

ing—a “present,” or an “excuse,” was supposed to be a prerequisite to permanency of university tenure. That this rule was not an unmitigated blessing may be inferred from the records of March 6, 1873, when “The Chancellor spoke of needing assistance to preserve order during chapel exercises. Consideration of action deferred.” On the 8th of February, 1872, “Professor Dake asked and obtained permission to fasten his door soon after the ringing of the bell for recitations, in order thereby to avoid disturbance by students passing in and out.” Professors Aughey and Hitchcock were, April 28, 1875, “appointed a committee to investigate the matter of ‘oiling’ the well.” The students never knew, and the records do not show, whether the committee concluded that the oil in the well entered from below, or from above. At least the faculty never prospected its “find” any further. A set of rules for the government of the proceedings of the faculty, and the conduct of the students, was adopted February 26, 1877. Article VIII provided for a standing committee on “discipline,” for each term. Whether the committee was to deal with the faculty, or with the students, is left in doubt. But judging from the internal commotions that prevailed in the faculty for the next five years, it seems that it was at least as much needed for the former as for the latter. For violating the above and other rules and regulations, the faculty records show that it was no rare thing for students to be summoned before it, and to make either a verbal or a written promise to do better. But alas! the records also show that the promise was frequently followed by another offense; this, perhaps, by a suspension; then another apology and a restoration, until finally the rules, especially those in regard to absences, became a dead letter and passed into “innocuous desuetude.”

The records also show that the intellectual welfare of the students was not neglected, for September 15, 1875, it was moved and carried “that all who spelled 25 per

cent of the words in Professor Thompson’s examination be passed.” How sad that “the conservation of the records” of the past has been so imperfectly attended to! The past life of universities, as well as of peoples, must ever remain in doubt because of the carelessness or inefficiency of those whose duty and pleasure it should have been to preserve accurately the deeds and doings of their age! Now in this case we are left forever to guess. Historians will move heaven and earth in their vain attempts to determine whether this allowed those to pass who spelled 25 per cent., or only those who spelled that per cent. correctly. The laws of interpretation, the intention of the framers of this act, will be discussed during the coming ages; and, who knows, but wars may arise before the question will be settled! The importance of accuracy in record keeping rarely finds a more important and pointed illustration. May 10, 1877, a rule was adopted requiring that any student failing in a recitation be required to make it up, and for five failures he should be suspended. Perhaps this accounts for the slow growth of the University for so many years. The following rule of November 6, 1873, shows that English was carefully attended to. November 6, 1873: “Moved by Professor Dake that the Grammar classes take the subject of punctuation in addition to their regular courses this term. Carried.”

These quotations are enough to show the paternal character of the government attempted, and the records are sufficient proof of the practical failure of the attempt. The standard of the University was that of the high school, and the methods of instruction were not essentially different. All studies were required. There were no electives. The curriculum was as fixed as the laws of the Medes. All intellects were to be treated practically to the same regimen. Slight differentiations in the courses afforded the only outlet for individuality. The students were not allowed to choose that which they liked, hence the necessity for the paternal-