



THE

✓
P R I N C E T O N

R E V I E W .

Benj M Warfield

By Whom, all things; for Whom, all things.

1883

FIFTY-EIGHTH YEAR.

JANUARY--JUNE.

NEW YORK.

1882.

JULY.

	PAGE
WAGES, PRICES AND PROFITS	I
HON. CARROLL D. WRIGHT	
THE PERSONALITY OF GOD AND OF MAN	16
GEORGE P. FISHER, D.D., LL.D.	
POLYGAMY IN NEW ENGLAND	39
LEONARD WOOLSEY BACON	
RATIONALITY, ACTIVITY AND FAITH	58
PROFESSOR WILLIAM JAMES, HARVARD COLLEGE	
THE NEW IRISH LAND LAW	87
PROFESSOR KING, LAFAYETTE COLLEGE	
PROPOSED REFORMS IN COLLEGIATE EDUCATION	100
LYMAN H. ATWATER, PRINCETON COLLEGE	

SEPTEMBER.

CAN AMERICANS COMPETE IN THE OCEAN CARRYING TRADE?	121
GEORGE F. SEWARD	
THE FUTURE OF TURKEY	133
CANON GEORGE RAWLINSON, UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD	
THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT PSYCHOLOGY	156
HENRY N. DAY, D.D.	

PROPOSED REFORMS IN COLLEGIATE EDUCATION.

THE present time is fertile in projects of reform in American colleges. Doubtless they are on manifold sides open to improvement. If they would thrive and grow they must welcome genuine, while they repel spurious projects of reform, in adaptation to the wants of the hour. Their permanency is impossible without progress. Differing alike from the gymnasia and universities of Germany and other analogous institutions of the Old World, they must none the less shape themselves to the varying exigencies and wants of the country which gave them birth and has moulded their life. Out of the immense variety of reforms projected, and urged with zeal and enthusiasm by parties entitled to consideration, we can now only touch briefly upon some relating to instruction, discipline, and morals, including religion. These, too, have mostly one trend. This is principally in the direction of leaving to the pleasure of the student what has hitherto been prescribed for and required of him, being, in the failure of other influences, enforced by penalties, which, if not otherwise effectual, culminate in exclusion from the privileges of the institution, temporarily or permanently.

I. MATTER AND MODES OF TEACHING.

As to methods of teaching running more or less into things taught, this respects the grand differentia of the college as distinguished from other spheres of training for life. Morals and religion are not, therefore, lowered as to their relative importance in the college. These are supreme here and in every other sphere of humanity, especially growing humanity. In this all are on a level. But it is not, or should not be, the *differential*

factor in any. Yet as the acquisition of expertness in accounts, or in the arts of trade, or skill in some handicraft, is the differential mark of training in these three departments respectively, so the acquisition of liberal knowledge, training or culture, at least in their elements is the differential aim of a college education. Now the questions what shall be taught, and how it shall be taught, are still on many sides subjects of dispute. Where they seem to have been most nearly settled, they are nevertheless beleaguered with new and almost revolutionary projects. The question about dropping out of the college course the ancient classics, in whole or in part, in order to afford a place for modern languages, science, and philosophy, has gradually been solving itself, by remanding to the preparatory course much that formerly consumed time in college; by more efficient teaching and study, which accomplish more in shorter periods; by scientific schools or departments, which provide for those who desire it a minimum of language and a maximum of science; by the introduction of optional studies and post-graduate courses, enabling the student to cultivate specialties, and this, if need be, at some loss of general culture. In all these ways room has been gained for the needful training in modern studies, without degradation of the ancient classics from their merited rank in the academic curriculum.

But without now dwelling on the course of study, and conceding that the one generally adopted in our American colleges is in the main as good as their respective circumstances admit, considering the state of their preparatory schools, their pecuniary resources, their number and grade of professors, indeed all their "environment," will permit, yet some important changes in the manner of teaching have been proposed in high quarters which cannot be overlooked. These all look towards leaving all studies and studying to the option of the student, special or final examinations in such studies alone excepted. In the midst of many valuable suggestions as to improved methods of teaching, the President of Harvard College says in his Annual Report for 1879-80, p. 13, with reference to the under-graduate academic department:

"The inventive activity of the instructors has undoubtedly been stimu-

lated by the gradual abolition throughout the university of all disciplinary methods of enforcing the attendance of students at lectures and recitations. The student now goes to the lecture-room because he is interested in the work done there; or because it is easier to accomplish the prescribed work of the course with the daily help of the instructor than in any other way; or because he finds attendance indispensable if he would pass the stated examinations; or, finally, because he is urged to attend by his friends, his parents, or the officers of the university, on the ground that attendance is both an advantage to him and a duty. If it can be reasonably maintained by the student that attendance on the exercises of any professor is not interesting, or as profitable towards a knowledge of his subject as some other use of his time, or indispensable towards passing the examinations of the course, every inducement to attendance seems to fail; and even the parent or the friend who wishes to urge the student to attend the exercises of that instructor will have serious difficulty in giving good reasons for such advice. It follows that in all departments the instructors have felt prompted anew to make their exercises interesting, profitable, and indeed indispensable, to their students."

All this surely looks towards the largest liberty on the part of the student as to the studies he pursues, and his attendance on lectures or recitations. It is so radical a revolution in the traditional methods of the American college as to demand thorough examination. And first in regard to the scope to be allowed the student in the choice of his studies.

Saying nothing of the propriety of permitting a few, whose circumstances preclude anything more, in the character of special students, to take such fragments of the course as their means permit, without honors or degrees, we speak only to the question of the extent to which studies should be required or optional in a full normal course for the bachelor's degree in our American colleges. On this subject we have no hesitation in saying that the main part of the course should be required, while the optional studies should be comparatively few, and ordinarily confined to the latter half of the course. The simple reason is that at this stage of life and education there is generally wanting the degree of judgment and of self-control requisite to induce the selection, or the thorough pursuit, of the studies most needful and profitable for the pupil—those which have been proved by the wisdom and experience of ages requisite to that robust and rounded mental development which forms the

best preparation for professional study, or for non-professional life in positions requiring intelligence and culture. The truth is, as all having acquaintance with average students know full well, that selections of studies will be largely made for other reasons than their proved utility in disciplining and informing the mind and imparting to it symmetrical culture. We agree with President Carter in his recent inaugural that "the average student in Sophomore or Junior year will gain little by a course of study selected in full according to his notions of value, or according to college traditions in regard to a profession, or to the adaptation of hours to athletic possibilities, or to a reported superiority of marks in a given department, or even with respect to a future profession." On the other hand, we cordially concede and maintain with him that "in the last year or two there may be value in granting to the student some freedom in the choice of studies; in giving, for instance, to one who will be a teacher of the classics an opportunity to refresh and advance his classical knowledge; or to one who wishes to pursue his studies abroad additional facilities in the modern languages; or to one who will study medicine laboratory practice in chemistry," etc. etc. But with this partial concession we would stop. We believe that the standard curriculum, with the ancient classics and mathematics for its basis, and its accessory training in modern languages, science physical and mental, rhetoric and English literature, exacted in due proportion, likely to make stronger intellects and higher men, for whatever profession or sphere of life, than any amount of studies chosen by youthful caprice or inexperience. In fact, no such option is given or possible in the courses of professional schools. As respects Harvard, President Eliot, in his Report already adverted to, speaks of the "elective system which prevails in the college and to *some degree* in the Law School and the Medical School." No degrees can be given upon merely elective courses in law or medicine. Why, then, should they be awarded to such a vague and heterogeneous academic curriculum? The truth is that this system virtually dispenses with that admirable feature of the American college, often indeed defectively worked out, which fills a gap *valde deflendus* between the German gymnasium and university. This explains in

part why the Germans are so apt to be wanting in breadth, while exhaustive in narrow lines of study and research. We think the substitution of chiefly elective for required courses in the academic curriculum of our colleges would prove disastrous to high education in this country.

Meanwhile, let us consider that part of this plan which leaves not only the departments to be studied, but attendance on the exercises of instruction and recitation, everything but principal examinations, to the option of the student, his only stimulus to attendance being *his own judgment* as to the interest they will excite; the help he will get from the instructor, and its indispensableness to preparation for stated examinations; or the urgency of friends and the weight of the reasons they offer for his attendance. Aside from the false position, soon to be noticed, in which it places the teacher, this is a most dangerous liberty for the student at this period of immaturity in judgment as to the kind of instruction and drill most needful for him. Or if he possess all this in adequate measure, in how large a proportion of students, at this stage of life, is it fatally antagonized by indolence, the passion for amusements, diversions, games, light or pernicious reading, which readily help to distract him and to bias his judgment towards the conclusion that he loses little or nothing by absence from the regular exercises of the department he has chosen, until he is enslaved to habits of idleness or of hurried, scattered, perfunctory mental application. It will never do to leave all this to the whim or caprice of students at this stage of life and training.

But it will doubtless be said that all danger will be obviated by the thoroughness of the stated examinations. To which the answer is, that it tempts to dependence on "cramming" for examination, which can never make up for the loss incurred by previous neglect. No doubt, all observing teachers have found that there is an art of "cramming" by daily and nightly toil, just on the eve of examination, which will sometimes produce almost incredible results in the hour of trial. But it is subject to grave objections. (1) Knowledge acquired in this way, unless it be the reviving and fixing of what has been previously stored in the mind, quickly vanishes. It goes in and out of the mind as

through a sieve. It does not root itself as seed in the soil, imbedding itself there in the form of germs of future life and growth. At best it falls on stony ground, with no depth of earth, and soon withers away. (2) It not only fails to impart information in a durable and germinant form, but it fails also to form those habits of regular study and persistent application, that discipline of steady intellectual activity and self-control, which, not less than the impartation of knowledge, is a chief end of college education. (3) If successfully carried out, this desperate cramming for examinations is often a serious strain upon the health. We should expect intellectual dissipation to outdo intellectual concentration, in the majority of academies, under this regimen. Even our theological seminaries have found it necessary to tone up, by certain disciplinal arrangements, attendance on the exercises of their regular curriculum, advanced as their students are in age, and we might fairly suppose in judgment and conscience, beyond average academies. Moreover, beyond the conclusive reasons above stated is the weighty one of forming habits of punctuality in fulfilling appointments, and attending to duties so vital to success in every sort of occupation; the lack of which is always injurious, and often fatal in business and the professions. The position of President Porter in his Report to the Corporation of Yale College of Oct. 31, 1881, cannot be gainsaid. He says:

“Not a few experiments in college discipline and management are announced in various quarters which promise to relieve students, and especially younger students, from the sense of constraint, and the necessity of constant accountability to monitors and teachers. The announcement of every new device would be hailed by all teachers who are tired of marks and monitors, were it not true that the larger and more various is the experience of the veteran teacher, the more tenacious does he become of the conviction that to have learned to meet a duty when it calls, promptly, thoroughly, and without excuse or complaint, is one of the prime conditions of a successful student and public life, and that to the scholar and professional man, above all, habits of this sort are of inestimable value. If such habits are to be formed, they must in some way be effectively enforced. If they are self-enforced, so much the better, but in such a case the monitor (or marker) awakens no reaction and needs no apologist. So long as bankers' and merchants' clerks, and employés of every sort, must

keep their hours, and these hours are often prolonged into tedious confinement, it strikes us as altogether unreasonable that college youths should complain of any peculiar hardship, or that their guardians should second their sighs." (p. 4.)

Next in order comes the effect of this liberty of the student, first to choose his studies, and then his manner of pursuing them, whether by attendance on or absence from the exercises of instruction or recitation in them in the college, upon the teachers, and finally upon the whole government of the college. President Eliot is explicit, not to say enthusiastic, in his views on this point. He says, "It follows that in all departments the instructors have felt prompted anew to make their exercises interesting, profitable, and indeed indispensable to their students" (p. 14). We should hope as much; and not only so, but that the instructors who would not do their utmost to accomplish this for students whose attendance is required would quickly give place to instructors of a higher grade in colleges, if such there are, in which they are now an incubus. The President adds: "Again, the elective system . . . has also a tendency to make every instructor desirous of adopting the most interesting and effective method of teaching his subject, lest, in the multitude of courses open to the student's choice, his subject should be neglected" (p. 14). So far as legitimate means of "interesting" are concerned we may fairly assume that no man, fit morally as well as intellectually to teach college students, would need such a spur to do his best.

But there is just ground of fear that such a posture of affairs would tempt teachers who need such an adventitious stimulus to fidelity to adopt sensational or other spurious methods of alluring students utterly inconsistent with the high aims and standards of liberal education—methods more *ad captandum* than *ad docendum*. The highest teaching and training in some departments cannot, in the incipient stages, have much charm for the average student. He must be put through a course of severe and unwelcome discipline in the more abstract and difficult studies before he can have the pleasures of insight, or feel the charm of delighted progress and facile execution. Hence the need of

external stimulus at the outset to induce the self-denying exertion which will in time make the subject, and the right teaching of it, intrinsically fascinating. On this ground Sir William Hamilton and most great educators justify the resort to emulation in the case of young students as an extraneous motive to stimulate that application which is necessary before the "rapturous eureka" is reached that makes such study its own motive, turning what was before an irksome task into a spontaneity and a recreation. And this has its analogy in all vocations, trades, and arts. The greatest proficient in them became such through a protracted, tedious drill, which prepares the way for facile and delighted execution: a drill submitted to not because its utility is at the time self-evident, but because competent authorities insisted on its necessity and utility. This is true alike of the simplest and most consummate arts; from handling the pen to the key-board or the viol-string; the mastering of one's vernacular, or a foreign tongue. And when we consider what extrinsic considerations, entirely foreign to the merits of the case or their own needs, tempt learners, are we to beleague high departments and high teachers with influences so morbid, a pressure so unwholesome, to swerve from the standards in which genuine scholarship lives and moves and has its being? We do not doubt that inefficient or low-class teachers occasionally creep into our colleges, who rely for maintaining themselves more on their entrenched position than on their attainments and efforts to do justice to their subjects and their pupils. We have rarely known them cured by such appliances, which, even if suited to their case, must, on the whole, tend to degrade the tone of teaching in an institution.¹

¹ We find the following going the rounds of the educational press. Does it not represent one alternative to which the voluntary system of attendance now proposed in this country might tend?

"A complaint is prevalent in England that the universities themselves have long since abdicated their teaching functions. Most of the real teaching, it is said, is provided by the unauthorized and outside system of private tutors, who exist independently of the colleges and have, in a great degree, superseded them. In too many cases the candidate for an ordinary degree, if he wish to pass, is compelled to make use of a private tutor. His college does, indeed, provide him with a certain number of lectures, but the number is usually quite inadequate;

II. IMPROVEMENTS IN DISCIPLINE.

We next pass to discipline, which it is proposed greatly to relax or utterly abolish, in conformity to the theory of leaving the students wholly to their own will in respect to conduct, order, and morals, as well as studies. Much that has already been said about the removal of control and restraint in respect to studies applies here. Indeed, the doctrine is promulgated, in quarters entitled to respect, that college teachers and faculties utterly transcend their province, and do more harm than good, when they attempt any oversight of the morals and manners of their pupils, or to insure anything beyond preparation for prescribed exercises and examinations more or less frequent. It is contended that the undergraduates of our colleges should, in this respect, be put upon the precise footing of graduates in professional schools, or when taking the optional courses of universities. This is contrary to nature, Scripture, and experience. Instinct teaches that during the period of growth and immaturity youth should be under tutors and governors, and trained up in the way in which they should go. Of course constraint should be gradually relaxed and freedom enlarged until the period of majority is reached. But moral oversight and control cannot be wholly renounced with safety till the ordinary college course is completed. It is simply monstrous to say that at this period of opening manhood youth should be left unregulated and uncared for as to manners and morals. A kindly eye should be kept on them in order to preserve them from evil courses, to win and hold them to the true, beautiful, and good. As soon might parents be released from the obligation to watch and guide their sons as teachers, who are, but only within due limits, *in loco parentis*.

Beyond all doubt, the forms and amount of this disciplinary oversight must vary with the circumstances of each college: the age, previous training, and special dangers of its students;

and even if it were greater in several instances the teaching provided is not nearly so well calculated for the needs of the pupil as is the better-arranged teaching of the private tutor."

whether mostly away from their homes, in college buildings, or rooms in neighboring houses, or whether, as in some city colleges, they nearly all live with their parents and are under the oversight of the college only at its public exercises. But, be this as it may, so far as within the precincts of the college and the charge and inspection of the faculty, the responsibility of the college within due limits for the conduct and deportment of its students can never cease.

Of course it is highly desirable to avoid espionage, or making the prominent idea of a professor in the students' mind that of a spy. Nor will a wise teacher appear to know or take cognizance of more or less than he does see. But no fear of being reproached as a spy should prevent any officer of a college from having his eyes open, and getting all available light in regard to the institution, and whatever affects its welfare and that of every member of it. To shirk or disown duties because those whose good depends upon their performance put false constructions upon their fidelity, or call them by hard names, is as unworthy as it is unmanly. If carried out in human affairs generally, it would make an end of truth, honor, and loyalty among men.

But in the family, the school, and the college alike, the grand secret of success in government, as in all things, is the avoidance of extremes, knowing how to govern enough without governing too much, and how so to govern enough with the least possible parade of government, so that it shall be felt more than seen. The more fully the ends of good government are reached in such a way that the subjects of it are conscious only of governing themselves, the better. Hence, other things being equal, one will be successful in teaching and managing his classes in proportion as he can enlist the sympathies and interests of the students in maintaining order, particularly in consciously or unconsciously co-operating with him to maintain it.

We are not, however, prepared to go the length in this direction advocated by President Barnard in his last able and interesting Report to the Trustees of Columbia College. He advises government of colleges by the students themselves, at least so far as the maintenance of order is concerned. He says:

"The weak point of the present system is that it conceals from the student the important fact that it is his own interest and not that of the faculty that is mainly concerned in the maintenance of order. . . . Could this mistaken feeling, so fruitful of pernicious consequences, be extirpated, college disturbances would soon cease to be heard of, and the peace of academic communities would preserve itself. There is one way, and apparently only one, in which this desirable result may be accomplished. It is to charge the faculty of the college with no other duty but that of instruction, requiring them to attend in their lecture-halls at suitable hours for the discharge of that duty, and leaving students to profit by their instruction if they please. . . . The great majority of students in every college are sincerely desirous to avail themselves of the large opportunities of improvement which they find spread out before them. . . . Let it be understood by them, therefore, that the doors of colleges are open to them only for the purpose of giving them instruction, and that unless they see to it themselves that no irregularities occur to disturb its officers in the discharge of this function, they will be closed; and the spirit which now so generally animates undergraduate bodies in American colleges, and which is the most prolific cause of troubles among them, will speedily disappear, and such troubles will cease to be known." (pp. 18-21.)

We hope those who believe in such a method will speedily test it, not only for their own satisfaction, but the great host of college instructors who, however sceptical about it, would hail and adopt it with ecstasies of joy if proved practicable in more than exceptional instances. What has already been said of the proposal to have attendance on exercises of instruction optional largely applies here. This plan also leaves the order as well as attendance to the option of the students. It might work in some peculiar cases. But taking the average college class, unless the option of attendance cleared the room of students disposed to disorder, we should have little hope of due order being preserved if unsustained by an officer authorized and competent to enforce it. That officer may generally best be the teacher. And in the presence of a competent teacher, to be thus empowered and competent to enforce it, there will be small occasion to enforce it by penalties. As to its being dependent on the due regulation of the disorderly by the orderly students, how shall the latter enforce their discipline? Even tho we might thus "make a solitude and call it peace," solitude is not the ideal condition of lecture and recitation halls, or the supreme achieve-

ment of the teacher. The chief instances known to us of the preservation of order being substantially left to under-graduate students in large classes unaided by the authority of a college officer are instances of consummate disorder.

President Porter in his recent Report says :

“Teachers are equally bound to be mindful that their pupils are mercurial, fickle, and oftentimes forgetful of the most serious truths and obligations, and consequently demand the exercise of unwearied patience and good temper. The ease with which in public schools and colleges the plainest axioms of manners and morals are disregarded, and the accepted axioms of courtesy and truth are openly violated by specious casuistry, is one of the constant wonders of college life. Many expedients have been sought to give working force to nobler practical convictions. Not a few college officers seem honestly to believe that the only radical cure of these evils is to be found in some sort of relaxation of college discipline, or some seeming makeshifts that shall dress up old facts in new garments, or disguise the bitter pill of duty with a new sugar coating. The true and radical remedy for all these evils, so far as a change of circumstances can furnish any, in our view, is first of all in holding the student to his duties as such with no mask or disguise, and next the introduction of as great a variety into the student’s life as is practicable—making reasonable provision for attractive amusements and athletic activities. More than all is required the provision of competent, laborious, and patient teachers, who have faith in their pupils on the one hand, and in college discipline on the other. Faith in students will sooner or later shame down lying if it be blended with fervent faith in duty and discipline; and faith in college discipline will breed respect for college work, provided the teacher brings zeal, patience, and inspiration to his own duties. We cannot easily at the present time too much exalt the office of elementary teaching and personal care, especially for the two lower classes, in the eyes of the teachers themselves and of the friends of the college. So much has been said of the necessity of men of general reputation to the *eclat* of a college, and of their attractive power, that there is serious danger of overlooking the equally important service which is rendered by those who possess and are disposed to exercise the gift of inspiring, directing, and controlling elementary students.” (pp. 4, 5)

This is “sound speech that cannot be condemned.” Established methods of liberal training and discipline may doubtless undergo constant improvement. They cannot be done away till human nature is done away. There is no royal road to a liberal

education that is without its rugged ascents and thorny hedges for teacher and pupil, who none the less exalt themselves as they go up. The "celestial railroad" is not yet in being.

A recent vigorous discourse by President Tuttle of Wabash College, from which we wish we had room to quote, shows that such evils exist in full potency in the smaller and younger as well as the older and larger schools and colleges. They belong to the false casuistry which infests so many occupations, professions, and trades of older boys, the *idola specus, fori, and theatri* of Lord Bacon. But we rejoice to have lived long enough to witness a gratifying decline of this morbid casuistry among the sort of students addicted to it. We hope yet to see it shamed out of being—even as we hope to see adulteration of food and medicine, quackery and dissimulation, lying and slander shamed out of mercantile, professional, and political life.

III. RELIGION IN THE COLLEGE.

It is urged that religion ought to be eliminated from colleges in order to free them from the taint of sectarianism and from interference with liberty of conscience. Or if there be any religious exercises, it is insisted that attendance on them ought to be left entirely to the choice of the student, since enforced attendance on religious exercises is inconsistent with genuine worship and defeats its own end. Here, as in teaching and discipline, all depends on the extent to which the doctrine is pressed. In its extreme logical outcome it would result in atheism, lawlessness, and license as the basis of human life and action. Any sort of religious principle inculcated or enforced would infringe upon somebody's real or alleged liberty of conscience; and an atheistic creed lived and acted upon, puts at least an equal burden upon the consciences of moral and religious parents and teachers who are compelled even negatively to conform their social and educational methods to such a godless, heathenish, or infidel system. The truth is, no such system will work in practice. People will carry their sentiments and convictions, in appropriate measures, into every sphere of life and action. They can no more ignore conscience or violate their

religious convictions in education, politics, or the state, than they can spring out of themselves. By some, casting religion out of colleges, society, and the state, is spoken of as if it could be done as easily as a man can snap a fibre of cotton. But the laws and modes of education of any people will in a large degree reflect their real sentiments. The laws, institutions, and manners of each and every State of this Union, and of the nation itself, could not be what they are if the people were agnostics or Mohammedans. When the question of tolerating polygamy as a domestic institution among us, on the plea that we may not interfere with liberty of conscience, arises, such pleas vanish before the inalienable right of society to exorcise the demon of unchastity from itself like fogs before the sun. The late argument of Senator Garland on this subject when discussing Mormonism is unanswerable. Our State and other universities, founded on a disclaimer of any sectarian or religious attitude, lest they infringe upon religious liberty after all, cannot do violence to the religious convictions and sensibilities of the people who constitute the State. Says the President of the University of the State of Michigan to the Board of Regents:

“As I understand it, the university occupies in respect to religion the same ground with the State itself, and with all other institutions of the State. The State of Michigan is a Christian State, and her institutions are founded and governed upon Christian principles. Christianity, therefore, is not merely tolerated in the university, not merely not proscribed, but is unhesitatingly honored and cherished. Our dependence upon God is acknowledged in the invocation of his blessing on the meetings of the Regents, and in the public exercises of prayers in chapel throughout the academic year. But to these latter students are not coerced. And for freedom here there are two good reasons. Young men and women of the average age of nearly twenty-two can hardly be elevated in their religious character by attendance on religious worship which on their part is not voluntary; and, second, to make such attendance a condition of enjoying the privileges of the university is a violation of the freedom of opinion and of conscience inherited by every citizen. Religious worship, therefore, is voluntary.”

In the New York *Tribune* of March 27, President White, of Cornell University, is reported as saying:

“For instance, a gentleman comes along who builds us a beautiful chapel, upon the condition that attendance upon its services shall not be compulsory. That of itself was a thing unknown to American colleges. Presently another young man comes along who offers \$30,000 to found a chaplaincy for the chapel. ‘No,’ I said to him, ‘we will not take it for that purpose. Ours is to a certain extent an institution founded by the State, and we would neither have the right, nor do we wish to graft any form of sectarianism upon it. But if you will give me the money for a fund to be used to secure the services of the most eminent clergymen of all denominations, who shall preach here at stated times throughout the year, I shall be very glad to use it for that purpose.’ That experiment was tried, and of its success there can be no question. We have had there the most eminent divines from all parts of the country, representing all denominations and all creeds of the Christian religion. The interest which the students have shown in these sermons, crowding the chapel to its fullest capacity, is in striking contrast with what you will see if you should go into the Yale chapel, for instance, any fine day. For next term we have secured one of the most prominent preachers from each of the great denominations, and it will be the most remarkable series of sermons ever given in a college chapel. The beneficial effects of such a system upon the students cannot be overestimated.”

It may, then, be taken as fairly settled that the Christian religion, in its teachings and worship, are in place in State and other institutions founded, as far as such institutions can be in this country, on a non-sectarian, non-Christian, or non-religious basis. The special difference between them and other religious colleges is that the latter usually require attendance upon their regular religious services in the case of under-graduates, whom alone this question respects. It is agreed that institutions endowed by the State cannot make attendance on any particular kind of religious exercises a condition of enjoying their other advantages. But the issue respects those colleges which are founded and endowed by the benefactions of their friends, whether or not specially by, and in behalf of the interests of, Christian people and the church. The question is simply and purely, Ought the under-graduate members of these colleges to be required, unless in exceptional cases, to attend daily prayers, and public worship on the Sabbath, in connection with the college?

We answer,

1, That, unless so required, a large proportion, varying at different times, places, and colleges, will seldom or never attend public worship. Many of these absentees will be even from the bosom of Christian families. It is proved by the actual state of things in the non-religious colleges and departments of colleges. It is especially true of those members of post-graduate and professional schools whose habits of attendance on religious worship have not been previously fixed by required attendance on worship in religious colleges. What, then, is to be expected of mere youths at a more immature and volatile age, with no domestic or college rule requiring their attendance at religious service? If many will attend, as many, if not more, will find excuses for non-attendance, which may possibly be sometimes overcome by the advent of some star-preacher, whose influence has all the brilliancy and endurance of other meteors. We shall not stop to argue with those who would not consider such a state of things deplorable in itself, alike in its immediate and remote effects. At all events our Christian colleges have not been founded or endowed for any such purpose, or to suit the views of those who deem the requirement of attendance on religious services an evil and a wrong. Nor can they be so administered without a grievous breach of trust.

2. We welcome all the attractive force that can be exerted by bringing a succession of distinguished preachers of the gospel from abroad to our college chapels, in order to induce a willing attendance of college students. But we venture to say, that it is only here and there a college that has the means to command such services to any extent; in fact, the number and engagements of this class of preachers render any such resource wholly unavailable as a dependence for nine tenths of the colleges of the country. But if it were generally available, it is no substitute for, it can only supplement and invigorate, the regular and permanent services and ministries of the Sabbath and sanctuary. It is these steady if less blazing lights, after all, that do the real work of sustaining the religious life of generations of youth.

Occasional preaching of whatever kind in communities, however stirring, leaves no enduring impress, unless followed up by abiding practical teaching and leading. The intervals of pastoral vacancy in college pulpits have often been supplied by the most distinguished preachers that could be obtained far and wide. But they have not been found to be any substitute, more than in other congregations, for a fixed ordinary pastorate or its equivalent. And our observation is that, after it becomes somewhat frequent and common to have these great preachers in academic quarters, the system loses the charm of novelty, and with this its special power to attract and satisfy, much beyond the average stated ministry. This is said as the testimony of an experience and observation now no longer small or unvaried. When the Sunday audiences of Yale are pronounced "listless," we confess that we have seen such audiences there and in other colleges, and in every variety of Christian churches and congregations as well. But he must have been more unfortunate than ourselves, who has not seen often and not uncommonly a wakeful and interested attention in average college audiences; nay, fully up to the average in the best grade of Christian congregations. Both at Yale and Princeton we have seen, and often seen, assemblies of students under the ordinary ministrations of the word, as interested as they were interesting; and this not exceptionally but habitually. And we have seen over and over again these academic communities wrought upon mightily by the powers of the world to come—multitudes of frivolous and wayward youths becoming humble followers of Christ, and in life the burning and shining lights of the church in its various denominations. We can point to numbers of prelates, great preachers, pastors of metropolitan churches, and presidents and professors in colleges and theological seminaries, who received their first decisive heavenward impulses under a system which is alleged to be specially responsible for "listless audiences."

Evils and imperfections, no doubt, mix themselves with these beneficent channels of divine blessing to our liberally educated youth; for they are not only human beings, but human beings at an age and in circumstances peculiarly liable to abuse

and perversion of highest privileges, secular and religious. But we believe, if the facts are mastered, it will incontestably appear that in no sphere of training at this very formative period of life are so small a proportion smitten with remediless blight, so large a proportion reaching the goal of noblest manhood. Far off be the day when our Christian colleges shall disown the motto inscribed on Harvard's seal by her founders, CHRISTO ET ECCLESIE!

IV. THE COLLEGIATE EDUCATION OF WOMEN

on the same footing and in the same college classes as males is vehemently urged by some eminent educators. Thus far it has been introduced, more or less tentatively, in comparatively few of our old historic colleges. Not that young ladies have not been allowed to attend lectures in the physical sciences, affording opportunities of observation and experiment not accessible elsewhere, in these institutions. We have seen this at Yale and Princeton. Doubtless it occurs at other colleges. We have seen, too, in Princeton a professor of English literature deliver a course of lectures on that subject to a considerable class of ladies exclusively, who sought the instruction in his own college class-room, and this for successive seasons. Ladies attend the Art School in Yale College. They may attend with young men analogous exercises in small elective classes with advantage, and often with no countervailing evil. If they may attend one class of this sort, some institutions may be so situated as safely to admit them to several, and give them the diplomas or certificates warranted by their examination grades. Such arrangements will be feasible in proportion as the studies and classes in a college are entirely or chiefly optional; or the regular classes small; or where the stated teachers of the college have the time, or its treasury is sufficiently ample, to provide the requisite teaching for females by themselves. A large class of difficulties, too, will be obviated where the female students can live with their parents, as with colleges in large cities, and measurably so in proportion as they can in other colleges come into proximately equivalent conditions of life. But all these

concessions only touch some points in the circumference of the subject without approaching its centre.

Nor is the question whether women are as strong-minded or should have as good opportunities of education as men, often as it is argued as if this were the issue. The mind in each sex has the same fundamentals of human intelligence. Each, too, has points of superiority to the other. We speak of what is normal in each; not of masculine women or feminine, who are too often effeminate, men. There is in the normal man a physical and mental robustness not normal to the tender sex. And there is in the normal woman a grace, a delicacy, a quick intuitive insight, a tenderness and fineness of sensibility, not natural to the stronger sex. All this points to a similarity in the education of the sexes up to a certain limit, and to a difference beyond that. It is indicated not only by their respective natural gifts and aptitudes, but by the spheres they are to fill, in all but exceptional cases, often due to the defeat of natural longings and adaptations.

Three questions here arise :

1. Whether in ordinary cases the education of males and females, being substantially alike in fundamentals, should not differ in important respects in the more advanced stages of what is known as liberal or college education?

2. Whether, exceptions aside, the full collegiate curriculum, in some of its more abstract and severe branches and advanced courses—mathematical, scientific, and philosophical—does not put too heavy a strain upon female health and vitality, with no compensating advantage?

3. Whether, at the average susceptible age of American college life, say from seventeen to twenty-one, it would be promotive of female delicacy and refinement to be mingled with average collegians, in classes numbering from fifty to two hundred, three hours per day for four years, in the ordinary experience in and around the college class-room?

We have no hesitation in answering the first, that while the opportunities of young ladies for education should be "equal" to those of young men, yet in view of the peculiarities of the female mind and constitution, and the sphere to which woman is normally adapted and destined, the educational opportunities of the women cannot be thus "equal" to those of the stronger sex, unless they are in some important respects different. Woman needs what will fit her to be queen of the household and of society, while man needs what will fit him for those rougher and sterner duties to which ladies ought never to be driven unless under stress of exceptional exigency. It does not follow that the educational advantages of women are inferior to those of men if they are not taught transcendental mathematics or metaphysics, any more than if they are not trained for the army, navy, or police. As to those of either sex who are gifted with genius, it becomes its own law, makes its own sphere, and asserts its prerogative to overpass ordinary bounds, with an authority which none can dispute.

We have as little hesitation in answering the second question. We believe it would generally prove injurious to health by overloading them with a class of studies for which the average female wants the natural aptitude. The number whose health is now wrecked by injudicious crowding with studies beyond their years and unsuited to their peculiar constitution, in too many female boarding-schools and lady-colleges, is something appalling. It is vain to make light of the loud warnings of physicians on this subject. We meet with ladies on every hand who, from overdoing and overstimulating at school at a most sensitive age, are chronic invalids.

As to the third question, for ourselves we answer, no. But we have no room for argument with those who think otherwise. For it is a thing not of unreasoning prejudice, but very much of right feeling and intuition, until we have the positive teaching of a large experience. We notice, however, that so far as ladies have been introduced into Harvard, through a Ladies' Annex, as we should expect, they must take to the classics. While they have the option of substantially the same teaching as the male students, it is given them in places by themselves; thus dupli-

cating the labors of existing teachers, or requiring additional ones. It is affirmed that "individually and collectively they do not desire co-education, indeed are opposed to it as strongly as male students."

LYMAN H. ATWATER.