general result. It has been to me a little surprising, I will confess, that of the 2744 clergymen named in this Cyclopædia, 1139 are not college graduates; that is to say, fifty-eight per cent only are college graduates. The ministry is in general the most learned of all the professions. The lists of the first graduates of our two oldest colleges show that to be a college graduate was not identical with being a minister, but the lists do show that considerably more than one half did enter the ministry. In recent times this condition is altogether changed. For a long period that largest and most aggressive of our American churches, the Methodist Episcopal, discouraged the higher education as a pathway to the ministry. Clerical pioneers, like civil pioneers, it was thought, need no college training. But

at the present time the face of this great church is as strongly set toward the college as its back was in the former time. It may therefore be due to the early and long-continued attitude of the Methodist Episcopal Church and certain other churches toward education that we find no larger proportion than fifty-eight per cent among the more eminent clergymen representing a college training.

Among these figures it appears that seventeen per cent of the business men who have thus won recognition are graduates. Although this percentage seems small, yet it is exceedingly significant. There are mentioned in this Cyclopædia 1105 men of business. If one can by a mathematical imagination conceive how many business men there are or have been in this country and will compare this number of his imagination with 1105, and if on the other hand he will compare the 161 business men that are graduates who are men-

tioned in this Cyclopædia with the relatively small number of business men in this country who have had a college training, he will obtain a product showing how vast is the evidence in favor of the worth of a college training.

In this comparison occur the names of forty-three colleges. There are also included several colleges, represented by a small number of graduates, which are classified as the "Small Eastern," the "Small Southern," and the "Small Western" colleges.

Let me compare certain of these colleges which are conspicuous and which we naturally associate. The first college founded in America was Harvard, the third Yale; the second was William and Mary in 1693; but William and Mary after a long and noble career is now a college hardly more than in name. I may therefore compare our two oldest colleges, and, I think I do no injustice in saying, our two most conspicuous. Harvard College

was founded in 1636, Yale in the first year of the last century. Harvard, including the class of 1890, has 11,932 graduates; Yale, 10,576 graduates. Of the Harvard graduates, 883 are noted in this Cyclopædia; of the Yale, 713. Of the Harvard, slightly more than seven per cent; of the Yale, slightly less than seven per cent. In this same Cyclopædia the clergy has of Harvard men 204; of Yale 194. Of soldiers, Harvard 39, Yale 37; lawyers, Harvard 162, Yale 149; statesmen, Harvard 50, Yale 55; business men, Harvard 39, Yale 19; naval officers, Harvard 3, Yale 0; authors, Harvard 93, Yale 53; physicians, Harvard 91, Yale 43; artists, Harvard 12, Yale 4; educators, Harvard 95, Yale 83; scientists, Harvard 37, Yale 38; journalists, Harvard 14, Yale 15; public men, Harvard 32, Yale 14; inventors, Harvard 1, Yale 3; philanthropists, Harvard 9, Yale 6. As one compares these two sets of figures he is struck at once with the similarities and

the dissimilarities. In the number of clergymen and of lawyers there is comparative equality. In the number of educators each college has a similar credit. But in respect to the significant callings of the physician and of the author there is a great variance: Harvard has 91 physicians, Yale 43; Harvard has 93 authors, Yale 53.

I have been questioning myself as to the cause of such a dissimilarity. I am inclined to think that the reason Harvard has a so much larger number of distinguished physicians lies in the fact that the Harvard Medical School is assuredly a more conspicuous agency than the Yale Medical School, and that it has been more easy for the bachelor of Harvard to become a physician through his own Medical School than for the Yale bachelor to become a physician through either the Harvard or his own Medical School. The difference between the number of authors among the Harvard gradu-

ates and among the Yale graduates has long been recognized. It has always been said that the literary influences of Cambridge and Boston are stronger than those of New Haven and New York. American historians have dipped their pens into the Harvard ink-bottle. Of our historical pentarchy, Bancroft and Motley and Parkman and Palfrey and Henry Adams are Harvard men. Of our poetical pentarchy, Lowell and Holmes and Emerson are Harvard men. What is the cause of such literary preponderance? A general cause may lie in the fact that Boston has been the literary centre of the United States. A general cause may also lie as far back as the earlier colonial period; the colonial pulpit had a tremendous influence in the promotion of the higher intellectuul interests. I also judge that a further and more immediate cause of the literary pre-eminence of Harvard students is found in the fact that the chairs of literature at Harvard have been

filled by such teachers as Longfellow and Lowell and Edward Tyrrell Channing.

Over the name of Channing one likes to linger. It is to Channing above every one else that this pre-eminence is due. Mr. Edward Everett Hale says:

"I once heard it said, by a person competent to judge, that Harvard College had trained the only men in America who could write the English language, and that its ability to do this began with the year 1819 and ended with the year 1851. The same person added that whoever chose to look on the college catalogue would see that those were the years when Edward Tyrrell Channing began and ended his career as the Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory. This was said thirty years ago."*

Mr. Hale adds:

"Half a century afterwards, when I was an overseer, the president of the time said

* "My College Days," *Atlantic Monthly*, March, 1893, Vol. LXXI., No. 425, pp. 360, 361.

to me, 'You cannot get people to read themes for many years together.' I said, 'I thank God every day of my life that Ned Channing was willing to read themes for thirty-two years.'" *

The work that the college can do for a man in teaching him to write English is slight, but is worth much. American literature owes a debt to Edward Tyrrell Channing which will never be properly recognized. Less distinguished than his brother, William Ellery Channing, American literature owes him an obligation hardly less than that which the liberal church of America owes to the distinguished apostle of Unitarianism.

But when, in comparing Harvard and Yale, we turn to what are called statesmen, we find that the advantage lies with the college in New Haven. Harvard, although having a larger number of graduates, is credited with only fifty states-

* Ibid., p. 361.

men, while Yale is credited with fifty-five. It has commonly been said that Harvard is more of a literary college and Yale more of a college fitting one for a political career. It would seem that possibly Yale is touched by what may be called the American spirit. A Harvard graduate and also a teacher in Harvard has lately said:

"The essential object of the institution [Yale] is still to educate rather than to instruct, to be a mother of men rather than a school of doctors. In this Yale has been true to the English tradition and is, in fact, to America what Oxford and Cambridge are to England, a place where the tradition of national character is maintained, together with a traditional learning. If there is a difference, as of course there is, between the Yale undertone of crudity and toughness and the sweet mellowness of studious and athletic life in England, that is not the fault of Yale, but is due to the fact that

English and American society are at different intellectual stages. The Yale principle is the English principle and the only right one. . . . No wonder that all America loves Yale, where American traditions are vigorous, American instincts are unchecked, and young men are trained and made eager for the keen struggles of American life." *

In a word, Yale seems to be more American than Harvard. Political life, statesmanship, represent a very important part of American life. Therefore a larger number of distinguished men of Yale we do find in statesmanship than of Harvard.

Let me also make comparisons of certain other colleges. I select, as standing at the head of the list, Amherst and Bowdoin. Amherst is credited with 102 men of distinction, Bowdoin with 104. Let us run through the list and see how in respect to professions the balance

* *Harvard Monthly*, "A Glimpse of Yale," by George Santayana, December, 1892, Vol. XV., No. 3, p. 95.

stands. Of clergymen Amherst has 27, Bowdoin 24; soldiers, Amherst 4, Bowdoin 3; lawyers, Amherst 7, Bowdoin 15; statesmen, Amherst 4, Bowdoin 10; business men, each 3; naval officers, Amherst 0, Bowdoin 1; authors, Amherst 7, Bowdoin 15; physicians, each 8; artists, Amherst 0, Bowdoin 2; educators, Amherst 24, Bowdoin 16; scientists, Amherst 12, Bowdoin 2. Also put down side by side the old college of William and Mary that has practically ceased to be and the newer college of Jefferson's creation, the University of Virginia, that has and is to have a very great influence in the intellectual life of the South. William and Mary has 82 men of fame, the University of Virginia 54. Of clergymen, the University of Virginia has 9, William and Mary 7; soldiers, University of Virginia 4, William and Mary 7; lawyers, University of Virginia 8, William and Mary 15; statesmen, University of Virginia 8, William and Mary 29; educa-

tors, University of Virginia 8, William and Mary 5.

Dartmouth and Brown are credited with comparatively the same number of distinguished graduates, Dartmouth having 208, Brown 189. Observe the similarities and dissimilarities in the different callings. Brown has 53 clergymen, Dartmouth 60; Brown has 6 soldiers, Dartmouth 10; Brown has 33 lawyers, Dartmouth 36; Brown has 21 statesmen, Dartmouth 22; Brown has 12 physicians, Dartmouth 8; Brown has 27 educators, Dartmouth 44.

Compare also two colleges dissimilar in history and association, Williams and the University of Pennsylvania. The University of Pennsylvania is said to have 175 distinguished men among its graduates, Williams 157. Included in and making up these numbers the University of Pennsylvania is credited with 40 clergymen, Williams 43; University of Pennsylvania, 2 soldiers, Williams 6; University of Pennsylvania, 30 lawyers,

Williams 23; University of Pennsylvania, 7 statesmen, Williams 12; University of Pennsylvania, 12 business men, Williams 7; University of Pennsylvania, 11 authors, Williams 9; University of Pennsylvania, 34 physicians, Williams 11; University of Pennsylvania, 7 educators, Williams 26.

As one goes through these comparisons one is struck, as in the case of Yale and Harvard, with the similarities and dissimilarities. Similarities, however, are somewhat constant. Colleges on the whole seem to have about the same proportion of men in the different callings. And yet observe the contrasts. Amherst is credited with 4 statesmen, Bowdoin 10; Amherst with 7 authors, Bowdoin 15. Why these marked differences? We know that from Bowdoin came Longfellow and Hawthorne, Franklin Pierce and John A. Andrew. And we also know that these men had their college days in a time when Amherst was in its feeble infancy. It

would seem that the early forces at Bowdoin employed either in attracting men or in offering tuition were somewhat stronger than were the forces of the Massachusetts college. Amherst has given to the world a Storrs, a Beecher, a Roswell D. Hitchcock. But the college days of these men were after the college days of Longfellow, of Hawthorne, and of Franklin Pierce. William and Mary, too, has turned out far more statesmen than the University of Virginia, the child of the brain of Thomas Jefferson. But William and Mary was the chief Virginia college in the eighteenth century. It helped to make the men who helped to make the great Revolution.

I have been, I confess, a little surprised to find that Dartmouth has not educated a greater number of distinguished lawyers. It is commonly understood that the training given at this college is specially promotive of legal power and legal discipline. The names of Rufus

Choate and Daniel Webster occur. And yet Dartmouth has educated only three more distinguished lawyers than Brown, and fewer than Harvard or Columbia or Princeton or Yale; only seven more than Union, only six more than the University of Pennsylvania. But Dartmouth has trained a greater number of educators than Brown, as forty-four is greater than twenty-seven. It may be that the cause of this lies in the fact that Dartmouth has been a country college, attended by country boys. Country boys are usually poor in college, poor before college and poor after college for a time. The ready-made method of relieving the straits of poverty in college and after college is teaching; and when one has once entered into the profession of teaching, it is easy to stay.

It is noted that Williams has furnished eleven distinguished physicians and the University of Pennsylvania thirty-four. The explanation of such a difference lies

probably in the fact that Philadelphia, the site of the University, above every other place in America is distinguished for its Medical Schools. The University of Pennsylvania itself is probably more distinguished by reason of its School of Medicine than by its undergraduate department. Therefore it is not unnatural for its bachelors to enter the School of Medicine. No such condition obtains at Williams. And it may be remarked in general that differences of condition are a chief element in explaining these differences of results. It is also possible that these figures may warrant the remark that wherever a college is found in which there is one man of special strength or eminence the graduates naturally turn toward that profession or work in which this strength is of peculiar worth.

It therefore does not seem too much to say that the American college has profoundly influenced American life. It has not been the mother of great move-

ments, like Oxford, but it has been the mother of great men, like Cambridge. It has not made great soldiers or sailors, great artists or inventors; but it has contributed vastly toward the worth of the more considerable elements of thought and character. It has not created poets, but it has enlarged the vision of the poet and sweetened his song. It has not created historians, but it has given to the writer of history a subject, taught him to investigate, to weigh evidence, to write with power. If its influence has not touched certain eminent preachers, it has added to the knowledge and disciplined the powers of thousands of clergymen. It has brought and is daily bringing a larger offering to the editorial desk, the lawyer's office, the medical clinic.

The noble words of Newman one may, with certain changes, apply to the American college: A college training is "the great ordinary means to a great but ordinary end; it aims at raising the in-

tellectual tone of society, at cultivating the public mind, at purifying the national taste, at supplying true principles to popular enthusiasm and fixed aims to popular aspiration, at giving enlargement and sobriety to the ideas of the age, at facilitating the exercise of political power and refining the intercourse of private life. It is the education which gives a man a clear conscious view of his own opinions and judgments, a truth in developing them, an eloquence in expressing them, and a force in urging them. It teaches him to see things as they are, to go right to the point, to disentangle a skein of thought, to detect what is sophistical and to discard what is irrelevant. It prepares him to fill any post with credit, and to master any subject with facility. He is at home in any society, he has common ground with every class; he knows when to speak and when to be silent; he is able to converse, he is able to listen; he can ask a question pertinently, and give

a lesson seasonably; he is ever ready, yet never in the way; he is a pleasant companion, and a comrade you can depend upon; he knows when to be serious and when to trifle, and he has a sure tact which enables him to trifle with gracefulness and to be serious with effect. He has the repose of a mind which lives in itself, while it lives in the world, and which has resources for its happiness at home when it cannot go abroad. He has a gift which serves him in public, and supports him in retirement, without which good fortune is but vulgar, and with which failure and disappointment have a charm." *

It is significant that we call the college not *almus pater* but *alma mater*. She gives to us intellectual life and cradles that life in its first feebleness. It is almost as rare to find a son complaining of his college as it is to find him complaining

* Idea of a University, pp. 177, 178.

of his first home. Happy the man who has two mothers whom he reverences! Old President Quincy of Harvard said that a man got a good deal out of college if he just rubbed his shoulders against the college buildings. But he certainly does not get much in this way in comparison with what he gets by rubbing his head against the cases in the library. For to the true man of alert intellect, pure heart, and strong will, the college represents a new birth and a new life. College is simply another name for Opportunity: Opportunity, widest, deepest, highest, richest.

OUR COUNTRY: Its Present Crisis and its Possible Future. By Rev. Josiah Strong, D.D. 12mo, 275 pp., paper, 30 cents; cloth, 60 cents. Revision based on the Census of 1890. A new edition (160th thousand).

The many thousands who read the earlier editions of this book, and were moved by its striking portrayal of our religious, social, and economic condition and tendencies, will learn with interest that the author has availed himself of the latest statistics of the Census of 1890 to make a revision of his work, which causes it to show the changes of the last ten years, and to picture the actual situation of to-day. The matter of the book has been increased one third, and a map and diagram forcibly illustrate some of the more startling statistical facts and comparisons.

"This volume is a storehouse of information. We recall no recent volume which has so much packed into it of value for the minister, the editor, the teacher, and in general, the patriot, as this little volume on 'Our Country.'"—*Christian Union.*

"Its facts are collated and marshalled with rare skill. It is a powerful and patriotic book. It stirs the blood; it warms; it inspires; it thrills and it instructs. It ought to be read by every citizen of the Republic; it will be read by all our people who wish to keep abreast of needful knowledge regarding our country."—*Christian Inquirer.*

"If the means were at our command, we know of no service we could perform more practical and effective for the cause of truth and righteousness, than to place a copy of 'Our Country' in the hands of every man and woman in the land."—*Christian at Work.*

"Words are feeble in the recommendation of this book. It enlightens, stirs, quickens, and makes the blood boil with patriotic zeal and Christian vehemence."—*Pulpit Treasury.*

"No publication of the present decade has awakened a more profound and intelligent interest. In its present form, and it is still compact and easily handled, we again commend it to all Christian and patriotic American citizens."—*New York Observer.*

Sent, postpaid, on receipt of the price, by

THE BAKER & TAYLOR CO., Publishers,
740 and 742 Broadway, New York.

THREE PULPIT AND PASTORATE BOOKS.

THE DIVINE ART OF PREACHING. By Rev. ARTHUR T. PIERSON, D.D.

CONTENTS.—I. The Sermon as an Intellectual Product. II. The Preacher among His Books III. The Preacher with His Themes. IV. The Preacher Training His Memory. V. The Twin Laws of the Sermon. VI. Types of Sermon Structure. VII. The Preacher among the Mysteries. VIII. The Preacher among the Critics. IX. The Preacher with His Bible. X. The Preacher in His Pulpit. XI. The Preacher among Snares. XII. The Preacher among His People. XIII. The Preacher Communing with the Spirit.

"It contains the freshest thoughts of one of the leading preachers of the world, on a subject of deep interest to ministers everywhere"—*Cumberland Presbyterian.*

HOW TO BE A PASTOR. By Rev. THEODORE CUYLER, D.D.

CONTENTS.—I. Importance of Pastoral Labor. II. Pastoral Visits. III. Visitation of the Sick—Funeral Services. IV. Treatment of the Troubled. V. How to Have a Working Church. VI. Training Converts. VII. Prayer-meetings. VIII. A Model Prayer-meeting. IX. Revivals. X. Drawing the Bow at a Venture. XI. Where to be a Pastor. XII. Joys of the Christian Ministry.

"The fruit of large native sense, long experience, wide observation, and devout consecration."—*Congregationalist.*

THE WORKING CHURCH. By Rev. CHARLES F. THWING, D.D.

I. The Church and the Pastor. II. The Character of Church Work. III. The Worth and Worthlessness of Methods. IV. Among the Children. V. Among the Young People. VI. Among Business Men. VII. From the Business Point of View. VIII. Two Special Agencies. IX. The Treatment of Strangers X. The Unchurched. XI. Duties Towards Benevolence. XII. The Rewards of Christian Work. XIII. In the Country Town.

"Every chapter is full of pith, bristling with points, wise, sound, and practical."—*The Evangelist.*

16mo, cloth, gilt top. In a set, $2.25. Separately, each, 75 cents. *Sent, postpaid, on receipt of the price, by*

THE BAKER & TAYLOR CO., PUBLISHERS,
740 AND 742 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

TWO BOOKS ON ART.

CRAYON PORTRAITURE. Complete Instructions for Making Crayon Portraits on Crayon Paper and on Platinum, Silver, and Bromide Enlargements. Also, Directions for the Use of Transparent Liquid Water-colors and for Making French Crystals. By J. A. BARHYDT. 12mo, cloth, illustrated, revised and enlarged edition; paper, 50 cents; cloth, $1.00.

A carefully prepared hand-book for professional and amateur artists, written with special reference to giving such full explanation of details as to furnish to those who desire to take up crayon work a full knowledge of all the materials required and their use and manipulation, together with all the methods and processes employed. The coloring of photographs, engravings, and photogravures with Liquid Water-colors and the making of French Crystals are also fully treated.

The author's successfully accomplished intention is to furnish a manual that will enable the student to undertake the making of crayon portraits for a livelihood or to gratify his taste as an amateur.

AMATEUR PHOTOGRAPHY. A Practical Guide for the Beginner. By W. I. LINCOLN ADAMS, Editor of "The Photographic Times," "The American Annual of Photography," "The Photographic Instructor," etc., etc. Illustrated. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, $1.00.

A treatise for the amateur, by one whose experience of, and immediate contact with, the wants of those who are using the camera in and out of doors especially fit him to prepare a hand-book that will both serve as a guide to the ordinary work, and will introduce the reader to new fields of interest.

CONTENTS.—I. Apparatus. II. In the Field. III. In the Dark Room. IV. Printing and Toning. V. Portraiture. VI. Instantaneous Photography. VII. Flash-light Photography. VIII. Orthochromatic or Color-sensitive Photography. IX. Composite Photography. X. The "Fathers of Photography." APPENDIX, Tables, Formulæ, etc.

Sent, postpaid, on receipt of the price, by

THE BAKER & TAYLOR CO., PUBLISHERS,

740 AND 742 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

WAVERLEY NOVELS.

THE WAVERLEY NOVELS. By Sir WALTER SCOTT. *Centenary Edition*, in 25 volumes. Illustrated with 158 steel plates, and containing additional copyright notes from the author's pen, not hitherto published, besides others by the editor, the late DAVID LAING, LL.D. With a general Index, and separate Indices and Glossaries. Sold only in sets, in boxes. 12mo, cloth, extra gilt top, $31.25; half calf, extra, $68.75; half morocco, $68.75.

This is generally acknowledged to be the best Library Edition of Scott's novels in the market. The half calf and half-morocco bindings are elegant examples of the binders' art, while the dark blue cloth, with gilt top, similar to the Riverside Edition of Emerson, makes a plain but beautiful binding.

"A handsome and convenient set, neatly bound in dark-blue cloth. Each volume has a special glossary and an index, and the illustrations are numerous."—*New York Nation.*

"The edition is an admirable one. It is one of the best editions available for comfortable reading."—*New York Tribune.*

THE REPRESENTATIVE WAVERLEY. The Six Most Popular of Scott's Novels: Waverley—Guy Mannering—Bride of Lammermoor—Ivanhoe—Kenilworth—Quentin Durward. Half leather-gilt top, in a box, per set, $10.00.

This set has been formed of the half-dozen books which the experience of librarians has shown to be the most popular of Scott's Novels. The binding is very attractive, and furnishes the reader a thoroughly representative selection from the great novelist's works.

Sent, postpaid, on receipt of the price, by

THE BAKER & TAYLOR CO., PUBLISHERS,
740 AND 742 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

BOOKS ON SHORT-HAND AND TYPEWRITING.

HUMPHREY'S INTERLINEAR SHORT-HAND (Pitman Phonography), for Use in Schools and Colleges. A complete and conveniently arranged text-book, treating exhaustively of the principles of phonetic short-hand in their application to all branches of verbatim reporting, and containing the latest modifications known to the art, with special adaptation to self-instruction. By F. S. HUMPHREY. Part I, 8vo, cloth, $1.50; Part II, 8vo, cloth, $1.50. Parts I and II (in one volume complete), 8vo, cloth, $2.50.

"You have made the study of phonography so easy that any person who cannot learn with the aid of these lessons ought not to take up the study."—*W. O. Wyckoff, President New York State Stenographers' Association, of the firm of Wyckoff, Seamans & Benedict, Proprietors Remington Standard Type-Writer.*

"Your Interlinear Lessons are almost perfect. It is certainly the best scheme of presenting phonography that has been published."—*Alfred Day, Principal Phonographic Department Spencerian Business College, Cleveland, Ohio.*

MANUAL OF TYPE-WRITING. Business Letter-Writer and Exercises for Phonographic Practice. By F. S. HUMPHREY. 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

This book gives the reader a perfect mastery of the writing machine, and acquaints him with the proper form and make-up of all the kinds of writing adapted to it, by giving abundant examples of mercantile correspondence, legal business, theatrical, legislative, judicial, and miscellaneous forms, etc. It also contains an admirable collection of the most frequently occurring commercial, legal, and legislative phrases, rules for spelling, punctuation, etc.

"It is exactly what is wanted in every short-hand school."—*W. H. Slocum, Official Stenographer, Supreme Court, Eighth Judicial Dist., N. Y.*

Sent. postpaid, on receipt of the price. by

THE BAKER & TAYLOR CO., PUBLISHERS,
740 AND 742 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

TWO USEFUL WORKS ON GERMAN.

LETTERS FOR SELF-INSTRUCTION IN THE GERMAN LANGUAGE. By SOLOMON DEUTSCH, Ph.D. 2 vols., 8vo, cloth, $5.00. Each volume also sold separately. Vol. I. First Course, Grammatical; 8vo, cloth, 480 pp., $2.50. Vol. II. Second Course, Idiomatic and Literary; 8vo, cloth, 364 pp., $2.50.

This is an elaborate work which perfectly accomplishes the task of making it possible for an English student, entirely without other aid, to master every detail of the pronunciation, grammar, and idioms of the German language, and at the same time to become familiar with its conversational forms, its proverbs, and classical sayings.

Mr. CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER fitly characterized the book when he said of it: "The method is scientific, but is perfectly intelligible. The author is thorough; in order to be easy he cannot be brief; he explains carefully."

DRILLMASTER IN GERMAN. Based on Systematic Gradation and Steady Repetition. By SOLOMON DEUTSCH, A.M., Ph.D., author of "Letters for Self-instruction in German," etc. 12mo, cloth, 469 pp., $1.50.

The subject-matter of the book is divided into twenty-four sections, consisting of numbered paragraphs containing German sentences on the left page, and the exact idiomatic English equivalent on the right page. Each of these sections of fifty paragraphs is followed by the same number of paragraphs in English, containing drill exercises for oral and written review. In these no new terms are employed, but merely modifications and variations of the sentences already given. The grammatical rules deduced from the model sentences which form the bulk of the book appear in copious footnotes and in the appendix. The latter also contains synoptical tables, giving a general view of the inflections, and an alphabetical list of the prepositions, with their idiomatic use. An index, alphabetically arranged, directs the student at once to the resources of the book on any given point.

Sent, postpaid, on receipt of the price, by

THE BAKER & TAYLOR CO., PUBLISHERS,
740 AND 742 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

REV. DR. TODD'S BOOKS.

TODD'S INDEX RERUM. By JOHN TODD, D.D. Revised and Improved by Rev. J. M. HUBBARD. Quarto, half leather, $2.50.

The Index is intended to supply to those who are careful enough readers to make notes of what they may wish to use again, a book especially adapted to that purpose by a system of paging by letters, each page having a margin for the insertion of the words most expressive of the subject of the notes. It contains 280 pages of quarto size, ruled and lettered, and in the hands of an industrious reader, forms, in the course of years, a perfect index of his reading, as valuable as he may choose to make it complete.

THE STUDENT'S MANUAL. By JOHN TODD, D.D. 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

A work of real worth for students and those who desire to become such in the best sense of the word. It is written with force and that convincing quality which creates an inclination on the part of the reader to adopt as his own that fine body of rules and principles which it directly inculcates. As a formative book for the college period of life, it is unequalled in our literature. It has received the universal approbation of those who are interested in the best education.

"We have no hesitation in saying that this book should be diligently read by every student. It is an eminently sensible and stimulating book, and its advice is such as students would do well to heed."—*Chicago Interior.*

"This book has done an immense amount of good in its day, and is destined to accomplish still more in its reissued form. It is the most sensible and attractive work of the kind in existence."—*Utica Herald.*

Sent, postpaid, on receipt of the price, by

THE BAKER & TAYLOR CO., PUBLISHERS,
740 AND 742 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.