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1845.

Doc. No. 41.

(Prepared by W. B. Rogers, Chairman of the Faculty.)

The Committee of Schools and Colleges have considered, according to order, the expediency of repealing the law allowing an annuity of fifteen thousand dollars from the Literary fund to the University of Virginia; and have come to the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is inexpedient to repeal the said Law.

The Committee of Schools and Colleges having, as directed by a resolution of the house of delegates, passed on the 22d day of December, 1844, carefully investigated the past history and present condition and influences of the University of Virginia, with the view of forming their opinion upon the question of "repealing the Act of Assembly granting an annuity of $15,000" to that institution, beg leave to report the following facts and considerations as the result of their inquiries: —
On reverting to the known intentions of the illustrious founder of the University, and his distinguished collaborators, and of the legislatures by whose enlightened liberality it was set in operation, we recognize as the leading object of its establishment the institution of a higher and more thorough system of intellectual training than had yet been attempted either in our own or any of the sister States, and through this means the introduction of a better intellectual culture in our colleges, academies and elementary schools.

In the period of twenty years, which comprises the as yet brief history of the University, it would be unreasonable to expect more than a very partial attainment of all the salutary objects which inspired the hopes of its founders. The great literary institutions of the Old World, which now exercise so benign an influence on the progress of letters and of general education, have gathered their strength to do good by the slow growth of successive ages; and although in our own time and country more speedy effects are to be anticipated, because wiser and more practical methods of culture are adopted, the extensive diffusion of these good influences through the public mind is necessarily a gradual, though a continually progressive operation.

That the University has been successful in establishing within our borders a higher and more thorough system of scientific and literary training than had previously been accessible anywhere in the United States, is, we think, admitted by all who are familiar with its course of studies, and with the influences these have exerted through its well-trained alumni on the methods and aims of academic teaching in many sections of the State. In proof of this, referring in the first place simply to the training of its own students in literature and science, whether professionally or with general objects, we would call attention to the extent and thoroughness of the instruction which it offers, and to the system of intellectual culture it adopts. . . .
On comparing the system of intellectual culture adopted in this institution with that in use in the higher seminaries of learning in other States, we remark two distinctive features which from their influence upon the interests of education, may be deemed worthy of especial note. The *first* is the privilege allowed to students of selecting such studies as have a more immediate reference to the pursuits in which they design afterwards to engage, and the *second*, the practice of combining to an unusual extent, oral instruction in the form of lectures, with the use of text-books.

It should here be added that many years before the establishment of the University, the privilege of an election of studies was allowed at William and Mary. Within her venerable precincts liberal methods of instruction found a home long before they were adopted by the thronged and applauded colleges of New England; and in her halls were delivered by Bishop Madison the first regular courses of lectures on physical science and political economy, ever given in the United States.

*Election of Studies.* The former of these peculiarities of system originating in a wise regard to the practical wants of society, has been found well adapted to the genius of our country, and at the same time eminently favourable to that thoroughness of knowledge which in a just plan of education is even more important than variety of attainment. In virtue of this system the student preparing for divinity, law or medicine is enabled to secure substantial attainments in ethics, metaphysics and political economy, or in chemistry and general physics; the young engineer, in mathematics, mechanics and geology; and the incipient teacher, in the languages, mathematics, *belles-lettres* and such other portions of knowledge as will accomplish him for his intended pursuits; while in neither case is he
required to spend his resources and his time in the acquire-
ment of branches which are but slightly related to the
objects he has in view.

Nor does the privilege thus granted often lead, on the
part of those who aim at a general education, to a neglect
of the more indispensable branches of study, since custom
has established a particular order of studies to which, with
some modifications, the great majority conform. Besides,
all are aware that, although a separate diploma is conferred
in each department, nothing short of a full and thorough
course in all the academic schools can prepare the student
for the highest honours to which he may aspire.

It is not unworthy of remark that the advantages of such
an election of studies, clearly evinced in the experience of
the University, have been substantially recognized of late
by the adoption at Harvard, and we believe other promi-

nent institutions abroad, of a similar feature, to replace the
Procrustes system hitherto in general use. But we may
be allowed to add that, while engrafting upon their old
established methods this liberal improvement, they have
allowed much latitude of election even to their candidates
for the higher honours, and, thus departing from the stern
requisitions of our University, have held out inducements to
the student to choose his studies rather in accordance with
his fancy or love of ease, than with the claims of a rigorous
mental discipline and a more profound and thorough schol-
arship.

Instruction by Lectures along with Text-Books. Ad-
verting now to the other distinctive feature in the system
of the University, the extensive use of lectures as a means
of training and instruction, we would in the first place call
attention to the fact that distinguished scholars abroad
agree in regarding this mode of teaching as the most
valuable improvement in the plan of university instruction
witnessed in modern times, and that they ascribe to its
inciting influences, both upon teachers and their pupils,
much of that marvellous advancement in letters and science which has made so many of the seats of learning of the Old World the renowned centres of a knowledge no less beneficent than bright.

The advantages of an extensive use of this method in association with text-books, as compared with the old and still very usual practice of exclusive text-book study and recitation, although as yet but imperfectly recognized in many of the colleges in this country, must, we think, become apparent from considering, first, the greater impressiveness of knowledge orally conveyed, and secondly, the more wholesome discipline of the faculties which such a method renders habitual.

Respecting the former of these considerations it may be enough to add that this greater force and permanency of the impressions made upon the mind by the teachings of the lecturer, proceeding from a very simple law of our mental organization, is exemplified by the familiar experience of all, as well in the lessons imparted to infancy by maternal lips as in the oral instructions descending from the forum, the pulpit and the bar. In proof of the prevailing conviction on this subject in Europe as well as at home, reference might be made to the eagerness with which crowds of all classes of society gather around the desk of the distinguished expounder of philosophy, science or taste, and the earnest activity of thought with which they analyze and assimilate the knowledge he imparts. Indeed, so highly is this method of teaching valued at the present day, that, while it has been made a prominent feature in the system of all the most active and successful institutions of learning in the Old World, and has been legitimately applied as a most efficient mean of popular instruction by the learned and wise, it has not unfrequently been spuriously employed to deceive the simple and to tax the purses and the credulity of the uninformed.

In judging of its good influences we should bear in mind
that they show themselves as much in the increased vivacity, clearness and originality of thought excited in the teacher as in the quickened apprehension and sharpened criticism of those whom he instructs, and that thus by a reactive sympathy of thought the one becomes better qualified to teach, and the other more ready fully to appropriate the lessons he receives. It is true that, unaided by the systematic study of well-selected books, mere lectures alone would prove but an ineffective means of thorough collegiate instruction. But when united with the daily or occasional study of a text-book, they conduce, as we think, to a more wholesome discipline of the faculties than any other collegiate system could.

On comparing this union of the two means of instruction, that of the lecture-room and the closet, as in use at the University, with the almost exclusive system of text-book teaching, which characterizes the method of a large number of our colleges, it will readily appear that from the very nature of the two methods, they must exert entirely different influences in the mental training of the pupil.

Experience has amply shown that a large proportion of the students at academies and higher institutions, where book lessons are confided in too much, fall into a mechanical routine of unreflecting labour, and, discovering that it is easier to remember words than to analyze and compare ideas, cease to apply the higher faculties of thought to the subject of their studies. And even where this worst of all the abuses of scholastic training does not follow, we but too generally find them resting with implicit confidence on the reasonings, and resorting to the very language, of their book, without so much as daring to frame for themselves other arguments or illustrations, or even imagining that such are to be discovered. Thus habitually leaning upon the thoughts, and repeating the words of others, accustomed to be satisfied with whatever stands in verbis magistri, their powers of thought are but imperfectly developed,
and whatever of invention they may have had is enfeebled or paralyzed by disuse. Inured to influences such as these, and scarcely permitted to walk alone, how little is the mind prepared for that vigorous and independent exercise of its powers demanded in the pursuits of life, and how utterly unfit for the hardy achievements of original and inventive genius!

Glancing now at the other, and as we believe far better method of instruction, we discern a different order of effects. Here the pupil accustomed in the lectures of his teacher to hear doubtful questions discussed, and to see new proofs and illustrations given of established truths, catches the enthusiasm of critical or inventive thought, and learns to reason and to demonstrate for himself. Taught by his own efforts rightly to value the systems of philosophy and science, and the productions of taste, which have been wrought out by the master-minds of our race, he acquires a deep reverence for their authority, because it is the authority of truth. But along with this modest deference to the oracles of knowledge, he cherishes that manly self-dependence of thought which springs from the conscious vigour due to the free training of his faculties; and when he quits the halls of his alma mater, he carries with him the spirit of an intellectual freeman beneath the bright insignia of his first literary achievement.

HONOURARY DEGREES NOT GRANTED AT THE UNIVERSITY.

While referring to those features in the organization of the University which distinguish it from most of the leading institutions in this country, and which are regarded by its friends as among its highest merits, it is appropriate to state that by an express law its authorities are forbidden to grant honourary degrees, and that accordingly no diploma of compliment has ever yet received its imprimatur. In most other colleges and universities, as is well known, such honours are extended not only to those who
have earned some reputation in divinity, medicine or law, or even in the uncongenial pursuits of party politics, but are accorded, as of course, in the case of Master of Arts, after the interval of a few years, to all who have taken their first academical degree. Rejecting a system so little friendly to true literary advancement, the legislators of the University have, we think, wisely made their highest academic honour, that of Master of Arts of the University of Virginia, the genuine test of diligent and successful literary training, and, disdaining such literary almsgiving, have firmly barred the door against the demands of spurious merit and noisy popularity. . . .

ALLEGED EXTRAVAGANT INCOMES OF THE PROFESSORS.

Among the complaints made against the University, we sometimes hear it urged that the incomes of the professors are extravagantly large, and that a regard to republican moderation as well as a cheapening of the expenses of instruction require them to be reduced. In the last four sessions, including the one now in progress, the average income of all the professors has been very nearly as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841–42</td>
<td>$2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842–43</td>
<td>2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843–44</td>
<td>2,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844–45</td>
<td>2,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It thus appears that the average for the whole period of four sessions may be set down at $2,300 for each professor. That this sum exceeds the income of the professors in a number of our literary institutions, is undoubtedly true. But it is equally certain that it does not surpass, and in many instances falls short of that of the teachers generally in seminaries of distinguished literary rank. Thus the receipts of those professors who are steadily employed in a full course of duty in Cambridge, in Columbia
College New York, at West Point, in the collegiate department of the University of Pennsylvania, of several of those in Princeton, in the University of South Carolina, and several other institutions in the Southern States, are as great and in many instances greater than are received by the professors of our University. And it should be borne in mind that the comparative cheapness of the means of living and of the prevailing habits of society has the effect of bringing the smaller emoluments of the teachers in many of the New England and Western colleges more nearly to an equality with the receipts of those elsewhere who are more liberally paid.

It should also be remarked that in many of our institutions the numerous tutors who share the inferior duties of the professors, and thus greatly lighten their toils, divide the emoluments of the department, and thus very properly reduce the incomes of the principal instructors in a ratio somewhat corresponding to the diminution of their labours. At our University, on the contrary, the tasks of tutor and professor fall upon the same individual; and those who are familiar with the daily routine of instruction, especially in some of its schools, well know the unceasing drudgery it involves. Comparing the emoluments at Cambridge and most other prominent institutions with those at the University, as bestowed upon each leading department or school, it will be found that, for the amount of laborious teaching they perform, the professors at the University are less liberally rewarded than their brethren at any of the institutions in view. In a word, the full circle of instruction in any one school or department is really obtained at much less cost at the University than by their complex system it can be with them.

But we turn to another view of the question, comporting, we think, better with right conceptions of the high interests it involves. The qualifications which fit a professor for the duties of any chair at a distinguished seat of science and
letters are such as are won only by long years of studious labour, and of abstinence from pleasing relaxations of society. They are the mingled fruits of genius and perseverance, matured often at the cost of health and generally by the sacrifice of many a plan of easy self-advancement. They are the gathered treasures wrought with anxious toil from amid the deep labyrinths of thought to be sent abroad with the impress of truth as a precious part of the intellectual currency of the world.

Are qualifications thus rare, difficult of attainment, and valuable in application, to be estimated as but of little price? Compared with the easy training which prepares men for the ordinary vocations of life, they are surely worthy of at least an equal remuneration. Besides, we should remember the toil and confinement of the professor, as well in his closet as in the presence of his class, in forming our estimate of the value of his services. Yet with all his hard-earned acquirements in science and letters, and his daily exhausting labours of instruction and discipline, his emoluments at the University, thus alleged to be extravagant, will scarcely vie with those of the middle class of lawyers, physicians and merchants in any of the thriving communities of our country.

The cultivators of letters and science, eminently social in their activity, and especially so in modern times, naturally seek the incentives and rewards of their efforts in the wide circle of emulous spirits gathered in the larger cities. Nor can we expect that small pecuniary inducements will suffice to tempt the really worthy of their number to exchange such congenial scenes for the isolation of a professor’s chair, even though it be one in our honoured University. Even the more liberal compensation formerly given has proved, as is well known, insufficient in some instances to secure the services of distinguished scholars invited to its halls, and has not prevented the resignation of many professors who had for a time filled its stations
with undenied success. To stint their emoluments then would be at once to exclude from its chairs the commanding abilities and attainments necessary to accomplish the high ends for which it was established, to paralyze the living spirit of its organization, and to degrade this noble institution into a cumbrous machine for class-book recitations and superficial, though, it might be, plausible, academic routine.

ENDOWMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY AS COMPARED WITH OTHER INSTITUTIONS OF LIKE RANK.

In claiming from the Commonwealth a continuance of the pecuniary help heretofore accorded to her, the University only asks, in behalf of the great interests of education, for that just and reasonable support which is essential to the discharge of her peculiar functions in the intellectual training of the youth of the State. If this higher and more thorough training be really as important to the welfare and honour of the community as the wise and patriotic of our own and other countries have uniformly maintained, then Virginia cannot, without grave injury to her interests and her reputation, dispense with such an institution as her University. It only remains to be considered at what rate, compared with other communities, she purchases these precious advantages. On this point we do not hesitate to say that, adverting to the great comprehensiveness of the scheme of actual instruction in the University, and comparing her income with that of other prominent institutions sustained either by public liberality or private munificence, her annuity of $15,000 cannot be regarded as more than a merely moderate endowment.

The most richly endowed universities of this country cannot be compared in their resources with the long-established institutions of Europe. Cambridge and Oxford in England, and the University of Edinburgh in Scotland, are possessed of incomes the accumulated growth of ages,
which vie with the revenues of some of the most opulent States of the Union, and which far exceed the aggregate income of all the universities and colleges in our land. Many of the German universities have resources almost equally extensive, and there is probably not one of them of reputation whose means do not exceed that of any university or college in the United States. In most of them the professors and other officers, forming a very numerous corps, receive their salaries directly from the government, and are regarded as a part of the official organization of the State.

Referring to the institutions of our own State, we find William and Mary and Washington colleges each provided with a permanent fund yielding an income, which, considering the scale of operations in the two cases, is as large, if not larger, than that of the University. The University of South Carolina, endowed by the State, and formerly entitled to an annuity of about $12,000, is, we believe, at present receiving the same or a greater sum from the public treasury. Two of the collegiate institutions in Louisiana have been sustained by an annuity of $15,000 each, and the University of Alabama is supported, we believe, by a still ampler contribution; while several of the institutions of the Northwestern States, richly provided for by grants of land, are beginning to receive or are already enjoying valuable and daily augmenting resources. The permanent income of Columbia College, New York, is, we understand, but little, if at all, inferior to that of our University; while the revenue of Harvard, the institution most justly compared with ours, is not much short of $60,000.

With these facts in view, the annuity of $15,000, instead of appearing wastefully large, cannot fail to be regarded as but a very moderate contribution in behalf of the high literary interests devolved upon the University. Indeed, considering the expansive scheme of its instructions, and
the substantial literary merits which have given it so dis-
tinguished a place among the higher seminaries of our
country, this annual provision might justly be viewed as a
comparatively meagre endowment, which, though large
enough perhaps for the present literary wants of our com-
community, may hereafter be augmented with great benefit to
the Commonwealth.

It may perhaps be objected that, as the fixed revenue of
Harvard, and some other institutions above mentioned, is
derived from the munificence of individual benefactors,
and therefore makes no call upon the treasury of the State,
it is unfair to adduce the example of these seats of learn-
ing in support of the claims of the University. But our
argument, of course, supposes that an institution such as
the university is demanded by the highest interests as well
as the reputation of the Commonwealth, and we have
referred to these other distinguished seminaries only for
the purpose of showing at what general cost such an insti-
tution can be maintained.

At the establishment of the University, the hope was no
doubt indulged that sooner or later it also would become an
object of private benefaction; but we have not the slightest
ground for supposing that in the patriotic aspirations of its
founders these private endowments, should they accrue,
were ever looked to as a means of withdrawing the Univer-
sity from legislative control, by dispensing with the annual
bounty of the State. It would on some accounts certainly
be desirable, were our University, like Harvard and several
others, sustained entirely or in great part by funds derived
from the munificence of individuals. But it should not
be forgotten that, while by this means the public would be
relieved from the annual contribution now required, the
general interests of the community, as affected by the oper-
ations of the institution, would be either wholly neglected
or but partially secured. The entire government and
organization devolving upon self-elective boards of trustees,
irresponsible to the State, would of necessity be exposed to the narrowing influences springing from the predilections and prejudices of religious sects and classes of society; and the University, by an easy transition losing the liberal features of a school suited equally to all, would become the property and the spoiled favourite of a particular denomination or rank.