

be enabled to free themselves in a proper degree from those local prejudices and habitual jealousies which have just been mentioned, and which, when carried to excess, are never-failing sources of disquietude to the public mind, and pregnant of mischievous consequences to this country."

You will please to notice that he did not speak of a university in Washington, but of a university "in the central part of the United States." What is now the central part of the United States? Is it Chicago or is it Baltimore?

Let me now proceed to indicate the conditions which existed in this country when our work was projected. You will see that extraordinary advances have been made. The munificent endowments of Mr. John D. Rockefeller and of Mr. and Mrs. Leland Stanford, the splendid generosity of the State legislatures in Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, California, and other Western States, the enlarged resources of Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Princeton, Pennsylvania and other well established universities, and now the unique and unsurpassed generosity of Mr. Carnegie, have entirely changed the aspects of liberal education and of scientific investigation.

As religion, the relation of finite man to the Infinite, is the most important of all human concerns, I begin by a brief reference to the attitude of universities toward Faith and Knowledge. The earliest universities of Europe were either founded by the Church or by the State. Whatever their origin, they were under the control, to a large extent, of ecclesiastical authorities. These traditions came to our country, and the original colleges were founded by learned and Godly men, most of them, if not all, the ministers of the gospel. Later, came the State universities and later still, the private foundations like that in which we are concerned. Gradually, among the Protestants, laymen have come to hold the chief positions of authority formerly held by the clergy. The official control, however, is less interesting at this moment than the attitude of universities toward the advancement of knowledge. Today, happily, apprehensions are not felt, to any great extent, respecting the advancement of science. It is more and more clearly seen that the interpretation of the laws by which the universe is governed extending from the invisible rays of the celestial world to the most minute manifestations of organic life reveal one plan, one purpose, one supreme sovereignty—far transcending the highest conceptions to which the human mind can attain respecting this sovereign and infinite Power. Sectarian supremacy and theological differences have dwindled therefore to insignificance, in institutions where the supreme desire is to understand the world in which we are placed, and to develop the ablest intellects of each generation, subservient to the primeval injunction "replenish the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." Notwithstanding these words, the new Biology, that is the study of living creatures, encountered peculiar prejudices and opposition. It was the old story over again. Geology, early in the century, had been violently attacked; astronomy, in previous centuries, met its bitter opponents; higher criticism is now dreaded. Yet quickly

and patiently the investigator has prosecuted and will continue his search for the truth,—heedless of consequences, assured by the Master's words,—"the Truth shall make you free."

Still the work goes on. Science is recognized as the handmaid of religion. Evolution is regarded by many theologians as confirming the strictest doctrines of predestination. The propositions which were so objectionable thirty years ago are now received with as little alarm as the propositions of Euclid. There are mathematicians who do not regard the Euclidean geometry as the best mode of presenting certain mathematical truths, and there are also naturalists who will not accept the doctrines of Darwin, without limitation or modification, but nobody thinks of fighting over the utterances of either of these philosophers. In fact, I think it one of the most encouraging signs of our times that devout men, devoted to scientific study, see no conflict between their religious faith and their scientific knowledge. Is it not true that as the realm of Knowledge extends the region of Faith though restricted remains? Is it not true that Science today is as far from demonstrating certain great propositions, which in the depths of our souls we all believe, as it was in the days of the Greek philosophers? This university, at the outset, assumed the position of a fearless and determined investigator of nature. It carried on its work with quiet, reverent, and unobtrusive recognition of the immanence of divine power,—of the Majesty, Dominion, and Might, known to men by many names, revered by us in the words that we learned from our mothers' lips, Almighty God, the Father everlasting.

Another danger, thirty years ago, was that of conflict between the advocates of classical and scientific study. For many centuries Greek and Latin were supreme in the faculty of liberal arts, enforced and strengthened by metaphysics and mathematics. During the last half century, physical and natural sciences have claimed an equal rank. The promotion has not been yielded without a struggle, but it is pleasant to remember that in this place, no conflict has arisen. Among us, one degree, that of Bachelor of Arts, is given alike to the students of the Humanities and the students of Nature and the degree of Doctor of Philosophy may be won by advanced work in the most remote languages of the past or in the most recent developments of biology and physics. Two illustrious teachers were the oldest members of the original faculty;—one of them universally recognized as among the foremost geometers of the world,—the other, renowned for his acquaintance with the masters of thought in many tongues, and especially for his appreciation of the writers of ancient Greece, upon whose example all modern literature is based.

Our fathers spoke of "Church and State," and we but repeat their ideas when we say that universities are the promoters of pure religion and wise government. This university has not been identified with political partisanship,—though, its members, like all patriots, have held and expressed their opinions upon current questions, local and national. Never have the political views of any teacher helped or hindered his