

ism which we have noticed. All instruction was based on the use of text-books. The library was unused. The interest that comes from real investigation was lost. The ideal of the entire university life was in the past, not in the coming systems of education. The library and the laboratories, such as they were, seemed to exist for no purpose, or for the sake of the professor. At the second meeting of the faculty the chancellor asked how to make the library most useful to the students, but he seems to have received no answer. The records do not show that anything further was attempted till March 11, 1873, when rules were adopted in substance as follows: students might take out one book at a time; keep it out one week, with right of renewal for a second week. For failure to return the book at the proper time, the fine varied from fifteen to twenty-five cents per week. The library was to be open on Fridays from 12 m. to 2 p. m., for taking out books, and on Saturdays from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. for reading. These terms were more liberal than they were in some subsequent years. About 1879, the library began to be used and appreciated. January 15, 1874, Robbins Little asked leave to take books from the library, but the request was refused. In 1876, it was "moved that all University students be allowed to take books from the library," but March 26, of the same year, a committee of the faculty reported against any further extension of the privileges of the library. At this time, the library was only open on Friday afternoons.

Of course it goes without saying that like all organisms, the University had to begin in simple forms, hence our criticism should recognize the newness of the institution and its surroundings and the many difficulties under which the faculty then labored. However, we cannot avoid seeing the narrowness of the life, the undeveloped condition of the students, and the meagreness of the intellectual food that was provided for them. A study of the time card for the fall of 1872-'73 will illustrate this fact better than any

detailed description, hence it is here reproduced:

- 9—10. *Manley*, Tacitus; *Dake*, French; *Hitchcock*, Algebra; *Aughey*, Chemistry; *Thompson*, Trigonometry; *Church*, Algebra.
- 10—11. *Chancellor*, Intellectual Philosophy; *Manley*, Anabasis; *Dake*, Beginning Latin; *Aughey*, German; *Thompson*, English Analysis; *Church* German.
- 11—12. *Manley*, Greek; *Dake*, Analysis; *Hitchcock*, Geometry; *Aughey*, Geology; *Thompson*, Natural Philosophy, *Church*, Greek.
- 2— 3. *Chancellor*, de Amicitia; *Church*, Cicero's Orations.
- 3— 4. *Hitchcock*, Physics.

The absence of the culture and practical studies which occupy such a conspicuous place today will be especially noticed. The fact also stands out prominently that the differentiation of departments had not progressed far. Newness and crudeness and scantiness, as might be expected, are found in the University as in the State. These elements are not all gone yet, by any means, but the progress has been prodigious. The first faculty when completed in 1872, consisted of Chancellor A. R. Benton, (Philosophy); A. H. Manley, (Greek and Latin); H. E. Hitchcock, (Mathematics); O. C. Dake, (English Literature); Samuel Aughey, (Natural Sciences); Geo. E. Church, tutor; S. R. Thompson, (Agriculture).

Prof. Manley's health gave way during the Academic year 1874-'75. His work was assumed by the other members of the faculty, and was carried by them till the fall of 1876, when Geo. E. McMillan was called from Hillsdale College to the chair of Greek, and Geo. E. Church was promoted to the chair of Latin. Prof. O. C. Dake died suddenly, the morning of October 17, 1875. His successor was not elected till the fall of 1877, when Geo. E. Woodbury, a recent graduate of Harvard, and now (1893) professor of English Literature in Columbia College, was selected for the place.