

378
T88h

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN**

OAK ST. HDSF

THE HIGHER CULTURE:

Its Nature, Position, Method and Patrons.

BEING A

Baccalaureate Discourse

DELIVERED AT

WABASH COLLEGE,

CRAWFORDSVILLE, IND.,

BY JOSEPH F. TUTTLE, PRESIDENT,

June 23d, 1872.

ISAIAH, 33: 6.

NEWARK:

PRINTED AT THE DAILY ADVERTISER'S OFFICE,

1872.

DISCOURSE.



Possibly my discussion shall seem too secular for an occasion like this. Let those who think so, consider whether anything is to be regarded as secular which has direct bearings on the great social, civil, and moral interests of mankind. The University of Oxford is shading English Protestantism into Romanism, and if the Papacy once more gain control of England, this University shall be held responsible for the Apostacy. The universities of Germany have revolutionized the thought and the creed of the lands which have Luther's Bible. Harvard College was a chief agent in forcing the churches of Eastern Massachusetts to discard the divinity of Christ, whilst through the educating power of Williams and Amherst, Western Massachusetts clings to the "better way."

The College is a great power, and to discuss its claims on such an occasion as this, is not secular, but entirely religious.

Let me then invite you to consider the HIGHER CULTURE, *what it is, how it is esteemed, what is its method, and finally who shall provide it.*

And in the FIRST place, let me indicate very briefly what is meant by this *higher culture*.

Its chief elements are three. The first of these is WISDOM, which defines what a man *is*, rather than what he knows. A wise man is one whose faculties are so duly proportioned and balanced, that he takes reasonable views of things, and reaches right conclusions.

The second of these elements is KNOWLEDGE. It is not the same as wisdom. It simply defines *what* the mind knows.

Without knowledge even a wise man is like a cunning jeweler who has no gold or precious stones to work with, or a skillful artillerist who has neither cannon nor ammunition. Knowledge is an ocean that is bottomless and shoreless, and includes all that is "knowable" in the realms of matter and spirit, on which the wise man may reason.

The third of the elements belonging to all true culture, is *godliness*. This defines the right condition of the moral nature, so that he who is godly loves God with all his heart, and his neighbor as himself. The inspiring motive of such a soul is LOVE. He is a *godly* man, and also a *humane* man; his moral nature flows forth in the fullest tide of love to the infinite Father in Heaven, and all his human creatures on earth.

These three elements belong to all true education. The genuine teacher, of whatever grade or condition, aims to develop all the faculties of the human soul in due balance, to impart a knowledge of the facts of existence, and to beget in it that true piety which can say with full love to God, "ABBA, FATHER!" and in his life illustrate the brotherhood of man, as symbolized in the human life of Jesus, and his sweetest character, "the good Samaritan."

The higher culture of which I speak is an extended, thorough, comprehensive education of man in all that can make him a wise, intelligent, and good man.

If it be objected that my definition defines a *religious* education, and not one for the common spheres of life, I answer, that a man for *his own sake*, without regard to his calling, needs to be educated, that he may be as strong and good a man as he is capable of.

He also belongs to *Society*, and the bane of society is that so many of its members defraud themselves and society by living as if they had neither neighbor nor God. This high crime is fruitful of personal and social disaster, and it cannot be unnoticed of God. A man, in whatever sphere he may move,—the bank, the Senate, the farm, the shop, the bar, the pulpit,—is a man, and a member of society, and as such

needs to be wise, intelligent, and good. Our nation to-day is reeling in distress because so many of the people, especially the leaders, are educated as the devil wishes educated not to be wise, but to be fools; taught not knowledge, but lies; inspired not by the fear of the Lord, but by a wisdom which descendeth not from above, but is "earthly, sensual, devilish."

And hence I must abide by my definition of the higher culture, as including the trio of heavenly attributes, wisdom, knowledge, and godliness.

In the SECOND place, let us inquire *what position has society assigned to this higher education?*

In the most emphatic tones history not only affirms the value of a thorough mental culture, but the superlative excellence in the eyes of mankind, of such an education as has been defined. The great-good men of the ages, are the true kings of our world. The men of the academy and the harp, Plato and Homer; the men who have been the reverent disciples of God in nature, Bacon, and Newton, and Morse; have exerted a wider influence on human destiny than the bloody heroes of history; and to-day two men,—two mere men—who are the most illustrious examples of the higher education—Moses, the world's law-giver, and Paul, the organizer of the Christian church that is conquering the world—are exerting a wider power in human affairs than all the monarchs on the globe.

In this respect history has only one sublime response to make in regard to the position hitherto assigned by society to the higher education.

But granting this, what is the position *now* assigned to the higher culture, of which history speaks such sublime approbation?

The simple fact is, there was never so loud a clamor as now for men thoroughly cultured, nor a time *when society has*

been so ready to employ, reverence and pay men who have this rich culture adjusted to the practical wants of mankind.

In the THIRD place, we must consider the METHOD of the higher education, that is, how it shall be attained.

The *old* method is on trial, and what that method is may be learned by taking the course of studies in any well established classical college.

A man may be graduated with honor at the Troy Polytechnic School, or even at West Point, and yet he is not liberally educated. That phrase, by established usage, describes a classical education at a classical college.

Of the many able men, from Thomas Smith Grimké to Horace Greeley, who have denounced the old method of liberal culture, I speak in terms of respect, and yet without fear, that they will be able greatly to modify that method.

And yet there is now a drift toward change in one respect, which is advocated by such men as President Eliot of Harvard, and President McCosh of Princeton. The proposed change involves the most careful preparation for college, and the strict adherence to a common course of studies to the close of the second college year. From that point, there may be several courses, each of which shall include certain elective studies. The student may choose any one of these courses, and reach the honors of the college.

The great objection to the plan is its *cost*. With all its revenues, Harvard staggers under the pecuniary load of its special courses, and Princeton carries them on feebly by overworking its Faculty.

I will add my conviction that as the endowments of our colleges shall be enlarged, special courses may be introduced profitably. At any rate, the method of the higher education is in this respect now subjected to a severe examination.

There is another proposed change in the old method, which is also undergoing the scrutiny of educators. I refer to the *o-education of the sexes* in the higher institutions.

Nearly forty years ago this modification was adopted at Oberlin, where it now finds the most devoted advocates. In 1867 President Fairchild detailed the workings of the plan in that college to a convention of college presidents, in a paper which is marked by its temperate statements, and its candor. He most heartily endorses it, as does his brother, President E. H. Fairchild of Berea College. In 1868 the latter said, "the experience of educating ladies and gentlemen in the same school and classes has proved eminently successful. In regard to the wisdom of this arrangement, there is but one opinion at Oberlin." The Faculties of Olivet, Monmouth, Ripon, Grinnell, and other colleges have adopted the same theory. President White, of Cornell University, says he can see no reason why the sexes may not be educated together at that institution.

In 1869 President Eliot, of Harvard, in his inaugural, declared in reference to the cautious and expectant policy of the University, that "the corporation will not receive women as students into the College proper, nor into any school whose discipline requires residence near the school. The difficulties involved in a common residence of hundreds of young men and women of immature character and marriageable age, are very grave. The necessary police regulations are exceedingly burdensome." And yet this very year the Corporation of Harvard has appointed a committee to examine the entire question of the co-education of the sexes, as related to that venerable university. The same is true at Williams College. Nearly all our state universities have adopted the plan, and we may be sure the agitation will not cease until the question is discussed and settled, not merely at Ann Arbor, and Harvard, and Williams, but every one of the colleges and universities in this country.

Having thus candidly stated what I think the *fact*, I may be allowed to express my views on this subject as related to our own college.

1st. At present there is no need of change in our policy,

since there are many institutions in which young ladies who desire it may receive a thorough education.

2d. Our present facilities are so limited, that the proposed change cannot be made without a large outlay of money.

3d. So far as I can now see, there are very grave objections to a system which involves so much social intimacy between young ladies and young men as the co-education scheme is admitted to have.

4th. My own opinion is that when that part of the education is completed which is included in a thorough preparation for college, the general rule is that for her own sake, and also for the sake of society, woman needs a training that is different from that given in our colleges.

5th. The results of my inquiries among practical teachers, including some who have adopted the plan, leads me to the further conviction that the subjecting of woman to the severe and protracted drill of our colleges, will not only damage her womanly qualities, but put her health in serious peril.

6th. And finally, taking the mildest view of the proposed change, there is such a wide difference of opinion among the ablest educators, that we have no right as the custodians of a great trust, by a radical change of policy to put in peril our present success in its execution, until we have more light. Some colleges are trying the experiment, and we shall get the truth in due time. Until then our policy is to move on the line of the old method. And I feel sure that I express the purpose both of the Board and the Faculty of Wabash College in saying, we shall follow the old path until better advised. The pendulum has been swinging strongly toward the proposed change, but I suspect that in a short time it will settle back into the arc which centuries of experience have defined for it. The general rule up to this time is that the higher culture, which has furnished the world with the purest and strongest manhood and the purest and richest womanhood, has been best effected in the old method, and not in the new.

This discussion is mainly to show that the methods of the higher culture are now under the most careful scrutiny ; and yet whatever the result reached as to the method, it will only enhance the estimate society places on the culture sought. Courses of studies, and methods, may be modified, but the value of the higher culture will not be depreciated. At all cost and pains, we must have *the thing*, and when we *have* it we shall all agree not to wrangle about the road we walked in order to reach it. Give us the wisdom, the knowledge, and the piety which insure the richest personal and social development, and the surest consequent national stability, and we shall all be content.

In the FOURTH place it remains to inquire WHO *shall* ENDOW and CONTROL *the institutions at which this higher culture may be acquired?*

This question cannot be intelligently answered without a careful examination of the *cost* of establishing a thoroughly equipt college.

In 1869 the cash endowments of Yale College amounted to over \$865,000, and they are now over a million Her library contains 90,000 volumes, worth a quarter of a million of dollars, and yet President Porter deplors its poverty. Her cabinets and other educational apparatus are worth at least a quarter of a million, and her real estate and buildings a million, or possibly two millions. To make Yale College what it now is, costs in actual money investments from two to three millions of dollars.

Harvard College at the close of the college year 1869-70, had a cash endowment of \$1,685,000, which with tuitions and rents give her an annual cash income of \$373,000. Her library of 180,000 volumes is worth \$400,000, and her cabinets and other educational apparatus not less than half a million. Include her real estate and buildings, and I suppose that Harvard College has invested as the condition of being what she is, not a farthing less than \$5,000,000.

The entire educational endowments and facilities at Amherst and Princeton are worth two millions each. The cash endowment of Michigan University arising from the sale of lands is about \$500,000, and she draws from the state treasury enough to make her endowment equal to a million. Add to this the campus buildings, library, cabinets, &c., and you have at least a million and a quarter invested to make that institution what it is.

In other words, a thoroughly equipt college is a *very costly affair*, but when you add the elective courses of study, necessitating the enlargement of the Faculty, you add to the impressive sum total of cost. When individuals, denominations, or states undertake to build and endow a college, they should consider that to get an acre or two of ground, and a pile of brick and mortar, and a teacher or two, will be only "a drop in the bucket." The builders must make vast outlays of money, or the so-called college continue to be a public pauper, asking alms at the wayside and at every door.

Take our own college and ask its treasurer how much money it has cost to make it what it is, and you will be startled at the sum total. The result of forty years' toil and economy, and expenditure we have within our campus. It would be difficult to say what that fine unmortgaged property is worth. It is enough to say, it is worth a large sum. And now suppose some generous friend of the college should add \$25,000 to our library, \$25,000 to our philosophical apparatus, \$200,000 to our current endowments, \$100,000 to establish new and needed professorships, and \$200,000 to furnish worthy homes for our students; I say suppose some princely friend of this college should do all this at once, our college would not even then be abreast with Amherst and Princeton, and scarcely in sight of Yale and Harvard.

I come back to my original statement, and ring it again in your ears, A FULLY EQUIPT COLLEGE IS A VERY COSTLY AFFAIR. We must have them, and we can only have them at an IMMENSE COST OF MONEY AND LABOR.

And who shall ENDOW and CONTROL these necessary and expensive institutions?

1st. Shall we assign this work to the CHURCH *as a church*? The Roman Catholic Church, with all its unity of direction and its ambiguity of power, has tried it, and yet to-day it has not a first-class college for either sex on this continent.

And so far as I know, there is not a first-class college in this country that is such by ecclesiastical endowment and control. Harvard, Amherst, Princeton and Yale, are what they are by no resolves of Association or Presbytery, nor is there a great college in this land that is organically owned and controlled by a church. The experiment has been repeatedly tried, and it has broken the back of more colleges than one. Thus far, as it seems to me, ecclesiastical control has not been a success in building first-class colleges.

2d. Shall we give this essential and costly work to the STATE? In 1787 Dr. Manasseh Cutler had incorporated into the ordinance under which he made the first purchase of lands north of the Ohio, the provision that the sixteenth section of every township and fraction of township, should be given to the public school, and that two townships should be given to endow a university. The next year a similar grant was made for a university in "Symmes' Purchase" between the two Miamis. This seed has taken root, and is bearing a harvest in both the classical and the agricultural state institutions in this country.

Forty years ago the state bore a very small part in the higher education of young men and women. In 1830 there was not a strong state college in this country. At the present time there is one great state University—Michigan University. Up to this time the two Universities of Ohio are substantial failures; that in Indiana, with an endowment less than some of its peers and dependent on the state treasury, has not yet passed the experimental period. Illinois has a so-called University with rich endowments, as have also Iowa,

Missouri, Wisconsin, Kansas and Michigan, and the country is on tiptoe to know whether in return for several millions of acres from the general government, and vast sums of money from the state and county treasuries, we shall have another state college that is a distinguished success. Cornell University and the University of Kentucky are, as I understand, close corporations, endowed on certain conditions with public funds, and so do not come within the purview of my statement. As yet the returns for the vast outlay from the public treasury are not very imposing.

The theory on which the state bids for the enterprise of furnishing the higher education, is simple and beautiful; it represents the educational system as a pyramid, the base of which is the public schools, open to the children of the state; on this grand base are built the graded schools, and its apex the state university.

I admit the grandeur of the system, and in this as in the plan for the co-education of the sexes, I do a wiser thing than to dogmatize, I hold myself open to conviction. The grand experiment is now in progress, and I only beg to be allowed to await its result, before admitting it to be best to commit this fundamental interest to the state. This higher education involves the handling of vast revenues; does the history of American politics show that these are safer in the hands of the state than of close corporations?

A distinguished educator once remarked at Ann Arbor, "this university is built over a political volcano." He may have been wrong. If so, many are in error with him. All I need to say is, that the attempt of the state to provide for a higher education is an experiment which is far from being finished. And if for no other reason, let us wait for light.

There is one other view that must not be omitted. In the state college as in the public school, the patrons are or may be ranked, according to the census, under twenty-nine religious denominations, besides several "minor sects." Atheism, Deism, Rationalism and Spiritualism are entitled to, and

sooner or later will claim a voice in the state institution. In its patronage are found Jews and Gentiles, barbarians and Scythians, Sabbatarians and anti-Sabbatarians, Romanists and Independents,—indeed all the religious as well as political beliefs that are held by the voters of the state. And is it so very wonderful that a distinguished Professor in an institution with such a patronage, should remark that “religious and even moral teaching in such an institution cannot but be feeble and ineffective in the long run, whilst adverse influences are positive and rampant”?

Here again I only claim the privilege of waiting, before we, as Christian educators in charge of a great trust, surrender to the state the mightiest force committed to us. We may be compelled to surrender, but as yet our policy is to keep building on the old foundations, rearing the Christian college as the great conservator of all that is good in the past, and the great agent of expected good in the time to come.

Not yet will we surrender the mighty work of the higher education to the sole control of the state.

3d. Close corporations, self-perpetuating, whose members agree substantially on the great principles which should regulate their trust, and deriving their endowments from the voluntary gifts of persons in sympathy with them.

A corporation of this sort is not amenable to any church directly, and yet it may be inspired with the most profound moral and religious sentiment. It is not associated with political parties, and yet it may be the nation’s conservator. It does its work without the hopeless embarrassment of ecclesiastical or political trammels. It has a fundamental law, which gives it both unity of purpose and energy of execution.

My conviction is that such a control for our higher institutions is far safer and more effective than that of any church, or of the state. The triumphs of Christian education in this country have been achieved mainly through this agency, and well

may we hesitate a long time before we surrender a principle that has been thoroughly tested in so wide a field.

The great cost of a college has been referred to. That the state can, if it will, raise large sums of money for a given object is admitted, but where is the state in the Union that would dare raise by taxation such a sum as is represented in our well endowed colleges? Any state can afford to be generous when the *general government* donates it some hundreds of thousands acres of wild land, but what state would dare levy a tax to build and equip such a college as Yale or Harvard? Its Legislature may vote that certain fines, or surpluses from unusual sources may be added to a small direct appropriation from the state treasury to a state college, but what state would dare build a Harvard, and then appropriate to it annually three or four hundred thousand dollars?

In three colleges in Massachusetts are gathered educational facilities worth ten millions of dollars; would that state dare lay that sum as a tax on its treasury? Would Connecticut lay the three or four millions that Yale represents, or New Jersey the two millions that Princeton represents, on its revenues? In this state of Indiana, through the gift of every sixteenth section by the *general government*, through the incomes arising from our greatest vice, the fines collected from certain crimes, and by borrowing a vast sum of the Hollanders at a low rate of interest and loaning it out at a high rate, we have gathered a school fund of eight or ten millions, and yet private individuals have done as much as that for the three colleges of Massachusetts. Private munificence has done almost as much for a single college in Connecticut, as that state has done for its school fund, aided by the sale of its lands in Northern Ohio. Princeton has never had a dollar from New Jersey, and yet its friends out of their private resources have given that college a property almost as large as the state's school fund. What has the great state of New York done for its colleges? Suffered Union College to raise money by lottery, whilst one of its officers gave it three-fourths

of a million, and she has given to Cornell the agricultural lands that *Congress* gave her. And yet two of her citizens have built and endowed two institutions, now known as Vassar College and Cornell University. The united gifts of these two men to the higher education cannot be less than two and a half millions. Asa Packard, of Mauch Chunk, at a cost of a half million has built the Lehigh University, and with another equal sum endowed it. A. Pardee, gave to Lafayette College half a million, and a few other friends gave it as much more. William Thaw, of Pittsburg, gave the University of Western Pennsylvania one hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and now offers it as much more on certain conditions. Samuel Williston has given to Williston Academy, Mt. Holyoke Seminary, and Amherst, half a million. John C. Green has given Princeton five hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Among the friends of Williams, Amherst, Harvard, Yale, Princeton, we find such men as Amos and Abbott Lawrence, Nathan Jackson, Nathaniel Thayer, George Peabody, John C. Greene, Samuel Hitchcock, — Farnham, who have given to colleges from fifty to five hundred thousand dollars each. Here is the grand fact in the history of our eastern colleges, nay, of the whole country: the colleges which have done the larger part of the higher education, which present the finest buildings, the richest cabinets, the largest libraries, the heaviest endowments, and the most numerous alumni, have done their work almost exclusively by private munificence. Men of wealth and men of heart have, in respect to the higher education, made the country their beneficiary. They have literally eclipsed the state by the magnificence of their gifts to our colleges and universities, and these men able to grasp the great idea for which I am pleading, are not all dead. The colleges of America crown them, and will keep their names sacredly for other ages.

We come to our own state, and what is the record here? What has *Indiana* done for the cause of higher education?

Her work for the public schools is great, and yet even for that, her great fund is not chiefly the outcome of her taxes, but what has *she* done for the university? I do not ask what *Congress* has done, but what has INDIANA done? No one can exceed me in my respect for the able and good men who instruct in the State University, but what has the state of Indiana done for the higher education? Within the narrow grounds of the university is a single building which the state has erected. The university's cash endowment of a little over one hundred thousand dollars is the fragment of a government land donation. The library, small as it is, is what it is by the shrewd diversion of a part of the state's supplement to the university's income, rather than by the state's direct bounty for the purpose of books. It is true the state has bought the Owen Cabinet, but until the state grows liberal enough to erect a building for it, this valuable cabinet is "an elephant" which the university hardly knows how to dispose of. The university also receives, as already intimated, a few thousands to supplement its own fund, and yet even that is felt to be very precarious in its bestowment, from the very nature of the donating power.

You will not understand me as blaming the state or the university. So far from this, I would not mention the case except to say that one college in this very state, entirely dependent on the liberality of its friends, has erected better buildings and more of them, gathered larger libraries and endowments, and a cabinet scarcely, if any inferior to the Owen Cabinet, than the state has for its university. That college has surmounted its difficulties solely by the voluntary gifts of those who loved it, and from penury has grown into independence. No congressional land grants, no state, county, or municipal taxes have helped it. Ungrudged and almost unsolicited private munificence has done a work in that single college, which to-day makes it the superior of its state competitor in almost every respect.

Add to this statement of what private munificence has done for Wabash, what the same agency has done for her sister at Hanover and Green Castle, and it is not too much to say that the friends of education in Indiana have done for these three colleges more than Indiana has done for its own university thrice told.

Nor is this all. Private liberality is like a fountain that pours forth water at every season, and during all the ages. Of it we may say,

“No check, no stay, this streamlet fears;
How merrily it goes!
'T will murmur on a thousand years,
And flow as now it flows.”

Let then the good state of Indiana do its duty to its own institution magnanimously, and in a spirit of liberality worthy of herself. And yet such are the checks and lets which are likely to cripple her in this line, that were her legislature to offer to take our work off of our hands, and to do that work so far as money can do it, I would not, for two reasons, entertain the offer a moment: because the state *cannot* do the work we have undertaken *as we wish it done*, and because past experience shows that *state benevolence is not equal to the vast and expensive undertaking of endowing a college fully*. An undertaking which our friends with a munificence as ungrudged and full as the rain-clouds and the everlasting fountains of the earth, will carry joyfully and sublimely to success. To-day I pledge the good state whose citizens we are, in a generous rivalry in a great work for the country. It is our aim and our expectation here to build a Christian college for the high culture of young men, that through the ever-flowing benevolence of good men shall make it the glory of our commonwealth, and the worthy peer of any university the state may sustain.

In a word, our policy is to do our work wisely, in a magnanimous spirit toward all competitors, and with all our might. Our corporation is self-perpetuating and conscientious; it has but one aim, to make a college which shall

have every possible educational facility, and that solely by the aid of men whose chief honor is not their ability to make money, but their heart to use it for the glory of God and the good of mankind. They,—these great-hearted men of wealth—and not the state, shall bear this great work to a success greater than we can now conceive.

I will only add that it is ten years since I first occupied this platform, and officiated in the graduating of my first class. Great changes have taken place in our condition. The college has made great progress. It is not my prerogative to dictate to the Providence which called me here, how long I may remain. I have closed my ears against all solicitations to other fields, desiring with all my heart to be identified with this college as long as I can promote its interests. If I might be spared another ten years of unbroken vigor to see a greater growth than I have yet seen—and I am confident that growth shall take place,—if I might stand here in 1882, and see our magnificent acres studded with other buildings for the homes and the education of the multitudes of generous youth that shall make our campus resound with their merry voices, if I might see Wabash College, in all its equipments and endowments, what I am sure it will be,—I would be ready to ejaculate my “nunc dimittis.” What becomes of me, or any of my brother-workers, matters little, but “with desire we have desired” to see the college make another great stride toward the destiny to which it was set apart forty years ago, in the consecrating prayer which its founder, kneeling in the snow, offered to God. But whether we live or die, it is a joy to know that the work which has engrossed our love and our lives shall continue in the ages following, finding nursing fathers and nursing mothers, who shall bear it on their hearts as we do now, in their turn committing the holy trust to others in succession, until in the worlds completed history, it shall be no longer needed. Until then, O God, bless thou our college with the amplest affluence of thy goodness.

GENTLEMEN OF THE SENIOR CLASS :

You will pardon me the discussion of this hour, for its bearing on the welfare of your Alma Mater. It is true a topic might have been selected more directly bearing on your personal character, but to-day I preferred to call your attention to an entity in which you are bound up, a thing of the ages whose children you are. You are a part of Wabash College, and I thought it worth while to ask whether you are the sons of a mother who by an early death is likely to leave you orphans. It is predicted by some that the STATE shall soon assume the maternal functions on so large a scale, as to resemble the mother bee in the hive, living on royal food, and intolerant of all maternal rivals. All the sons of the future college are to be her sons. The other colleges are to be like the neuters or working bees, gathering honey and food, and working, not for themselves, but for *her*, that she alone may be the mother of all the sons to be born.

I do not think the state is to succeed in this magnificent maternal monopoly. Your mother is young, beautiful, and strong. For aught I can see, she bids fair to live a long time. And—pardon an allusion rarely made here of late,—she, like the Roman Cornelia, points to her sons and says fondly, “Behold my jewels!” Aye! even when she bends in tears over her dead, Steel, the Wilsons, Marshall, Hadley, Moores, Fullenwider, Spilman, McKinny, Rabb, Fry, Mills, Kingsbury, Jackson, Rice, all her sons, even then may she say, with conspicuous and justifiable pride, as did the same Roman mother over her dead sons, “the mother who has given birth to such sons should not be deemed unfortunate!”

Young men, the mother lives in her sons. To the world she is what you in your own lives represent her to be. A plain man once strode up to a shrinking woman, whose son had just closed his career as a student with honor, and said to her, “I want to see the mother of such a son!” By your well disciplined minds and large knowledge, by your humanity as men and your fidelity as stewards, and your piety as

good men who honor God, inspire men with a desire to know the mother whose sons you are.

A few days ago I was in the conservatory of the Soldiers' Home at Dayton, and the gardener said to me, as he pointed to a cluster of drooping and faded flowers that still surmounted a lofty stem, "had you been here last night you would have seen it in all its unrivalled beauty, and enjoyed its delicious perfumes. It was glorious last night, but this morning its glories are gone!" Young men, in the beauty of your young manhood, you are to us as glorious as the white crowns of the night-blooming cereus. We have waited in faith long for this hour, and now it has come. We look on you to-day as that gardener did on the wondrous crowns that his plant after so long a time had borne him; but if your training here shall prove only the means of a richer culture, if your acquisitions here shall be only the earnest of richer and grander acquisitions, if your fidelity to trust here, your humane brotherhood to man here, your aspirations for the good, the true, the beautiful here, your devout love of God, your Father and Saviour, and Comforter, shall prove only the dawn of a truer and stronger fidelity, humanity and piety in the world to which we send you, then you shall in one respect be unlike the crown of flowers which the gardener mentioned so tenderly, but so regretfully, for we shall not only to-day, but in other years still gaze on your undimmed beauty with pleasure, as on a diamond cluster that is imperishable; and when you at last pass into the heavens, we shall linger lovingly at your graves, and exclaim, "They fought a good fight, and have won their crown!"

And hence, in parting with you, we ask you for the sake of your Alma Mater, and of us who have taught you, for the sake of yourselves and of those who love you, for the sake of mankind and of Him who has created and redeemed you, be men, true men, good men, humane men, godly men. Oh! if in these last hours we might lead you to Him whom we call our Saviour, that with one accord we all might call Him our Saviour, what a benison would that be to our farewell!

It is a somewhat singular fact that, with one exception, it is not not possible that both the father and the mother of any one of your class should be here to witness this glad hour, for the reason that with one exception all of you have wept at the grave either of a father or a mother. Then in the name and stead of those who are not here, the sainted whom you think of as in a better country, let me win you to such a life, such a faith, and such a Saviour, that by-and-by. when you have finished your life's work well and faithfully, you too may pass gently and boldly from this land of shadows into that world of light where they are dwelling.

APPENDIX.

The following are extracts from a paper read by the President to the Board of Trustees, on Wednesday, June 26th. 1872.

In the FIRST place, let me present you the *financial* aspect of the college in 1862, as contrasted with that of 1872.

In 1862, Prof. Hovey, the treasurer of the college, estimated the solid assets of the college at \$90,100. To these were to be added 8,000 acres of wild land, for which there was then no sale.

The liabilities of the college were summed up in a debt of \$10,000, and in the *canorous* fact that its current expenses each year exceeded its income from all sources, by the sum of \$2,392, a sum equal to more than one-third of its entire expenses. In this strait the College Society brought us some relief, but not entire.

These statements are a more pathetic account of the embarrassments of the college than I can make. They predicted disaster in the future, unless relief came.

Nor is the worst yet told as to the first three years of my connection with Wabash College. Bad as were the facts just named, they were not so trying as the further fact that the condition of the currency had shrunk the value of the college assets, and of the salaries of its officers, by the appalling discount of about 60 per cent. The life of the college and its officers during those years was a repetition of the old story of the manna which God sent.

In the fall of 1863 the day broke. I can never think without profound sensibility of the evening when three members of the Faculty in tears knelt to thank God for a draft of five thousand dollars, drawn by a man whose name we never mention but with grateful emphasis. Then came another draft from the same source; then the donations from Lafayette Second, Indianapolis, Evansville, Terre Haute, Orange, and other places. How bright those days of relief! The college was to live!

And now in contrast with what the college was in 1862, the treasurer, whose cautious habits are well known, has placed in my hands a paper in which he makes the following estimate of our property:

The Campus,.....	\$50,000
Centre Building, with wing,.....	75,000
* Dormitory,.....	11,000
Academy,.....	4,000
Gymnasium,.....	10,000
Endowment fund, (cash).....	100,000
Baldwin fund, (cash).....	28,000
Haines fund, (cash).....	2,500
Wyatt fund, (cash).....	1,000
Tichenor fund, (cash).....	3,000
Libraries,.....	15,000
Cabinet,..	20,000
Unsold lands,.....	35,000
Total,.....	\$354,500

The contrast is marked, and it inspires the hope that the future shall witness still more marked progress in our financial strength.

In the SECOND place, let me review the growth of our educational facilities during the past ten years.

We have added the two wings to the main building, furnishing us a spacious chapel, library, cabinet, laboratory, philosophical and other needed rooms, the whole constituting a noble and imposing edifice for college purposes. To make these changes has cost about \$50,000. And conspicuously in our campus stands the gymnasium, which when finished will be one of the finest buildings of its kind in this country. The libraries have received at least 2,000 volumes, and the cabinet, which ten years ago included 3,000 specimens, now has 25,000. In all our educational facilities except philosophical apparatus, we have made great advance.

In the THIRD place, let me review the history of the college as related to the number of its students, and the character of our course of studies.

The number on the catalogue of 1861-2 was 120, but I am confident that not more than half of them were on the ground in May, 1862. Many of them were in the army. The eleventh catalogue, closing the tenth year, just issued, shows we had last year 235 students.

In the FOURTH place, let me mention what should be our policy for the future.

* The Dormitory is now rebuilt, and is worth \$20,000.

I only anticipate your own views in saying it must be a *progressive* policy. In a recent discourse I have shown that a well endowed college is a *VERY costly necessity*.

Let me, gentlemen, in the first place remind you that our railways place us at the mercy of a tremendous competition. It is no longer a question of mere locality that is to determine a young man's place of study. Yale and Princeton are to-day nearer a young man in Indiana than Wabash was to his father thirty years ago. If we expect to retain our patronage, it must be by our educational attractions, and not by the resolutions of Synods or by local proximity.

And how great the competition is you can know by examining the educational attractions of our eastern colleges, on which private munificence has lavished such vast sums of money, to secure for students the highest literary and scientific culture.

In the second place, let me urge you to devise measures at once for larger endowments for the current expenses of the college. To meet the necessary expenses of our increasing buildings requires a large sum of money, and this item is of necessity certain to increase.

But a still more urgent matter is to provide for a more generous support of your employees in the Faculty. As compared with men of their position, they are receiving too little for their services. It is certain that if these chairs were vacant, we could not fill them with men of ability at the present salaries, and it is a question whether you ought not to be as generous in providing for your servants who have borne the burden and heat of the day, as you would be to strangers whom you might invite to enter into our labors.

In the third place, there is a most imperative need for philosophical apparatus. Our present display becomes more mean as it approaches removal to the splendid quarters just provided for this department. The interests of the college are most seriously compromised by this lack.

In the fourth place, the question of Halls for the lodging of students is one that cannot longer be deferred without damage to the college. Much has been said concerning the "Dormitory System," both in praise and condemnation. It has been the opinion of some that these dormitories are not favorable to the morals and health of students. The late Dr. White was wont to say that "our dormitory is the safest place for students in Indiana, and the average of health and good morals is higher among its occupants than among an equal number of young men in any business away from home."

Among the plans suggested there are three worthy of consideration.

1. The immediate and thorough *renovation* * of the old building, under the direction of a skillful architect.

2. The erection of an extensive and commodious Hall for students. As an investment of money it might not produce over five or six per cent.,

* This has been done already.

but for the growth of the college it would be a very valuable investment, and would do a great work in attracting students to us.

3. A third plan is one that contemplates a system of less pretentious lodging halls, with club-houses attached. Two halls three stories high, containing rooms for from thirty-two to forty-eight students each, and a house for the boarding club with all the conveniences possible, might be put up for comparatively a small sum, probably the whole not over \$30,000. These buildings could be arranged by an architect so as to be imposing, commodious and attractive, and they would have the advantage of diminishing the risks of fire.

The great want next to the central, educational facilities, is to provide means by which young men of limited means can have both good rooms and boarding at a low rate. The great bar in the way of poor men now is the cost of education. This at eastern colleges is very high, and the tendency is in the same direction at the West. This may be counteracted in some measure by generous charity funds, ample rooms of the best kind, and boarding at cost.

Do not blame me for these suggestions. Gentlemen, we have in hand a very important enterprise. It has grown on our hands, and it is still growing. It cannot but be an expensive enterprise. And yet with such a display of vigor and growth, what a work it is to enlist the capital of Christian men! It has grown nearly four-fold in ten years. It has a location of great beauty. Its immediate home in this ancient grove has no equal at the West, if it has any at the East; it has the magnificent beginnings of buildings, libraries, cabinets, and endowments, none of which groans under a mortgage. It seems to be a college which shall have a glorious future, if its friends with a large wisdom and an open hand provide for its wants.

Ten years ago I came to you with great misgivings as to my ability to fill the place and my duty. I have promptly and repeatedly refused to entertain proposals to go to other fields of labor, whose promised emoluments were greater than you offered. I have often trembled for the enterprise, lest we might make a mistake as to our policy and its execution, and yet to-day, gentlemen, I can devoutly bless God for allowing me a part in this work, to express an undoubting confidence in the future of the college, and to pray in faith to Him whose goodness has been its treasure.

Gentlemen of the Board of Trustees, I commend Wabash College to you, in the confident expectation that you will adopt a policy in its behalf, that will look to its great enlargement for the work to which the Master is summoning it.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 064875070