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Introduction

A word of warning: This is not a history, but an historical sketch. Preparing it and writing it have prompted many thoughts and feelings, by no means all of which are here recorded. This phenomenon must be true with all writers. I would guess that no writer would quarrel with the notion that in addition to what he managed to get down--his book, printed, bound, given finality, for better or worse--was only a copy, very likely a poor copy, of that other work, still reposing in documents and in his head. The latter work is infinitely superior to the one realized. Why, then, not take a bit more time and capture more of the ideal work and lock it into print? There are many reasons, no doubt. One may be that if a writer were to do that, that is spend more time and effort, he would have no assurance whatever that things added, elaborated, refined, altered in any way would make his work approximate more closely at all the potential one he knows exists somewhere. Melville, on this point, makes a character say of a revered imagined writer that his work "ever seemed to him but a poor scrawled copy of something within, which, do what he would, he could not completely transfer."2

The most obvious way this sketch falls short of the ideal account is its brevity. Clearly it makes no pretense to completeness. Even a casual thumbing of old University catalogues would quickly reveal much not here recorded. But
to have ransacked old catalogues more thoroughly would have been fruitless, or at least would not have comported with the present writer's view of his assignment. He was asked by the Dean's office to write a history of the English Department, to be combined with histories of other departments in the College of Arts and Science, the collection to make a history of the College. Not all of the contributions from other departments were exciting reading, said the Dean's spokesman, and he enjoined the present writer to do what he could to make his account readable. It was an acceptable injunction, for if not readable, why the effort?

What interested the present writer was the people associated with the Department. To focus on the principal ones seemed a good way to organize the story. So, although some chapters have topical headings, most are built around the character, aims, experience, and activities of a colleague. That term is usually reserved for contemporary co-workers, but it suits the present writer to apply it to predecessors, as well. Reading of earlier Missouri professors of English impresses one with the continuity of the Departmental enterprise. Just as we read of gentilesse, of the song that charmed magic casements, of Time's winged chariot, of a certain slant of light, or speak Cordelia's "no cause, no cause," so will the teachers a hundred years hence--and so did they a hundred years ago. Time "avails not." This sketch, then, hopes to acquaint us with our
professional parents and grandparents.

If the sketch is hazy about the Department's beginnings, it is quite as hazy about recent developments and personalities. There are obvious reasons why this should be so, the principal one (aside from the need to avoid the obviously ungrateful task of having to comment on one's good friends) being that the present writer does not regard recent matter as old enough to be history. Let a file be started and a custodian appointed to collect data against the time when it can be winnowed, assimilated, and shaped into a continuation of the present sketch.

An omission some may deplore is a systematic listing and perhaps description of members' publications. Some of them are touched on, or alluded to, in the running account, particularly the work of the older members, not so likely to be familiar to members today; but nowhere near all the works of even these persons are mentioned. Lists of publications of more recent members are available in the Chairman's personnel files, and could be supplied, presumably, to anyone interested.

An even more glaring omission in this sketch is an adequate recognition of the large transient corps of teachers--formerly Instructors, latterly Teaching Assistants--who teach the elementary writing courses. Their number and their necessarily temporary stay in the Department rule out a full treatment of their contribution. Nor would it be fair to single out individuals from the group, some
of whom have probably been at least as effective in the classroom as any of the professorial staff. Many of them have gone on to distinguished careers elsewhere. The group does not need official recognition; teaching is its own reward. But it would not do to omit mention of it and to fail to thank those who have carried such a substantial part of the departmental burden. They deserve our thanks, and we gladly extend them.

Columbia, Missouri

January 28, 1984

Leon T. Dickinson

Professor Emeritus of English,
University of Missouri-Columbia
The beginnings of the University of Missouri were modest. The University was founded in 1839 by act of the Legislature. Academic Hall was completed in 1842, burned in 1892, and was replaced by the present Jesse Hall. The institution was a classical college, with a large "Preparatory Department," necessary, because of the weak condition of high schools throughout the State, to bring students up to the level of college work. In spite of the achievement of President Lathrop in launching the University, it suffered very soon from the political turmoil created by the slavery issue. President Shannon was pro-South and pro-slavery, and his six-year tenure was a stormy one. By 1862, Federal militia occupied Academic Hall, and in that year the Curators closed the University. But with the passage of the Morrill ("Land Grant") Act in the same year, the Federal Government granted the State of Missouri 330,000 acres for the "endowment of a College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts." The administration of President Daniel Read (1866-1876) saw the change from a college to a university. It is at this time that the present sketch of the Department of English begins.

Growth of the University was slow. By 1890 no more than 500 students were enrolled in Columbia. Before the advent of intercollegiate athletics and fraternities, social life was limited. Literary societies were prominent, giving opportunities for writing and declamation and for
socializing. Attendance at daily chapel was compulsory. The library was an active center; faculty could withdraw six books and keep them one week. Students could also withdraw books, but only by depositing the cost of the book withdrawn. The library was encouraged as a study center: "Students are expected," reads the catalogue, "to be in the library at work if not at recitation, or in their residences, during the school hours."

By 1898 the University, out of a sense of its guardian responsibility, felt it desirable to keep the library open at night: "It was believed that this would be some offset to the temptations to which students are everywhere exposed at night."

That neither sex is specified as being tempted perhaps marks a gain from an earlier time, when special concern for women students was voiced. They could not attend chapel. They must use the library at hours different from those for the men. They were guarded in their marches about the campus. They were to move purposefully from one spot to another, and certainly not to dally or--lovely word--to "loiter." Wrote Jonas Viles of the early time, "It was still a number of years... before the girls were allowed to loiter in the halls."

Women were first admitted to the University in 1871, but with limited privileges. The authorities moved "very cautiously" and deliberately to extend them, "carefully feeling our way, as though explosive material was all around
They were encouraged to make these moves when it was seen that "the young women of 'The Normal' did no manner of harm." Official apprehension is not surprising. Co-education was mostly an unknown quantity. Curators and faculty were understandably solicitous, both for the well-being of the young men (and hence the educational enterprise itself), and for the safety of the young ladies, the assurance of which, to President "Rollins and Kentuckian Columbia," was "a sacred obligation." Then there was the legislature to be considered--at a time when the University earnestly sought its financial help. One or two state representatives, of noisy virtue, well schooled in conventional propriety, could dash the delicate relations between University and its chief means of support. So solicitude there was, though the ease of transition in this first great egalitarian move in academe made the earlier anxiety seem unwarranted. The ingredients in the second great egalitarian move, the dropping in the recent 1950's of racial barriers to admission, were similar to those in the first: the long-overdue redress of an ancient wrong, the widespread misgivings about effecting it, and the later discovery, in the event, that the misgivings had been largely unjustified. In both cases the great weight of tradition and the fear of the unknown operated.\(^\text{10}\)

What of the faculty in the early years of the University? The official view, expressed in the catalogues, was, not surprisingly, that the faculty was strong. The
spokesman in the catalogue, by way of presenting "the University for public endorsement," chose not to single out particularly effective faculty persons but to characterize the ideal professor, the kind the Board of Curators sought to appoint. The professor must have a strong intellect; anything less "generates actual feebleness in the mental constitution of the pupil." A "weak, insipid nature" makes for "blight." The officer who tolerates it is "criminally derelict to duty." By contrast, "breadth of mind, strength of conviction, earnestness of disposition, deep spiritual intuition, intensity of spirit, love of the truth, and a noble and lofty devotion to human welfare" are the marks of the ideal professor. They are "the qualities from which alone true university success can reasonably be expected." Knowledge is important, but "of far greater moment is character." Character in "the teacher induces character and purpose in the student," without which "life is a failure." 

It is hard to quarrel with these criteria. If a bit quaint, perhaps it is merely because they are spelled out. In any case, a person embodying these traits is a valuable asset to an institution, and deserves its support. The extent to which support was forthcoming at Missouri is a long story, and not an entirely happy one. The matter is beyond the scope of this sketch, but a few words about it are probably in order.
If we are used today to legislative appropriations, however meager we may regard them, we should remember how meager they were in earlier days. Sizable appropriations were made in 1872, 1883, and in 1887. Income for operations came from tuition and fees, from "one and three-fourths per cent of the state revenue after deducting twenty-five per cent for the public schools," from endowments, and from sale and rent of land (especially after passage of the Morrill Act). Special legislative appropriations for university buildings were virtually unheard of in early years. As late as 1907 the Curators Report in the University Catalogue mentioned the need for a solid Physics building. Careful work in Physics is impossible, the report said, "unless the building from ridgepole to foundation stone is delivered from all forms of tremor." Over and over the Curators warned of the need for higher salaries to hold good professors and prevent what later has been called the "brain drain." They wrote flatly that "Probably no University in America has had so large a percentage of its men called to other institutions as this University has within the last two years." As the later saying has it, "Missouri is a good school to be from."

Particularly sad are the efforts of administrators, from president down to departmental chair persons, to prove the need for more financial support by presenting figures contrasting Missouri salaries with comparable ones in the institutions of adjoining states. The present writer, when
chairman, amassed such figures, in order to make a telling point in his report requesting more money for salaries. The naive expectation was that the sight of such comparative figures would so embarrass and shame the administrators at the higher echelons that they would immediately drop everything and bend every effort to catch up with Kansas—or Oklahoma, or Nebraska. Fond Hope. There was no embarrassment and no shame; administrative officers had seen such figures many times before—their own and those of others—and were only too aware of the need for more support. They also were experienced enough not to entertain great hopes of winning much support from legislative appropriations.

Noteworthy here is the prophetic voice of Elijah P. Lovejoy, the Abolitionist martyr. A St. Louis editor, driven from the city for his published views, he established a paper in Alton, where he was attacked four times and finally killed in 1837 in defending his paper. Earlier, after a tour through Missouri in 1834, he had expressed himself on state support of higher education:

I have no idea that any Legislature that we are likely soon to have will establish a University on any principles that will insure, or even permit, its prosperity. They will yoke it to the car of State, and then it will be pulled forward, or pushed backward, according as this or that political party shall prevail. And in the turmoil and confusion attending such a state of things
learning and science will be frightened from its halls. Be assured that the muses will never endure the presence of a political stump-speech maker.¹⁵

That the University survived as well as it did the political dangers that Lovejoy warned of, including the scant financial support stemming from them, is due in large part to the dedicated service of a succession of able people on the University staff. A number of them were in English. To know the history of the Department of English, one must know the prominent people in it. This sketch, then, will turn to acquainting the reader with several of them.
Outlines of the early activities of the University of Missouri, the Department of English included, are hazy. What is clear is that for a generation after the founding in 1839 the work in English was largely limited to what was appropriate to a "seminary of learning," as the University was called in its early days. This meant courses for the training of teachers. Also, because of the probably necessary policy of admitting students inadequately prepared for college work, make-up work at the high-school level was offered in the Preparatory Department. A move toward a college curriculum in English as we know it today began during the presidency of the vigorous Samuel Spahr Laws (1876-1889), through the efforts of Laws himself and of his appointee David Rice McAnally, Jr. (1847-1909), chairman of English during his tenure of eight years (1877-1885).

The novelty of this move is suggested in a laudatory sketch of Laws by James S. Blackwell, a professor who offered courses in ten languages, including Sanscrit and Hebrew, though he may not have taught them all. Wrote Blackwell: "The chair of English Language and Literature was given special prominence and encouragement [by Laws], contrary to the old English and American notions, which supposed that every native knew already enough about his mother tongue." Laws picked McAnally to build up the English Department.
Some have thought that in hiring McAnally, Laws did better than he knew.\textsuperscript{17} He did not know him personally, it is believed, and he is said to have selected him quite on the recommendation of another. Further, McAnally had no earned academic degree. That he turned out as well as he did is ascribed largely to chance.

The case is perhaps not so simple as such an implied argument suggests. As for Laws' choosing McAnally on the recommendation of the Methodist minister in Columbia—presumably John S. Grasty, pastor 1876-1878—this is not unlikely. Tradition has it that it was "time" for a Methodist appointment, the procedure being to recognize the several Christian denominations in turn, in order to preserve a balance in the staff. The rotation, it was felt, would tend to preclude the religious domination of a public institution designed to be secular.

But Laws may well have known of young McAnally or his family. Before his appointment at Missouri, David, still in his twenties, was a "leader writer" (i.e., editorial writer) on the St. Louis \textit{Globe-Democrat}. His father, David, Sr., was a man of some prominence in St. Louis. He had been a Methodist circuit preacher for twelve years in Virginia (Laws' native state), had been president (1841-1849) of East Tennessee Female Institute in Knoxville, and in 1851 became editor of \textit{The Christian Advocate} in St. Louis. He wrote tracts and pamphlets on educational topics, and was said to
be "connected with Horace Mann and others in the endeavor to improve the common school system of the country."18

President Laws was a man of parts. Besides holding degrees in law and medicine and being a vice-president of the New York Stock Exchange (and inventor of the stock ticker!), he was a Presbyterian minister and served for five years (1855-1861) as president of Westminster College. In spite of the denominational difference, it is hard to believe that Laws knew nothing of the McAnallys.

If he did know something of them—their breadth of interest and experience, their force of character and of mind, traits not unlike his own—it would help explain his otherwise anomalous appointment—he, Laws, wanting to give special prominence and encouragement to the "Chair of English Language and Literature," naming, to fill the chair, a man with no college degree in the subject.

That a man had no graduate degree in 1877 is not surprising. The great exodus of American scholars to Germany for advanced study was just beginning, as were opportunities at home, graduate work being offered when Johns Hopkins was founded in 1876, Yale College became Yale University in 1887, and Harvard, under President Charles William Eliot, greatly expanded its graduate offerings. So there were few advanced degrees in the early Missouri faculty. But McAnally did not even have a Bachelor's degree. He had taught at Carondelet High School in St. Louis, and for two years was principal. Thereafter he "took
charge"¹⁹ of a "country college"²⁰ in Arcadia, in Iron County, Missouri, southwest of Ste. Genevieve. It is a picturesque spot, the site of a Methodist encampment, which may have attracted McAnally. The college conferred on him an honorary M.A., the only degree listed for him during his term at the University of Missouri.

It was the Great War, wrote W.F. Switzler, that kept young McAnally from college. Fourteen when the War began, "he remained home under the tutorage of his distinguished father, which probably gave him greater thoroughness than he could have obtained at the schools."²¹ Quite possibly. The father, of Union sympathies in spite of a southern background, was a skillful editor, an accomplished writer (he wrote a biography of a Methodist bishop, and also a socio-economic volume entitled The Unemployed [1889]), a vigorous polemic, and a man of wide interests. His papers, preserved in Ellis Library in typescript, treat these varied topics: North American Indian Music, Amusements, Scientific Names, Female Warriors, The Runaway's Gratitude, Plagiarisms, Anachronisms, Eighteen Centuries of French Fashion, the Napoleon Family, A Heroic Operation, Shipping, Popular Songs, The Roman Wall Builders, The Cost of Their Triumph. Some of the curiosity reflected in this list must have rubbed off on the son. It would be a valuable trait for an English professor, who, more than other scholars, is expected to know at least a little about a lot.
English professors in the early days, certainly including McAnally, were expected to be versatile. Writing of that period, Professor Jonas Viles of the History Department noted that "the actual teaching in French was done by the professor of English," and that "history and logic emerge [also] as part of" his activities. More to be expected of a professor of English were McAnally's support of the writing and speaking activities in the student literary societies, and his cooperation with President Laws in his publications, including the University Review, one of the three forerunners of the Columbia Missourian. As the central voice among English teachers throughout the State, he frequently addressed the State Teachers' Association, working for understanding and harmony with the preparatory levels in the schools. After leaving Missouri he displayed still another talent when he wrote at least two small books designed to interest the general reader. One was Irish Wonders; the Ghosts, Giants, Pookas, Demons [etc.] of the Emerald Isle (1888), a collection of fourteen of his stories, derived from conversations he had had with natives on a walking trip through Ireland. It is an early treatment of the Celtic things that soon were to be part of the Irish Literary Movement. A contemporary, William F. Switzler, speaking of McAnally, made the flat statement that "No young gentleman of his age has greater educational prominence in Missouri."
Another of McAnally's titles is startling: *How Men Make Love and Get Married* (Chicago: Laird and Lee, 1892), one of what the publishers called "The Pastime Series." Even so, it is not a sex manual, but rather an entertaining and instructive treatment of the tender passion. Drawing apparently from indexes, concordances, books of quotation, and so on, he assembled an astonishing quantity and variety of references and quotations, classified them into chapters, and added unobtrusive and often amusing commentary that served as their setting. Occasionally he drew not from literature but from life, as when, to show that jealousy could make for comedy as well as tragedy, he wrote that "One day the country is thrown into spasms of mirth by the jealous train-master who ordered all the trains off the track, took an engine and rode eighty miles at a terrific speed to thrash a telegraph operator, his rival for the affections of the lady stenographer in the superintendent's office." Unacademic, perhaps, but lively, as his classes must have been.

Strong appreciation of McAnally's versatility and his contributions to various areas of University activity was voiced a number of years later by J.W. Connaway, Professor of Veterinary Medicine, in a biographical sketch of the man inserted in the library copy of a volume of McAnally's *Irish Wonders*:

"[McAnally's work shows] that the English Department was the incubator which helped greatly to hatch..."
several great University Departments, namely, the Department of History, Business Administration [McAnally, on the basis of work on his father's Christian Advocate and in running Arcadia College, was assigned a course in Bookkeeping, i.e., Accounting, not Book Collecting], Journalism [This course is said to have been the first in the subject taught anywhere], Music [he taught Vocal Music], [and] the auditory division of the School of Fine Arts.25

The president of the "Dramatic Arts [department], Professor Benj. F. Hoffman," Connaway continues, "had his inspiration and early training in the fine arts from Prof. McAnally."

Professor McAnally may have thought that an ideal chairman of English should not spread his talents so thin. He expressed his opinion about an ideal department in a full statement in President Laws' first University Catalogue (1877-1878). The catalogue was unusual in setting forth not only the ordinary items of courses, lists of things and people, and so on, but also the hopes and needs of the University and its staff. Laws was proud of it. He called it "an elaborate treatise on higher education. I am willing," he said, "for it to go to criticism in Europe as well as America on that basis....[I]t is my hope that it will make a favorable impression for our state."26 In the catalogue Laws called attention to the statement of Professor Swallow, of the College of Agriculture, appealing for support of his program; clearly it had Laws' approval,
this being some time before the deadly quarrel that
developed between the two. McAnally's report must have been
solicited by the President and, like Swallow's, have had his
approval. The statement deserves generous quotation as a
rare early formulation of the role of the English Department
in the University. McAnally wrote as follows:

VI. ENGLISH

PROFESSOR McANALLY.

The basis of the success of an English department in
any institution of learning, must be found in the unity of
its course of study. To be what it should, this must
comprise not only the linguistic elements, but all the
factors that have contributed to the present condition of
the language, together with the literature of the English
speaking peoples. As it is impossible to obtain even an
approximately correct idea of the writings of a nation
until the military, civil, political, social, religious,
and even revolutionary causes which brought forth its
literature, are thoroughly understood; the various phases
of human life presented by history's glass, must also be
taken into account, and carefully provided for in the
scheme of instruction. Only when this plan is success­
fully carried out, can any English department become an
equipoised whole; the study of the language, as it is,
leading up, almost insensibly, to the study of the lan­
guage as it was, thus inducing an examination of the
numberless verbal changes which time, social changes,
warlike and commercial causes have brought about, and thus
compelling an investigation into the sources of events
which could mould a nation's speech, and shape its des­
tiny; an investigation which is, in turn, rounded off and
completed by a systematic reading of the principal liter­
ary works of the language.

Such, in few words, is a glance at the work of the
ideal English department of a University. The plan, here
briefly and imperfectly indicated, has been partially
carried out in theory and practice elsewhere, and there
are good hopes, that profiting by the experience of other
institutions, the Missouri State University may soon be
able to boast the realization of this ideally perfect
department.

The course of English study in the Missouri
University comprises the elements of the language, studied
with an eye to review and immediate practical results, as
well as to theoretic consistency; and, as the fact is admitted, that, whatever be the merits of the other departments, the graduates of a University are judged by the public more particularly with reference to their English scholarship, than to any other part of their educational attainments, no efforts are spared to secure thoroughness in these elementary branches.

The study of Rhetoric is next especially commended to students, and all are required to give it a large share of attention. The history of the English speaking peoples receives in course much time, not less than an entire year being devoted to the study of English and American history, while the connection between the two is fully shown at the appropriate periods of the work, and the subject is greatly simplified by the use of maps and historical charts.

English and American literature forms a distinctive feature of the department, and it is believed that, in time, a prominence will be given to this branch that will surprise and gratify the friends of the institution. The subject is, at present, taught by the use of appropriate text books and manuals of literature, with occasional lectures and illustrations drawn from concurrent periods of history. A free use of the English historical books in the library, is constantly urged on the attention of the classes, and by a frequent reference to standard English classics, and a daily reading in the class room of the most entertaining and instructive passages from their pages, an interest is awakened that could be inspired in no other way, while essays on the different periods of literary life give practice in thought and expression, and regular examinations fix the matter of daily recitation more firmly in the mind.

The crowning study of the English department is Political Economy, which is taught in the latter half of the junior year, by means of lectures, of which students in attendance are required to take copious notes, to be subsequently worked up into essays, theses, and similar compositions. The University Library is fairly supplied with works on political and social science, and of these an unsparing use is made both in instruction and in illustration. The habit of reporting the lectures is found to be beneficial in the highest degree, since it contributes to accuracy in thought and statement, and furnishes no small amount of exercise in practical composition.

Elocution receives attention in every class, it being considered axiomatic, that every student should be able to read his mother tongue with ease to himself and satisfaction to his auditors, while book-keeping and vocal music are also for the present in this department.
Language study is prominent in the scheme. The study of literature is "a distinctive feature of the department," though it is said to be valuable because it "rounded off" the study of language. Bookkeeping he elsewhere regards as "not strictly belonging to the English Department," and he feels the same about vocal music. But he makes no apology for including history, British and American, and Political Economy, the "crowning study of the English department." Including in English studies these subjects which for a later age seem so clearly discrete, autonomous areas resulted from the thinness of the curriculum at that early time. But the English Department, at least McAnally, was content to teach them because they related so closely to the core of English studies--language and its use in expression, written and oral.

This relationship was a basic assumption in McAnally's view of literature and how to teach it. He insisted on the importance, for understanding literature, of knowing what we often call the "backgrounds," but what he called the "philosophy" of literature. The word appeared in the title of his unpretentious book of 164 pages, published in Columbia in 1883, while he was still chairman. "The business of History," he wrote in the preface to The Philosophy of English Poetry, is "to record facts; that of Philosophy to account for them." His book treats what he regarded as a neglected study--a study of "the moving causes and antecedents" of English poetry; it sets forth "some of
the movements, both mental and material, which preceded the various eras of our poetry." The critical phrase is "account for," the view somewhat deterministic. To say that literature springs from its time and place does not surprise us, but in McAnally's day it was, at least in its emphasis, a new view. One suspects the influence of Hippolyte Taine, and indeed Taine's History of English Literature was on the reading list for third-year students in English. So were Lord Kames' Elements of Criticism and Hugh Blair's Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres, solid and standard texts for a century. But Taine, his history translated in 1873, was something new; and McAnally, supposedly from a frontier institution, was alert to recognize him and adopt his influential work. One wonders, finally, whether the emphasis on English life persisted in English courses. It probably did, and the descent just may be traceable down to what for years at Missouri was the title of the sophomore survey course in English literature--"English Life and Literature."

McAnally's little book is lively and vivid. "Gower cherished the delusion that he was writing poetry," says the author, "when he was only grinding out doggerel and then even that delusion was dissipated, and he ducked back under the waters of oblivion and vanished." Chaucer, by contrast, is like a flash of lightning that suddenly illuminates the dark world: "Every boulder gleams in the flash and shows even the minutest crevice on its surface, every man stands
forth with the faintest lines of his face clearly defined and the expression as distinctly marked as though he had been in view for hours." Then, as suddenly as it came, "the light dies away; the wonderful pageant grows dim; the splendid lords and jewelled ladies, the riotous monks and irreverent priests, the glittering knights, the comfortable merchants, and the dissolute populace, fade away into the gloom, and again become the shadows they were before."\(^27\)

Equally vivid is a two-page passage of long, aggregating sentences depicting the dazzling and extravagant costumes of Elizabethan men and women of fashion.\(^28\) How exciting for a youngster come to the University from a country cross-roads thus to be escorted through the realms of gold. "The first course of lectures on English language and literature ever given in the University," wrote a contemporary, "was delivered by Prof. McAnally in 1879-80." It is easy to believe him when he adds that the lectures "were as well attended as any course of the institution."\(^29\)

David McAnally was an enthusiast. He loved good writing and the people who had done it over the years. He encouraged it in his students, not least by the then substantial gift of $200 given to the Curators in 1880 to establish a fund permitting the annual award of the "McAnally Prize for English." For a while a title was specified to contestants--"Carlyle as a Husband," "Goldsmith as a Humorist," or simply the name of a figure, "Rudyard Kipling," "Robert Louis Stevenson," "Ralph Waldo Emerson,"
"Thomas Hart Benton." Standards were high. If no distinguished paper was submitted, no prize was awarded. Once it was withheld for six years. For years the prize was a gold medal, awarded for "the best essay or poem" submitted by a member of the senior class. About 1950, on the ground that medals were not being worn much at the time, the Department voted to dispense with the medal in favor of a cash prize, awarded, like the medal, in the name of the donor. Future recipients may take pride in being named as achievers of something of the literary excellence that Professor McAnally so highly valued.
Writing a history of a department partly in terms of its dominant figures seems particularly appropriate for the career of Edward Archibald Allen (1843-1922). As in most European universities down to modern times, a department at Missouri in its early days consisted of one professor, surrounded by whatever assistants he required to help with the program. Allen was the professor of English at Missouri for much of his tenure of twenty-five years (1885-1910). He served under five University presidents or acting presidents, and his career spanned the burning of Academic Hall in 1892, customarily regarded as separating the Old from the New University of Missouri. He was appointed by fellow-Virginian President Samuel Spahr Laws, held the headship in English during the entire tenure of fellow-Latinist President Richard Henry Jesse (1891-1908), whom he assisted in his successful moves to assemble a faculty of quality, and he took part in the reforming activities of President Albert Ross Hill (1908-1921). Much of the Department of English as we know it had its origin at the hand of Professor E. A. Allen.

Allen's schooling was interrupted by the Civil War. According to a knowledgeable descendant, Allen, nineteen, and two cousins, the younger seventeen, ran away and in 1862 enlisted in the 13th Virginia Calvary, commanded by W. H. F. ("Rooney") Lee, son of General Robert E. Lee and Harvard
classmate of Henry Adams, who mentions him in his Education. In the battle of Malvern Hill (see Melville's poem), Allen's older cousin was killed and the younger lost a foot. Allen gathered up the dead and wounded cousins and drove them home in a wagon, some seventy miles behind the lines, and then returned to rejoin his regiment. He fought on for nearly three years, losing his horse to the battle of Five Forks (for which he was later reimbursed $900). He suffered no serious wounding thereafter, and following capture and escape, he joined General Lee's army and was at Appomattox at the time of the surrender 9 April 1865.

These facts, recounted by family members and verified and added to by grandson Allen Belden in his genealogical study of the Allen family, are probably more than E. A. Allen personally revealed of his experience. He seldom spoke of the War in later years. His loyal service to the Confederacy ended with Appomattox; he was not one to try to perpetuate it in protracted brooding over the Lost Cause. When asked by a youthful grandson if he was not disappointed in the outcome of the War, he replied, "Not at all. It is better so."

For a year following the War, Allen got his affairs in order and prepared to continue the education that the War had interrupted. It was a traditional classical education, which had begun about 1860 with at least one year's study, near Charlottesville, at the Classical School of one Dr. Gessner Harrison, a distinguished former professor and
chairman of the faculty at the University of Virginia. Schooling under Harrison qualified Allen for admission to Randolph-Macon College, then located in Mecklenburg County, Virginia. He enrolled for Latin and Greek and Mathematics and Chemistry, but the year course, 1861-62, was broken by his enlistment.

After the War he studied for two years at the University of Virginia--Greek, Latin, Modern Languages, History and Literature, and Moral Philosophy. He left without taking a degree--a not uncommon practice at the time--and began the teaching for which his study had prepared him, first at a country school, later as professor and principal of Sunnyside High School (or Academy), in Bedford County, and then at Farmville (later Longwood) College. Here for eight years (1873-1881) he taught Latin, French, German, and English.

Allen's next--and next-to-last--move was to the West. He had married in 1872, and he and his wife Priscilla Saunders Allen had four children by 1881. At that time he learned of an opening at Central Methodist College, in Fayette, Missouri, possibly through his father-in-law, the Reverend John Martin Saunders, prominent in Methodist circles in Virginia. Allen visited Fayette, liked it, and sent for his family, who made the heroic trek to Fayette, where they lived for the next four years.

At Central College Allen was head of both the "School of English" and the "School of Modern Languages," holding,
after his first year, an endowed chair as the "Mary Evans Barnes Professor of English and Modern Languages." His general statement in the college catalogue concerning the aim of the work in English is notable for his emphasizing a thorough and practical grasp of the mother tongue, in both its spoken and written forms:

Special prominence is given to our own language and literature. The grounds of reproach that students often leave College knowing far more of other languages than of their own, do not exist here. In the earlier stages, and indeed throughout the course, efforts are directed toward the acquirement of right pronunciation, clearness of articulation, widening of vocabulary, accurate use of words, simple and exact habits of expression, and correct spelling. The foundations of a rational and satisfactory knowledge of English grammar are here laid upon a sound basis, and this is deemed essential to a right appreciation of some of the higher branches in the course.

The statement of work in English in the three classes (there being no junior class) is notable for the specified inclusion of American literature, and especially for the emphasis on study of the English language, "philology" looming larger in the general English curriculum than it later has done.
The College course, embracing a period of three years, aims at an accurate and rounded knowledge of the language, in its origin, growth and development, from the earliest time down to our own; a history of its literature from the 7th century to the present time, including American literature; a close and critical reading of the great authors, through their best works; not in fragments, but in some acknowledged master-piece of each. Strong efforts are made towards the cultivation of a literary taste, towards creating and stimulating a love for good books. Rhetoric and composition, with exercises, afford constant practice. Anglo-Saxon, as indispensable to a scholarly knowledge of our language and its grammar, is taught with pains in the Senior year. The reading of old writers closes with Chaucer, to the study of whose works considerable time is allotted.

The whole course ends with lectures on Comparative Philology. 32

It was a solid English program. Allen's efforts in carrying it out impressed University President Laws, who, perhaps mindful the success of his former "Methodist" appointment in McAnally, called Allen to Columbia in 1885 and appointed him head of English, a post he filled with distinction for twenty-five years.
When he came to Columbia, the University, counting the preparatory department, enrolled 455 students, mostly men. Women had been admitted since 1869, but were granted full status only gradually. Many were students in the Normal College, and in 1871 were not admitted to chapel exercises, college classes, or even the library, except at hours different from those for the men. "Finding, however, that the young women at 'The Normal' did no manner of harm," reads the University catalogue of 1873, "we very cautiously admitted them to some of the recitations and lectures in the University building itself, as supplementary to their regular exercises; providing always, they were to be marched in good order, with at least two teachers, one in front and the other in the rear of the column as guards."33 Thus protected, many of them marched right into Professor Allen's classes, where they made up at least half of the enrollment.

A number of them were students in the "Normal Department," and so would come under Allen's guidance, for during the first six years of his tenure, Allen was "Professor of English [and of 'Pedagogics'] and Dean of the Normal Faculty."34 Teacher training in English, then, was a departmental activity; only later did the supervision pass to the new School of Education. But whatever the administrative arrangement, Allen played a major part in the University's effort to provide the State with instruction and guidance in matters of language and expression. In the
catalogue of 1910-1911 President of the Board of Curators

David R. Francis acknowledged Professor Allen's contribution; Allen had exerted, wrote Francis, "a great influence on the educational development of the State."35

It is quite true; he wrote articles, addressed meetings, and was in touch with the English teaching throughout Missouri. This part of his work is reflected in his several English grammars, school texts that are clear, well organized, and practical. Not in them but elsewhere did Allen reveal his considerable skill in the historical aspects of English language study. He was meticulous and original in his study of English "doublets," different words deriving from the same stem, a work that later Anglo-Saxonist Milton Gatch singled out for commendation in his brief comment at the dedication of Allen Auditorium. Gatch also noted Allen's work as associate editor of two multi-volume anthologies designed for the general reading public--The World's Best Orations (11 volumes, 1899) and The World's Best Essays (10 volumes, 1900). Gatch concluded his piece by quoting from an idealistic poem of Allen's on the Jefferson Monument that stands on the Missouri campus. The poem appeared in Missouri Literature, a volume prepared for school use by Allen and President Jesse in 1901. Allen's publications, then, show a generous willingness to share his knowledge with a variety of readers.

Professor Allen's scholarly and pedagogical contributions, as well as his attractive and admirable
character, were widely recognized, both during his lifetime and at the time of his death. Word of his work "out west" got back to his native Virginia, and in 1890 Washington and Lee University conferred on him the degree of Litt. D. At home, the year after his retirement in 1910, Missouri conferred on him the LL.D. Appreciative comments and tributes at his retirement and at the time of his death were unusually laudatory and heartfelt. Indeed, in the opinion of Allen's widow, the story in the Columbia Daily Tribune was a bit overwrought, the author being somewhat "carried away by his own emotional fervor." But the headline was no doubt accurate in calling Allen "One of Pioneer Members of Faculty Who Helped Bring University to Fore."

Professor Allen's prominence in the life of the University is nicely symbolized in his place of residence. In 1888, with six children and with one more, his last, on the way, Allen bought a large lot for $1200 and built on it. It was located in a commanding position at the head of Ninth Street, at the southeast corner of the campus. The frontage on the south side of 900 Conley Avenue was 150 feet, the depth 435 feet; the lot was part of a former wheat field, Allen used to say; for years he kept a cow on it. On the lot he built five additional houses for income. The property was ringed by a horseshoe drive, known as Allen Place--the western arm stretching along the present eastern walk of the Mall, the eastern arm coinciding very nearly with the drive to the east of the Arts and Science
building. The professor's front yard, then, was the site of the present Allen Auditorium. It was dedicated to Allen and officially named for him, as indicated on the bronze plaque affixed to the wall in the foyer, in a ceremony in 1973 presided over by Chancellor Herbert Schooling. Armon Yanders, Dean of the College of Arts and Science, gave an appreciative tribute, as did Professor Milton Gatch, Chairman of the Department of English, who noted that the ceremony was one of those occasions, "happy, and unfortunately rare....., when universities commemorate their teachers." The auditorium, thus named, is, like the McAnally literary prize, a valued link with colleagues of an earlier time.

The Allen house itself, which stood until 1958, has ties with a later generation. The present writer visited in it, and, indeed, owned a house of similar vintage. He did not keep a cow, but he enjoyed the sheep grazing immediately across the street. He can appreciate the attractions of the old Victorian houses: creaky and musty and drafty and hard to heat as they were, they were commodious (Allen's house had twelve rooms), cool and airy in summer from the 12-foot ceilings, spacious and comfortable, well suited to the large families of an earlier day. (900 Conley housed Mrs. Allen's parents and a widowed sister, and Allen's unmarried sister, as well as Allen and his wife and their seven children--thirteen in all!) The present writer's house,
like the Allen's, was bought by the University and razed in its developmental push toward the South. But the old architectural tradition lives on in the Victorian mansion of Professor and Mrs. Howard Fulweiler, on Greenwood Avenue.

In addition to the socials on the lawn, with Japanese lanterns, celebrations on the 4th of July, feasts at Thanksgiving, and so on, perhaps the most momentous event in the Allen house—for a Departmental history—is the courtship that led to the marriage of the Allen's daughter Ethel to Assistant Professor of English Henry Marvin Belden. Belden succeeded to the chairmanship upon his father-in-law's retirement in 1910, and so gave promise of creating a dynasty for the governance of affairs in English at Missouri. If the dynasty did not develop beyond Belden, it did important work during his tenure, in the form of solidifying, expanding, refining, and modernizing the program in English as received from father-in-law Allen.
One of the most distinguished and admired members of the Department of English in its more than one hundred-year history is Henry Marvin Belden (1865-1954), active in Department and University affairs from 1895 until his retirement in 1936 and beyond. He founded the Missouri Folk-Lore Society (1906) and for years served as its secretary and twice as its president. He was active in founding the University of Missouri Studies (1926) and chaired the editorial committee from 1928 until 1943, seven years after his retirement, when publication was suspended because of the War. His scholarly interests were wide and varied, and his published studies, if not numerous, were significant contributions of high quality: several articles on Beowulf (including "Scyld Schefing and Huck Finn"), an edition of Coleridge's poems, and a study of John Donne's versification, mentioned below. Most notable of his studies is his work on popular ballads, issuing in two publications: an edition of folk-songs and folk ballads of North Carolina, with Arthur Palmer Hudson in 1952, Belden's last publication; and his major scholarly work, "Ballads and Songs Collected by the Missouri Folk-Lore Society," first published in the University of Missouri Studies in 1940. It was reprinted in 1955 and contained a sketch of Belden's career by Professor Edward H. Weatherly, called by the Columbia Missourian "the most sensitive and appreciative tribute" to appear. It is
included in *A Belden Lineage*, pp. 208-209. Belden did his stint of administrative work, becoming chairman of English in 1910 when Allen retired. The chairmanship, wrote his son, "was a position that carried no additional salary and that no member of the Department wanted, but that [Belden] reluctantly had thrust upon him during most of the following years until his own retirement." He much preferred the classroom.

His low-keyed, thoughtful teaching appealed to some, particularly the better students, who valued his learning. He taught Anglo-Saxon, the Eighteenth Century, and American Literature, being something of a pioneer in the last-named field, which was only beginning to make its way into the English curriculum in American colleges and universities.

Belden was a New Englander by birth. His ancestors had "sailed from London" in 1635. Some had settled in Deerfield, Massachusetts, and had "suffered the rigors of the two Deerfield Massacres," in 1696 and 1704. Later members moved to southern Connecticut, Belden's father to Wilton. Henry, the second of five Belden boys, grew up on his father's small tobacco farm, where he kept a pet crow. The bird would go abroad at night, but return each morning and regale the family with his routine of antics. "Jim liked it on the farm," Belden wrote years later, in fond memory of his bird.
Henry was an early reader, devouring The Youth's Companion, Charlotte Yonge's books ("obtained from the Sunday School library") and The Swiss Family Robinson, "the first book that I owned and read for myself;... [it] made a great impression on me." His father taught him Latin, and he entered Wilton Academy, graduating in 1884. At the academy he read widely on his own: Shakespeare ("a play a night"), and Thackeray, who made him feel that he "was really learning about life at last."

At age seventeen, he recalled, "I had somehow got it into my head that I wanted to be a college professor." His practical father, citing the poor pay of professors, urged merchandising, which the boy tried but gave up because his "heart was not in it." He loved literature, and knew early it was for him. He entered Trinity College, in Hartford, because his uncles had gone there, and because it was an Episcopalian institution. "The Beldens had been church folk," he wrote, "since the Revolution or before, but took their churchmanship rather loosely," in contrast to his mother's family, of Quaker descent, who were "more given to church observances and doctrine." The noted difference prompted a social observation: "There is, I am afraid, something like snobbishness or 'social climbing'--quite unconscious of course--about church affiliations in our good democratic country."

Trinity enrolled 250 men at the time. There were fraternities, but the line between "Hellenes and Barbs" was
not sharp. Belden was not a fraternity man, but his very good friend, one Prosser Frye, was. Together they read Meredith, Tennyson's "Morte d'Arthur," Browning, the Elizabethan dramatists, and, in Greek class, part of the Odyssey and Oedipus Tyrannus. "the latter of which moved me deeply." Strangely, he later thought, "Milton, somehow, did not enter into our picture, nor Chaucer." Whitman he knew not at all. They read some Mark Twain, who was new to Belden, though of course he knew that Clemens was Hartford's most famous resident. Twain was a friend of C. F. Johnson, "our professor of English [at Trinity], and at a woman's club meeting at Johnson's house one day I heard him read Browning's 'Up at a Villa--Down in the City,' a masterly performance." Huckleberry Finn Belden read later. In college he and Frye favored poetry. Some of Belden's own verse saw print, and he was chosen Class Poet and read at Commencement. Recalling these early efforts prompted him, in retrospect, to voice the familiar

Ou sont les neiges d'antan?

He was elected to Phi Beta Kappa, and on answering an advertisement after graduation in 1888, was taken on to teach English at a school near West Point, where he coached candidates for the Military Academy to enable them to qualify for admission. They were not a promising lot, and Belden used to worry for the safety of the country if his academic charges became responsible for its defense.
An inheritance from the estate of his grandmother enabled him to attend graduate school, Johns Hopkins being his inevitable choice. It had opened in 1876, under Daniel Coit Gilman, and immediately became a distinguished institution, which was to set the pattern for graduate education in the United States. After a year's study Belden taught at Lehigh University for a year, and then returned to Baltimore to fulfill his residency requirement.

With the requirement met by 1893, he accepted an instructorship at the University of Nebraska, where he saw co-education for the first time and the vast expanse of the still-young West. More important, he was part of a group of young people who later gained distinction: Louise Pound and her brother Roscoe, Willa Cather, and Dorothy Canfield, later Fisher. He admired Miss Pound's athletic prowess, and enjoyed dancing with all of the ladies at the Commencement Ball. His recollections of these people are of interest. Asked by Willa Cather for advice on her career, Belden apparently responded much as Sarah Orne Jewett was to do: Give up teaching and write if you feel you must. As to his literary kinship with Miss Cather, it is questionable how close it was. When he complained to her that he could not understand Meredith's Modern Love (to which Miss Pound had introduced him), she replied, he wrote, "that it was perfectly plain to her." Suggestive of the milieu is the resignation of George Woodberry, later of Columbia University, who was irked by the "Bible-belt morality of
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He was said to have left in disgrace for having asked a student to have wine with him in his room. Miss Pound, Belden wrote, was "very scornful about the way he had been treated." In all, though he had done nothing on his dissertation, Belden felt that the year in Lincoln had been rich and rewarding because of the gifted and energetic people he had come to know there.

At the end of the term his friend Frye suggested a trip to Europe, and Belden agreed, it being--"then more than now," he wrote late in life--"the proper thing for a student of languages and literature to visit the old world; especially, for a student of philology, to go to a German university."

He wrote, for advice on what to see, to his friend Frank Jewett Mather, studying at the Hopkins in preparation for what was to be a distinguished career as art critic and historian. Mather, who had been to Europe, no doubt gave suggestions, but all that Belden recorded was a negative one:

Um Gottes Willen gehe nicht nach Berlin!

Belden found the proscription easy to accept, for he had settled on the university at Strasbourg. He was "a devoted Goethean then," and Strasbourg "had been the scene of [Goethe's] most significant university years." Goethe had been there in 1770-1771, studying law and medicine, when he came under the influence of Johann Gottfried von Herder. Reacting against the French doctrines of correctness and formalism, Herder came to value genuineness of feeling as the
true criterion of great literature, as seen in Homer, Shakespeare, and Ossian. Goethe absorbed these ideas (which Herder later expressed and exemplified in *Stimmen der Völker in Liedern* (1778-1779)), and was guided by them in his admiring analysis of the Strasbourg cathedral, which has been called "one of the first bugle-blasts of the coming romantic reaction in favor of the Middle Ages." Together Goethe and Herder collected German folk-songs. Their activity must have been preserved in local tradition, where, as well as in books, Belden would have learned of it.

This experience at Strasbourg could only have reinforced what Belden already knew of folk literature through the publication, during his formative years, of Francis James Child's monumental *English and Scottish Ballads* (1883-1898). The work, wrote Professor William DeVane, "was a harbinger of the future." Here is his full statement, useful because it so clearly places Henry Belden and his major scholarly work:

In the last two decades of the nineteenth century, the campuses of America began to feel in full force the effect of scholars and teachers trained in the German universities.... Young Americans, returning from their studies in Germany with a new vision, saw the land before them as offering an incredible opportunity for their cultivation. Equally important, they brought home improved methods in the lecture, the seminar, and the report to put their vision into operation. The new vision for English was, of course, philology—literature treated in the spirit of science, or "genetically," to show its sources, connections, and relationships.
Allen came earlier than the tide of German influence, others too late. Only Belden was a part of the movement that so greatly influenced American literary scholarship in its early days.

Perhaps in order here is a parenthesis on the word *philology*, since it figures in Belden's professional thinking. Today, toward the end of the twentieth century, the word is all but obsolete, even among scholars, except as it is needed for reference to scholarly activity of an earlier time. Originally (the OED dates the English word from the early seventeenth century) the word meant "love of letters" (i.e., literature), or "the study of polite literature." It was a direct borrowing from Latin *philologia*, itself a direct borrowing of the Greek word. The word in English apparently underwent the process of specialization, or linguistic synecdoche: Language study, admittedly a part of philology, came to be thought the whole of it. The change dates from some time after the turn of the century, since usage before that time implies a literary concern broader than linguistic. It is apparent to us, for instance, if we think about it, that the early journals which bore titles including the word--*The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* (1897), *Modern Philology* (1903), *Studies in Philology* (1906)--have, from their founding, treated literary matters quite as much as linguistic ones, if not more so.
A safe guess as to how the change came about is the simple fact that language study, though only a part of philology, is a large part; at the Hopkins Belden studied German, Old High German, Middle High German, and Gothic, as well as Old and Middle English. To beginning graduate students, philology must have seemed to be language study. Another explanation of the semantic "specialization," one advanced by Albert Stanburrough Cook in his presidential address at the annual meeting of the Modern Language Association in 1897, is the error of false analogy. Since philology is a compound of philo and logos, the word, many apparently have thought, analogizing from such words as philosophy, Philodendron, Philadelphia, and philanthropy, must mean "love of words," or "word study." This inference, wrote Cook, ignores the Latin philologia, which in classical times had already acquired a broader meaning than the sum of the meanings of its two components. But the amateur etymology of philology sounds plausible, and so may have contributed to the narrowing of the word's meaning.

The virtual disappearance of the word philology in our time was due not only to a change in its meaning, but to a growing aversion in some quarters to the thing itself, taken either in its early broad sense or in the later narrowed one. The complaint was that philology was literary study "in the spirit of science," as DeVane put it. It was, indeed, for like many other disciplines, the study of literature was affected by the post-Darwinian vogue for science—its
respect for fact and its concern with change, development, or "evolution." Both literary history ("genetic" studies) and an organic view of language reflect these features.

Professor Woodrow Wilson was one who deplored the direction taken by advanced literary study. In an impassioned essay titled "Mere Literature" (the disparaging "mere" presumably being the epithet of the "scientific" philologist, who is believed to regard literature merely as data for analysis) Wilson wrote, with heavy irony, that you, the philologist, broaden the area of science, for you rescue the concrete phenomena of the expression of thought—the necessary syllabification which accompanies it, the inevitable juxtaposition of words, the constant use of particles, the habitual display of roots, the inveterate repetition of names, the recurrent employment of meanings heard or read—from their confusion with the otherwise unclassifiable manifestations of what had hitherto been accepted, without critical examination, under the lump term "literature," simply for the pleasure and spiritual edification to be got from it.

"What you need is, not a critical knowledge of language, but a quick feeling for it,"43 he wrote, voicing the false opposition that has always plagued the scholar-writer dissension.

Another voice, somewhat less pedagogical, deploring the new authority of science in literary matters, was that of Norman Foerster, a leading spirit in the formulation and spread of the doctrine called the New Humanism. Professor Robert L. Ramsay, of the University of Missouri's English Department, discussed the new ideas in correspondence with
Belden, too, was interested in them, but both men regarded them with reservations. Although friendly to "creative" writing, they both were too thoroughly committed to the value of philology to agree to Foerster's view that philology belonged only in Ph.D. programs, and should give way, in study at the lower levels, to a less "scientific," more humane kind of study.

In writing an autobiographical sketch in 1948, twelve years after his retirement, Belden was proud to say that his professional life had been devoted to philology, which, from the vantage point of years, it pleased him to define in the wry words of Churton Collins, the English scholar whose efforts helped gain academic recognition for English literature at Oxford in the late nineteenth century: Philology is "'an unintelligent curiosity about trifles.'" But by 1948 Belden surrounds the term with quotation marks, showing that he regarded it as old fashioned. The word, though not the thing, was disappearing.

The present writer recalls what at the time seemed a plaintive question by Professor Ramsay, holder of a John Hopkins doctorate, when the Department in the late 1940's was seeking to fill a vacancy in the Renaissance: "Don't we go after men from the Hopkins any more?" We did not "go after" one at the time, as I recall, which did mark a change from earlier days, when that university was a major source of well-trained scholars. James Wilson Bright (known to all Ph.D.'s in English as the author of the Anglo-Saxon grammar
they struggled with in graduate school) must have received many requests for recommendations of good young scholars. He recommended Belden for the Nebraska job, and later for the one at Missouri, "a place," wrote Belden, "I had never heard of." He was hired as Assistant Professor of English in 1895, one of the high-quality appointments made during the tenure of President Richard Henry Jesse. 45

"Here [at Missouri] I have been ever since," he wrote in his memoir. There were "two rather feeble efforts" to move to other universities, but neither materialized, "I am happy now to say," he wrote. He valued Jesse's ability to get "promising young men from the east (Harvard, Cornell, Yale I believe, and two or three from the Hopkins) for his teaching staff."

His teaching in that period of ambitious graduate programs and small staff, which made for a kind of enforced versatility of the members, was notably varied. Besides freshman English and Gothic (which he "later yielded to Professor Hermann Benjamin Almstedt, when he returned from the University of Chicago as professor of German") he regularly taught American literature and the course in the Eighteenth Century. That was not all, however, for in his "forty-odd years" he also taught Beowulf, Spenser, and Elizabethan non-dramatic literature; as he put it, he "dipped into a variety of fields."46 The phrase "dipped into" is a modest understatement, at least in one instance, as is suggested by Professor H. J. C. Grierson's 6-page
acknowledgment (in his 1929 one-volume edition of Donne's poems) of Belden's knowledgeable and acute criticism, in a review of Grierson's full-scale edition of the poems in 1912. Belden was justifiably proud that Grierson "very handsomely" recognized his careful work.

Belden boarded at Professor Allen's house when he first arrived in Columbia. Here he met and later courted and married Ethel Allen. The couple lived for years on Virginia Avenue, and with the Allens made a close-knit family. They raised four sons, vacationed frequently at their summer home in upper Michigan, and on leave in 1916-1917 lived in Cambridge, where at Harvard Belden worked on his ballad book, continuing the work that had taken him to the British Museum in 1908. Family life meant much to him. In the end he came to value it more than scholarship.

But his scholarly life had been rewarding. He came to the University at a time, under Jesse, when it was becoming a distinguished institution. All who knew it at that time or have read of it tell the same story: that President Jesse was energetic and ambitious in staffing his faculty with promising young men from the leading graduate schools; that he persuaded the officers in those schools and the candidates for appointment that Missouri was a good institution; and that word got back from recent appointees that indeed it was. All of this made for a strong esprit de corps on the Missouri campus. In his memoir Belden troubled to list some of his associates, the names of whom, if not their identities, are
familiar to us as names of streets or buildings: Frank Thilly (philosophy), [William Gwathmey] Manly (Greek; brother of John Manly of the University of Chicago), Raymond Weeks (Romance languages), John Burnham (Latin), George Lefevre (zoology), Fletcher Marbut (geology), Isadore Loeb (history and politics), Herbert Reese (physics), and others. Slant tone.

He particularized the matter in the excellent chapter on the College of Arts and Science which he contributed to Jonas Viles' centennial history of the University (1939) (one of the very best chapters in the book), noting the stimulating atmosphere of faculty life early in the century. Belden mentions Herbert J. Davenport, who came to Columbia from the University of Chicago in 1908, and was instrumental in effecting "the sojourn at the University of Missouri of one of the most stimulating spirits of the time, Thorstein Veblen," who was "'lecturer' in economics [at Missouri] from 1911 to 1918." The understanding and the insight and the acuity displayed in this one-page account tell much about Veblen but also much about Belden. These were the golden years for him, and perhaps for the University; later, under Albert Ross Hill--"So it seems to this old-timer," wrote Belden--"Missouri has slipped back." But his earlier time at Missouri was a joy. "We youngsters were a happy lot in those early days. It would be an exaggeration, no doubt, to quote Wordsworth:

Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive,
But to be young was very heaven!54
but we felt that way, at least I did." He could easily have assented to the Virgilian thought in the epigraph of his Nebraska friend's novel, My Ántonia:

Optima dies . . . prima fugit.
For the present writer Professor Ramsay and Professor Fairchild were a link with the early Department of English. The careers at Missouri of both men began—1907 and 1904 respectively—while E. A. Allen was chairman, and extended (45 and 42 years respectively) to about mid-century. Both men were learned, with doctorates respectively from Johns Hopkins and Yale. Ramsay was principally a language man, teaching all of the courses in the English language and doing distinguished work in the field. His work on place names, especially those of Missouri (which enlisted, often, the help of students and other residents around the State), was universally recognized and applauded. A look through his papers reveals a voluminous personal correspondence with just about every eminent language person in America and England. His courses in the language were solid and demanding. Students were kept hopping to take down the hundreds of linguistic forms that covered the board, in red or yellow or purple chalk, most of which stuck to the board, but some of which tinged the edges of his jacket, by the end of the class hour, or even, occasionally, his otherwise snow-white beard. He also taught other courses. Before the establishment of a full-scale program in creative writing, Ramsay taught the courses in advanced writing, the short story, and versification. He had done work in the local color movement, and
regularly taught the course in Recent Fiction, which, as the years went by, became less and less recent. Ramsay also taught Milton. Fairchild had a proprietary hold on the Milton course, offered at the undergraduate level; Ramsay was never allowed to teach it. To accommodate Ramsay, the Department added a second Milton course, to be offered at the graduate level and bearing a different title, "Miltonic Criticism." The course continued to be offered for years.\textsuperscript{55}

Fairchild, a native Canadian, with an A.B. from Toronto, in addition to his duties as chairman, usually taught in two upperclass areas—Shakespeare and Milton—and the large underclass lecture course Masterpieces. He is said to have been an austere but impressive lecturer at both levels. The two-semester Masterpieces gave to underclassmen, who might take no other English courses, a lively and informed introduction to great literature. Upon Fairchild's retirement the course passed to Professor Charles Prouty and later to Professor Charles Hudson, both excellent lecturers. In recent years the large lecture feature was given up in favor of a number of small classes.

Both Ramsay and Fairchild did fine work for the Department, a fact the more remarkable when one considers the long antagonism that existed between the two. It was intense, protracted, and largely inexplicable. Examination of the Ramsay papers in the Western Historical MSS Collection revealed to the present writer facts that suggest
a cause for the notorious "feud," as it is popularly called. They do not favor Professor Fairchild. Probably nothing would be gained by disclosing them here. Interested persons can consult the Collection or a summary of the matter, in the possession of the Chairman, if they wish to learn about it.
"Stoner"

Anyone seriously interested in the English Department at Missouri hears sooner or later of a novel "about" the Department, written by an instructor who taught in it in the 1950's, John Williams, and published in 1965 by the Viking Press. It has been out of print for some time, and apparently at present there is no plan for a second printing. The book still finds admiring readers, however, though copies are becoming increasingly scarce. Some indication of its continuing appeal is seen in what a used copy brings today--between sixty and seventy-five dollars, the author reports.

Columbians are often interested in the truth of the novel: Are there prototypes of its characters, and do events have parallels in actual life? From a critical point of view such questions are an impertinence, of course, doubly so when put to the author, as the present writer admits to having done. Both he and the author knew about fictional truth and had discussed it in and out of the classroom. Why, then, the inquiry? Simply because questions on the relation of fiction to fact are of interest, even among the literarily sophisticated.

Names of buildings and streets are obviously drawn from life. Williams had lived in Columbia, felt at home there, and knew enough of its particulars to provide a setting. A few other facts are mentioned, as, for instance, the Junior
English Examination. But characters have no prototypes in any important sense. The author reports that, like almost all others, he had heard of the Ramsay-Fairchild "feud," and that probably he did draw on it for the relationship between Stoner and his chairman, Hollis Lomax. Lomax is lame, as was Fairchild, and both, without apparent reason, persecute a colleague, though Lomax's fiendishly sadistic move to load Stoner's schedule with composition courses meeting at eight o'clock has no counterpart in Fairchild's chairmanship. For all his antagonism toward Ramsay, Fairchild never stooped that low. Asked about Fairchild's allegedly accusing Ramsay of stealing stamps, author Williams said he had never heard the story, and was glad, for had he known it, he said, he would have been tempted to use it, and it would not have suited his conception of the story's chairman, Lomax. Williams' experience is like that of Henry James, who welcomed suggestions for stories, but wanted only a "germ," because details from actuality would direct or confine his imaginative vision of this character.

In the end, therefore, we are left with what we should have known all along, and probably did: Stoner is not a roman à clef, but a story with its own inherent logic and nature, prompted by a familiar situation in real life, but developed into a life of its own.

Beyond the question of prototypical origins, is the matter—inappropriate to consider here at length—of the story's quality. Among its many excellences, one
appreciates the academic detail: the graduate student Charles Walker, for one, a slick, ignorant bluff, whose oily manner, though outrageously transparent, enables him (with the connivance of Lomax) to worm his way up and over the many hurdles on the course to a Ph.D. One of these, his oral, is particularly well handled. Walker responds to Stoner's request to name plays by Marlowe by mentioning Dr. Faust and The Jew of Malfi. But Lomax helps him out by "broadening the question a bit," and, when he later threatens to bring charges against Stoner, wins for Walker a passing vote on the examination.58 Another excellence, extremely poignant, is the devastating effect of this academic tyranny on the fond and tender relationship Stoner has realized with a talented and devoted graduate student, Katherine Driscoll.

With a Columbia setting, therefore, and a few recognizable references to the University, Stoner is a human story of a courageous man, who, beset by disappointments and betrayals, nevertheless remains dedicated to his job of sharing with students his knowledge of literature and his passion for it. The author has said that although not a "great" teacher, Stoner is one of thousands, neither great nor poor, who keep the faith and pass their invaluable heritage on to successors. John Williams was kind enough, in response to my inquiry, to say that although nobody in the Missouri Department "was Stoner . . . yet I think all of my
friends there had some of Stoner in them." It is a generous statement.
The English Department at Missouri experienced significant changes in the 1940's. Enrollments that had shrunk during the War rose dramatically afterward, with the influx of veterans supported by the GI Bill, that showcase of successful federal support of higher education which did so much to alter permanently, and for the better, the character of undergraduate life the country over. These increased numbers created a need for more staff, a need compounded in English at Missouri by the coincidental shrinkage of the existing staff at this time, through death (Ainsworth, 1940), retirement (Belden, 1938; Rankin, 1940; Brashear, 1945; Fairchild, 1946), and loss to administration (Tisdel, 1937, who was succeeded as Dean of the College of Arts and Science in 1939 by Winterton C. Curtis, who in turn was succeeded by Elmer Ellis, 1946-1954, who in 1954 became Acting President of the University and in 1955 President). An additional "loss," not to the University but to the English Department, was suffered in the formation in 1940 of the Department of Speech and Dramatic Art, which from the English faculty took Professors Bower Aly and Donovan Rhynsburger. Professor Loren Reid, on the English staff 1935-39, had in 1939 left Missouri for Syracuse University. In a nine-year span (1937-1946), therefore, the Department of English lost nine members of its professorial staff. By 1952 two more regular members (Professor Robert L. Ramsay
and Miss Lura Lewis) retired. Clearly the English Department needed rebuilding.

The man largely responsible for assembling a new staff was Professor Edward H. Weatherly, who with departmental approval and the very real help of his neighbor and close friend Dean Elmer Ellis, gathered together a number of young men (no women yet!) that the present writer will be excused, he trusts, for characterizing as a congenial, dedicated, and on the whole effective group of scholar-teachers: Regular appointees (1946-1951) were Donald B. Clark, Leon T. Dickinson, Donald F. Drummond, George B. Pace, and William H. Peden, and two notable visiting professors, Hardin Craig and John G. Neihardt. This group joined the small permanent staff of Weatherly, Ramsay, Harold Y. Moffett, Charles M. Hudson, and Charles T. Prouty. The regular Elizabethan post in these years was less stable. It was manned by Charles Prouty, appointed shortly before Weatherly's chairmanship, William Bracy, appointed during it, and Richard Hosley shortly after it. Having created a good working department, Professor Weatherly retired from the chairmanship in favor of Professor Moffett.

Professor Weatherly was a fitting person to put together an effective department. Acquainted with a leading university (Ph.D., Yale, 1932) and the Eastern academic community, he was always a Missourian. He was raised in Hannibal, was graduated from the University (taking dual bachelor degrees--A.B. and B.J. in 1926--and an M.A. in
1929) and so was the only department member to be both a native of the State and also an alumnus of its university. Although his view of academic matters was anything but parochial, he was ever the loyal alumnus, who knew the University and its clientele, and so had a personal as well as professional desire to build a good department. He wanted scholarly competence, of course, and he valued energy. He also sought congeniality and affability and good manners, partly because, it may well be, he had so recently witnessed in the Department the corrosive effect produced by a lack of such things.

He wanted strong specialists, but he expected a certain versatility, too, such as he himself had developed. He served the usual apprenticeship in underclass work—three years as Assistant Instructor at Missouri, following the M.A., one year at McKendree College, east of East St. Louis, following the Ph.D. (teaching jobs were almost non-existent in those years of the Great Depression), and four years at Northwestern, before returning in 1937, as Assistant Professor, to his alma mater. The work was varied, his experience broad, so that he was well equipped to teach a number of different courses, as the still small staff required. His special interest was the eighteenth century; he published in that field and regularly taught the graduate courses in Swift and in Johnson. He enjoyed the course in Browning, and no doubt transmitted some of the enthusiasm for him that he had experienced in the presentations of the
popular Yale lecturer William Lyon Phelps. Professor Weatherly's work in the English literature survey course led to his editing with three colleagues (Moffett, Prouty, and Noyes) the two-volume *The English Heritage*, the text used for fifteen years in the introductory course, *English Life and Literature*, and followed by *English Literature: A College Anthology*, edited by young staff members: Clark, Dickinson, Hudson, and Pace. The courses in World Literature, which Weatherly introduced and regularly taught, led to a two-volume anthology in that field also. Perhaps his most popular course was *The English Novel*.

The most visible sign of Ed Weatherly's early attachment to the University was his keen interest in Missouri athletics, a zest continuing undiminished from his days as an undergraduate. He served on the University Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, helping to hire coaches and doing his part to keep the athletic program honest and academically respectable. He introduced evening tutoring sessions for players who might need extra help to pass their courses legitimately. He was a close follower of the teams, especially the football team. He talked knowledgeably about plays and players—Missouri's and opponents'—and would inevitably appear Monday mornings ready and eager to discuss Saturday's game. A few of his younger colleagues could converse on his level of expertise, but others could not. They made it a point, though, before Monday morning, to glean from the paper who Saturday's
opponent had been and who had won. They agreed among
themselves that it would have been unbearable to have to
meet Ed in the corridor—beaming rejoicingly if Missouri had
come out on top Saturday, philosophically glum if she had
not—and have to ask him who had won the game. Ed knew
better than to press them for details, which was kind of
him, for they would have failed miserably if they had tried
to offer any. It was fall, and so it must be the football
season. Much beyond that they could not have gone.

Ed was soft-spoken and was leisurely in manner, perhaps
giving to an observer who did not know him an impression of
apathy or of indifference. The fact is his mind was acute,
as students who might at first have misjudged him were quick
to discover. Graduate students said—such tales are often
apocryphal, of course—that during student reports in seminar
he would often appear abstracted or preoccupied. On one
such occasion, it was said, he appeared to be balancing his
check book; but he was quite ready, when the student
finished, to pose questions showing a close knowledge not
only of the subject in general but also of the report just
delivered. It is not hard to credit the story, for the
action is quite in character: the easy manner belied a
quick mind. 61

Also in character was his generous treatment of col-
leagues. Miss Lura Lewis, for instance, had served faith-
fully for years teaching composition and overseeing the
activities of the literary sorority, Delta Tau Kappa. In
recognition of her long and competent service, Professor Weatherly recommended and secured, her last year before retirement, her promotion to Assistant Professor. He also helped out Professor Minnie Brashear. A good student of Mark Twain and other western writers, she was modest and unassuming about her very real contributions to the work of the Department. When in 1945 she was placed on "limited service" for reasons of poor health, her income stopped, or would have stopped if Professor Weatherly had not arranged that a modest annual stipend be paid her out of English Salaries.

The action, unknown to most, was in keeping with what the present writer, under consideration for an appointment, first learned of Ed Weatherly. When he inquired of a friend on campus about Missouri's English Department, he was told of its new chairman, Professor Weatherly. "He is a humane man," the friend wrote, a characterization that a friendship of thirty years with Ed Weatherly has repeatedly confirmed.
Hardin Craig and John G. Neihardt

Two visiting Department members during the Weatherly chairmanship, office mates in Jesse 209 (along with five other people!), eminent, though in totally different ways, popular with students, though different students, and generous in sharing their wisdom and talents with groups beyond the classroom, were Hardin Craig and John G. Neihardt. Each deserves mention in the present memorial sketch.

Professor Craig, through the efforts of Harold Moffett, came to Missouri in 1949, aged seventy-four, to fill temporarily the Elizabethan slot left vacant by Charles Prouty's move to Yale. Regular appointees in the field followed--first William Bracy and then Richard Hosley--but Craig stayed on until 1960. For three years thereafter he was Scholar in Residence at Stephens College, and from 1964 to 1967, the year before his death at age ninety-three, he was attached to his alma mater, Centre College in Danville, Kentucky. In those last years he was active enough to write a history of Centre College.

Centre is where he began his academic career, taking an A.B. there in 1897. It was a good liberal arts college, though not widely known until, in 1921, when college football had become established in the South and West, Centre College met and defeated Harvard at Cambridge in one of the most celebrated upsets in collegiate football
history. (The hero was Bo McMillin, later coach at Indiana; he ran forty yards on a reverse for the game's only score.) Craig studied English under Professor C. H. A. Wager, later of Oberlin College, and was moved to pursue graduate study, though "Why I came to Princeton," he wrote later, "I do not know." He took an M.A. in 1899 and a Ph.D. two years later, thus displaying early the drive and dedication that were such a marked feature of his academic life in Columbia. After two summers at the University of Chicago (1900, 1901) and a year at Exeter College, Oxford (1902-1903), he soon began a succession of substantial teaching stints at American universities: the state universities of Minnesota (1910-1919), Iowa (1919-1928), North Carolina (1942-1949), and Missouri (1949-1960), and also Stanford University (1928-1942). A broad experience, indeed, which alone gave him a wide acquaintance in the profession.

He was known, too, of course, for his publications: many articles, a history of English literature (with others), an anthology of English literature (with others), and perhaps the most influential, the Scott, Foresman edition (1931) of Shakespeare: A Historical and Critical Study with Annotated Texts of Twenty-one Plays. This big black book, one of several working texts of its time, generous in selections and rich in learned commentary and background material--Manly's Canterbury Tales and Frank Patterson's Student's Milton are others--was treasured by
graduate students struggling to "get up" Shakespeare for comprehensives. The work was revised and enlarged to The Complete Works of Shakespeare, and was completed in Columbia and published in 1951.

Perhaps Hardin Craig's most solid work was The Enchanted Glass (1935); the phrase is in an epigraph drawn from Bacon's The Advancement of Learning. A study of "the Elizabethan mind in literature," the sub-title reads, and the preface says the work treats "a body of scientific, philosophic, and social considerations sometimes unknown, often concealed from view, and oftener still disregarded." It was called by Hazelton Spencer "a valuable introduction to the intellectual background" of Elizabethan literature.

A "Sequel to The Enchanted Glass" is the sub-title of a late book of Craig's, New Lamps for Old (1960). On the basis of much reading in twentieth-century thinkers—Einstein, Susanne Langer, Whitehead—Craig tries to come to some valid generalizations about modern belief and to address them to an imagined man of the Renaissance. This scheme was a device of self-inquiry; to explain his age to another age he must first understand it. Much in modern intellectual life he deplores; but he believes he sees signs of a coming change, a new "renaissance," a set of new beliefs that might undergird a new creative age similar in spirit to the one that followed the Middle Ages. Even if one heard Craig expound this notion in public address, it is probably fair to
say that such conviction as the presentation won was owing as much to the man's earnest and enthusiastic manner as to the logic of the argument. Stimulating it was, though, to hear him hold forth.

Craig made a place for himself at Missouri immediately. His manner was easy, his address affable. He was totally without pomp or pretension. All called him "Hardin" easily, though he was "Dr. Craig" to his respectful helpers. He worked it so that he had people, usually women, to look after him. Not all could qualify, for not only must they buy his tickets, run his errands, and, it was said, darn his socks, they must have academic credentials as well. They would keep his records, read his examinations, act as buffer to absorb the shock of complaining students, and even read proof and tend to other clerical aspects of getting out an edition. They loved their role, and Craig, a widower for years, appreciated being tended to.

He was an avid golfer, as a Scot should be. He would welcome a ride from his rooms southwest of the campus to the Stephens College course, but if necessary he would gladly walk the distance, toting his bag, play nine holes and walk back. This at age seventy-nine or so. The present writer recalls being astounded at how quickly Craig could shower and get back to his desk for some proofreading before supper. His vegetarian diet--not a philosophical choice but a doctor's prescription years before--suited him well; to it he attributed his good health. He had no vices except a
pipe, stuffed with Union Leader (economical for a thrifty Scot) that would fumigate 209 and the halls beyond. He corrupted Professor Fulweiler into using it—"young Fulweiler," which was all right, because Howard was young, comparatively. But Craig would refer to "Young Ed Weatherly," too—or call young anyone else under sixty.

He played golf well for a man of his years. He would knock a drive down the fairway—not very far but straight. The young bucks in the foursome, politely hiding their pity for such a feeble tee shot, would get up and waggle ostentatiously, press till the veins stood out in their temples, and let fly. But the ball would follow an errant trajectory, and then they would begin a long trek, through briar and bush, over hill and dale, through forest and glen, to recover the ball. Back in civilization they would see Craig and his ball on the green, most likely in fewer strokes than they had expended in their sylvan excursions. His gait was distinctive—slightly rolling, torso leaning forward, as if into the wind, the picture of determination, fitting for study as well as links. On the rare occasions when his ball, too, found its way into the undergrowth, he would not suffer its loss gladly. We would search patiently, and might eventually have to give up. But we would be back that way again, if not this season, then next. After all, it was a good ball, with only a few cuts. One could not—a Scot could not—let it go easily.

The man was an ideal companion—learned (though never
pedantic), well informed, widely acquainted, interested, curious, a good talker, a good listener, a source of gaiety and good feeling. The present writer, on the eve of embarking for The Netherlands to fill a Fulbright lectureship in a Dutch university, discussed with Craig how European universities differed from American ones. "They won't work you very hard," he said; "they have much more leisure than we do." In the same vein, at a fine luncheon of Mrs. Moffett's, he went on to tell of the man who was named The Merton Professor at Oxford.

"What will you have to do as Merton Professor?" he was asked.

"Do?" he replied. "I won't have to do anything. I am the Merton Professor."

The man had friends everywhere, including Amsterdam, and the present writer enjoyed being shown about the city by a Dutch professor for an entire afternoon simply because he had presented himself as a friend of Hardin Craig's.

As an Elizabethan scholar from a neighboring state put it while visiting the Missouri campus,

"Hardin Craig has certainly added luster to your department, hasn't he."

One could only agree, that yes, indeed, he had done that, and more.
The other patriarchal figure with Craig in Jesse 209 in the 1950's was John G. Neihardt. Craig, distinguished, to be sure, was cast in the familiar mold of English scholar; Neihardt's mold, on the other hand, was unfamiliar, because unique. "Young Fulweiler" experienced them both in his first year at Missouri, fresh from graduate school. If he was introduced to Union Leader by Craig, he had the distinction of being addressed by Neihardt always as "Fella." Fulweiler was later to learn about the Sioux and Neihardt's literary treatment of them, but what impressed him at first was Neihardt's familiarity with standard literature. The talk included Tennyson, Fulweiler remembers, and soon Neihardt was reciting whole portions of the "Morte d'Arthur" from memory, to be followed by incisive comment on its prosody. Or he would intone, virtually sing, the Greek hexameters of Homer's Iliad, also from memory. Who was this remarkable man?

The outward facts are well known, since the outlines of his life have often been recorded, oftener, certainly, than those of any other department member. He was born in 1881 in Illinois, grew up in Nebraska, near an Omaha Indian reservation, came to know and admire Indians, wrote of them in several volumes of verse, culminating in a collection, the five-part epic, A Cycle of the West, received the honorary degree of D. Litt. from the University of Missouri.
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in 1947 (he had been voted Poet Laureate of Nebraska by the legislature in 1921), and taught in its Department of English from 1949 to 1968, five years before his death. But the outer facts—John would be the first to say so—are less important than the inner ones. The present account can hint at the latter in its concern with John Neihardt during his years in the Missouri English Department.

Dr. Neihardt would usually teach two courses, one close to the regular needs of the Department, the other his own special course. The former was sometimes The Writing of Poetry, in which he brought to his teaching all of the knowledge of prosody that he has acquired over the years. He had written on it, first in the address he delivered in 1921 when he acknowledged Nebraska's conferring on him the title of Poet Laureate, and again in 1925 in the volume Poetic Values. The course was a solid one, though not all of it was applicable to verse of the mid-twentieth century. Another standard course, though somewhat geared to the teacher's talents and interests, was Book Review and Critical Essay. Here Neihardt could draw on his long journalistic experience as reviewer for newspapers in Minneapolis, Kansas City, New York (The New York Times), and St. Louis, where for twelve years he wrote for the Post-Dispatch. This, too, was a respected course.

His big course, though, was Epic America, the text for which was A Cycle of the West. This course was immensely popular, partly, cynics said, because it was so easy, and
grades uniformly high. If some colleagues were inclined to this view, prompted in part by the long file of burly chaps at registration who were unusually eager to be admitted to the course, it was because they felt that the course should be an elective rather than a central course in American literature. Nobody denied John's drawing power, or begrudged it.

His appeal was special, as was universally reported and as anyone who heard him could see. His sessions were performances, not contrived but wholly natural, and the students felt it. An even five feet, topped by an abundant shock of silver hair, a neat pince-nez at the center of a furrowed face--John Neihardt was a striking figure. Then when one heard the deep baritone ringing out the poet's own pentameters, he was truly moved. Even without the verse, he was an arresting presence, as Dick Cavett noted in reference to Neihardt's appearance on his television program. In a prefatory note to Neihardt's *All is But a Beginning*, an autobiographical volume, Cavett wrote that Neihardt's appearance on the show "drew the kind of mail I had not received before, nor have I since."71

The appearance on national television was a part of what Frank Luther Mott earlier had called the "Resurgence of Neihardt,"72 citing editions of his work (the collection *A Cycle of the West* and the reprinted *Black Elk Speaks*, 1961), critical writing on the author, some of it substantial, and a phonograph record, issued by Orpheus, of the poet reading
his verse. Professor Mott welcomed the "resurgence" but hazarded no opinion as to its cause. A few possible ones, unsupported guesses, may here be ventured: (1) the interest in things American following World War II, seen, for instance, in the Fulbright program and in the burgeoning of university interdisciplinary courses in American Civilization, Studies, or Culture; (2) a new interest in the ethnology of the American Indian and a growing desire for a long-overdue restitution to the nation's first neglected minority; and (3) a new interest in things of the spirit, as seen, for instance, in sects and cults devoted to meditation and influenced by beliefs and practices of the East.

A person with any or all of these interests would find much to his taste in Black Elk Speaks (1932; 1961). It is a redaction of conversations Neihardt had with the Sioux holy man Black Elk. In the first edition the title page included the phrase "as told to John G. Neihardt," but in the later edition, at the author's request, "to" was changed to "through," thus minimizing the importance of the "teller," or first narrator, emphasizing Black Elk instead, and, strangely, helping authenticate what he said. Of all writings on the American Indian, from Henry Rowe Schoolcraft and Longfellow on down, it just may be that the book on Black Elk does the most to convey the inner truth of the Indian. Neihardt had the full confidence of Black Elk, who, when the two first met, said: "As I sit here, I can feel in this man beside me a strong desire to learn what I know, and
I will teach him." He had a likely pupil, for Neihardt was quite prepared and ready to listen sympathetically. Both men were mystics, in the William James sense, and so there was no gap to be bridged. As a Sioux chief said of Neihardt, "His heart is as Sioux as ours." So, if some slipped through his course Epic America without exerting themselves, how is that different from the experience in many, perhaps most, classes? The important point is that this remarkable man reached many people and gave them something unique and unforgettable.

The legacy of John Neihardt is partly material, in the form of the substantial personal library, numbering some 4400 volumes, which he left to the University. At the present it is housed in the stacks of Ellis Library, just off the corner of the Language Reading Room. In that room, near the special card catalogue of the Neihardt Collection, is a handsome sculpted head of the poet, the work of his wife of fifty years, Mona Martinsen. Returned from Paris, where she had studied with Auguste Rodin, she discovered and was moved by the love poems in Neihardt's first volume of lyrics, A Bundle of Myrrh (1907), corresponded with the author, and soon met him in Omaha, where they were married.

It is rewarding to browse in the Neihardt stacks to see what fed the man's mind: fiction (Scott, George Eliot, Meredith, Balzac, Victor Hugo), the ancients (Virgil, Ovid, Cicero, Homer, Plato), history (Josephus, Suetonius, Saxo
Grammaticus, current history), biography, Americana, especially of the West, religion, philosophy, and psychology. One is perhaps surprised at the thinness of holdings in English and American poetry until he realizes that Neihardt, seeming to follow Emerson's injunction on reading, preferred source material to the use other writers had put it to. The source material is what education is all about, Neihardt believed, for it makes possible "the process of expanding the individual consciousness to include as much of race consciousness as possible, with universal sympathy as the ideal achievement." There are exceptions, notably Tennyson. Neihardt's sisters saved soap wrappers, redeemable for premium items—a common practice two or three generations ago, and an unsung cultural influence in American life. In return for their bundle of accumulated wrappers they got several 16mo paperback copies of classics. One of them was Idylls of the King, "by the very poet whom I had come to hold in awe!" That dog-eared volume, wrote Neihardt, obtained in 1893, when he was twelve years old, was for him "the most precious item in my collections at the University of Missouri library." Perhaps we all have had such a volume in our youth—a "Great Front Gate to the World of Wonder, Wisdom and Beauty."76 For John Neihardt that Great Front Gate was Alfred, Lord Tennyson.
The administration of any working body—the determination, location, and assignment of responsibility and the power that goes with it, together with the ways in which such arrangements operate—these matters are not the most thrilling to read about. They are important, though, to the effective working of a body, and so deserve mention here. The administrative procedures in the Department of English at Missouri have probably changed more in the last fifteen years than in the entire history of the Department before this time. A brief look at the changes, and their whys, and wherefores, will help describe the Department of today.

The basic fact is size of the professorial staff. Between 1965 and 1983 the staff nearly tripled—from eleven to thirty-three or four. The office force grew from two to five. Increased enrollment necessitated more staff, and University President John Weaver was quick to recognize the need, moved in part, no doubt, by demographic projections that pointed to an all but inevitable demand for trained teachers and scholars. That those projections were not entirely borne out by events is another story; they were believed at the time, and academic departments the country over expanded to fill the need.

The brunt of the effort to expand was borne largely by Professor Howard Fulweiler, and to an extent by his
successors in the chairmanship, Professors Milton Gatch and Jack Roberts. Fulweiler was the junior member of longest tenure in the Department when the chairmanship came vacant in 1967. Most of the older members had done a stint in the office; others were unwilling to serve or were unsuited to do so. Fulweiler was named, therefore, and faced not merely "his turn" in office, but also the important change that would transform the Department from a small one to a large one. These terms, common in professional discussion of the subject, refer of course to numbers, but more importantly to what the numbers imply: a relatively simple and unified program or a variety of courses and programs designed to accommodate various needs; homogeneity (professional and social) or the lack of it; and a simple administrative structure or one complex enough to serve the department offering varied programs and courses. Fulweiler felt his way, learned from other departments and from such cooperative colleagues as Roger Meiners and Dick Renner, and did much to establish the Department as a well-functioning "large" one.

Minutes of department meetings were kept--an innovation in the 1950's--and copies distributed. The privilege of serving as scribe was usually granted to the most recent appointee, who strove to make his or her recordings succinct and pithy. To make them interesting and to reward reading them, the writer might color them slightly with irony, or even flirt with frivolity. But at all costs the keeper
aimed at accuracy, because they had to be a trustworthy record of deliberations and decisions. More than once they have been consulted in order to dispel the mists of members' confusion as to what they had earlier decided.

Another guide for departmental activity, valuable to all members, but especially to new members, and, above all, to new chairmen, was a set of regulations, called a constitution, or, more accurately, By-Laws. What could and could not (or should and should not) be done was spelled out in a statesmanlike document that has made for stability and consistency and continuity. Dick Renner authored the original draft. It provided the right of amendment, but the right has seldom been exercised, so comprehensive is the instrument and sensitive to the needs and wishes of members. It has been consulted many times and has proved a major administrative help.

The By-Laws included the description of machinery for selecting a chairman. Until about mid-century the chief executive of a department was a head, thereafter a chairman. Although there is no intrinsic semantic difference between the two terms, they have come, through academic usage, to differ, principally as regards method of selection and length of tenure in office. A head is selected from above for an indefinite period; a chairman is selected by his departmental colleagues for a specified period. In both cases there is usually consultation between at least some department members and the higher administrative
officers--at Missouri the Dean of the College of Arts and Science--to obtain advice needed for consent.

The advantages of a headship are stability and continuity. If a head has the confidence and respect of his colleagues and dean, and if he has something of a reputation in his field and some national visibility, he can, over a period of years, do much to strengthen the department. A chairmanship, too, has advantages. A term in the office sharpens one's awareness of needs and problems of the department. It also acquaints one with concerns and procedures of the university and of the college of which his department is a part. It is true also that if he does not do his job well, no worry; his term will be up soon. With a head, unless he is hopelessly obnoxious, colleagues are "disposed to suffer while evils are sufferable," if only barely, and so to put up grudgingly with a leader they resent. He can be ousted, of course; the power and the mechanism to remove him usually exist. But the effort to do so "can be accomplished only with much pain for all concerned, and the ill-will generated by the effort can plague a department for many years."77

One should heed such warning, for good feeling within a department is far from unimportant. A system of chairmanships helps avoid the trouble just mentioned. Shortly after this system was adopted (more in departments of the Arts than of Sciences, where headships still exist), the Dean of the College of Arts and Science adopted with it the
procedure of naming a chairman according to seniority. The 1950's, therefore, were a kind of half-way station between a head and a chairman: A person was appointed by the Dean, as the old head had been, but he was picked by the arbitrary (and therefore seemingly fair) principle of seniority and for a limited tenure, features closer to the system followed at present.

Refinements of the selection process were spelled out in the Department By-Laws. The term of office was there specified as three years, with a second term of three years possible at the will of the members. Nomination and election by written ballot in a multi-stage process administered by an ad hoc committee were aimed at insuring privacy of choice and forestalling electioneering. If the latter goal has been achieved only partially, it is still worth aiming at for the sake of the departmental harmony desired by all.

Probably the most notable difference between the old and the new dispensations for running the Department is the proliferation of committees. Although they are the object of banter in academic circles--committees are the creatures of lovers of bureaucracy, committees are the end product of deliberation (discuss, lay on the table, form a committee), and committees are the legitimization of buck-passing--committees are an effective way of getting work done. In a large department they are indispensable; committee-of-the-whole would be altogether unwieldy. In a
small department, because committee-of-the-whole is feasible, assigning problems to separate committees seems unnecessary and is usually dispensed with. But there are possible dangers in so doing. The department as a whole cannot be as well informed on a given issue as a committee specializing in it. Moreover, the atmosphere of a committee meeting, less formal than that of a department meeting, is more conducive to free and full discussion; it is also less hospitable to the persuasive methods of the spellbinder and the man of power and influence. Still another advantage of the committee is its size. Students of the matter have concluded that five is the optimum size for effective work. So the creation of committees necessitated by the Department's growth was more than an accommodation to its increased size; it was a positive gain in the administration of the Department's affairs.

Besides ad hoc committees (including the all-important recruitment committee), the By-Laws authorize standing committees. These include committees on necessary but somewhat peripheral matters, such as lectures, publicity, library. More central are the committees charged with overseeing all aspects of the Department's work at three levels: Underclass Studies, Undergraduate Studies, and Graduate Studies. All of these may initiate change on their own, though in proposed major changes, they seek the approval of the entire Department. They are large committees (more than five members!), composed of members
from each area, and so reflect various interests and opinions. They work hard and keep the heart of the Department beating steadily.

A particularly sensitive and vital committee is that dealing with matters of personnel, particularly matters of promotion and tenure. It is composed of full professors and associate professors (except when any of the latter are themselves up for consideration). Candidates eligible for promotion or tenure are judged on performance in the traditional areas of service, teaching, and publication. Departmental attitude (and that of the College) toward publication has changed during the last generation from one of hope and encouragement to a virtual demand; accordingly the list of departmental publications has grown markedly, many of the items being of significance and high quality.

The Personnel Committee takes pains to secure objective evidence of a candidate's performance, to go with one's subjective opinion, which cannot and should not be ignored in a total evaluation. Student evaluations, class visitations by tenured faculty, reading of publications, and securing evaluations by knowledgeable persons outside the University--these are the chief sources of evidence of performance. Each has its value, but none by itself is wholly reliable. The procedure as a whole is time consuming, but extremely important. The results of following it in recent years have generally been satisfactory.
By comparison with ways of today, yesterday's methods seem the Model T of administrative procedure. Buttonholing a colleague in office or hall, maybe two at once, was an easy way to determine opinion. A Corridor Consensus it was, and although apparently casual, it worked well for its time. Decisions were no more regretted later than they are today. Clearly it would not work for today's department. It was a luxury of an earlier time.

A positive recent gain in procedure of voting, in the Department large or small, is the secret written ballot. Before it was adopted it was felt to be unnecessary—presumably, that is, for it was never discussed. The group tended to be of like mind; if one disagreed, he was free to dissent—wasn't he? Technically, yes, in actuality, not really. Pressure of unspoken assumptions could easily intimidate members, most likely the younger ones. On rare occasions an untenured member might bravely challenge the consensus, but if he persisted in such outspokenness, he might pay dearly for his privilege, and some did. In sensitive areas, such as matters of personnel, the written ballot is especially needed, to forestall that which, by whatever name, is sheer bullying. The written ballot, guaranteed by the By-Laws, prevents it.
History, both past events and the written account of them, involves change. So with a sketch of the curriculum in the English Department at Missouri. Things are different now than they used to be. It is true, though, as one can discover in old catalogues, that all is not new; much is the same. An English major today using a catalogue of 1922 or even of 1910 could (except for coverage of "modern" literature) devise a course of study not essentially different from the one outlined in today's catalogue. Yet change there has been, and it should be mentioned in this sketch. If the present writer must necessarily regard many late innovations as not really new, he also is no champion of the old merely because it is old and to him familiar. The latter is symbolized by the precious scrap in the Old Timer's lecture notes, irregularly shaped, the substance crumbling, the edges nibbled at persistently by Time, the sacred inscription rubbed to illegibility over the years, the whole, though lifted close to eye with reverent gentleness, threatening at any moment to disintegrate completely right before the expectant class. No, change is needed. Each age must write its own books, as the sage said, and each department must plan its own curriculum. For a full treatment of discussions of the matter one must go to the minutes and reports of the several Departmental committees responsible for curricular affairs. What follows
is no summary of them, but rather a mention of some of the changing features of the curriculum.

Some things change, but don't stay changed; or rather, they change back again to what they were. An instance is the first literature course for majors. For years it was the traditional survey, from Beowulf to Thomas Hardy and possibly a bit beyond. The course could touch on everything related to the work examined: biography, literary history (forms, conventions, sources, influences), social, political, and intellectual history—especially at a time when the teaching of history, as has been seen, devolved upon the English Department—and philosophy, religion, and science. Potentially, and actually when taught well, the course was a rich display of the thought, opinion, and imaginative vision of the English people. What a treasurable gift! Why on earth would one want to tamper with a course so valuable?

The answer, stated or implied in committee counsels, as it had been in many other English departments, went something like this: the panorama is fine, the cultural history is excellent, the narrative of development is superb, but of what value the coherent narrative of development if one does not know the constituent parts? In short, the students are not ready for the synthesizing account because they really do not know how to read. It is a disservice to literature, and to students, to talk all around a poem and never to consider closely the poem itself, never to teach, in the phrase of W. K. Wimsatt, "what to say
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Something on this score could be taught in the survey course, but it would necessarily be secondary or subordinate to other considerations. What was needed was genre courses—a separate semester each for poetry, for fiction, and for drama.

The abandonment of the prerequisite for majors of the two-semester survey in favor of two of the three genre courses seemed to solve the problem. Now a student could learn what a poem, a story, a play is, and could talk and write about it intelligently.

Ah, but now he does not see the work in context. He mixes up the centuries, thinking nothing of treating those two great sonneteers, Milton and Keats, as though they were contemporaries, if not close neighbors. Something must be done to provide him with an historical sense. Close reading is not everything; a work is of its time and place, and to ignore the fact may mean seriously to misread the work. Perhaps the old survey was not so bad, after all.

Rather than return to it, however, or try to devise a course covering both historical and critical matters, the Department elected to expose its majors in underclass years to both matters but in separate courses: for technique and the tools of critical analysis they would be required to take two genre courses, Introduction to Poetry and either Introduction to Fiction or Introduction to Drama; for literary history they could take one or both of the courses titled "The Tradition of English Literature," which, though
not required, were to be "strongly recommended." This compromise, recognizing the importance of both the historical and the critical approaches but preferring to treat the two in separate courses, resembles the structuring of the two seminars for upperclass Departmental honors students. At both levels the division has made for clarity of intention, and the arrangement seems to most to be satisfactory.

Another fluctuating feature in Departmental affairs is handling large classes. At one extreme is the large lecture course—Introduction to Shakespeare (with an enrollment of about 350) is the principal one—consisting of three lectures a week and no sectioning at all. Contact with students is made through graders, carefully chosen, and well schooled in the material, who are available for conferences with students about the course, including the test papers they write. At the other extreme for many years was the first course in American literature, which from its inception in the early '60's was a multi-section course. At its peak there were fifteen sections. There were controls to insure a measure of uniformity in the sections, but a section teacher was autonomous in the management of the course. The teachers, other than two or three permanent staff members, were usually candidates for the Ph.D. specializing in American literature, as for years had been the case with the Instructors specializing in a period of English literature who were teaching the elementary survey
English Life and Literature. At its best the system worked well. The instructors liked the course partly because it was a refreshing change from a heavy load of courses in composition, and partly because preparation to teach the course was at the same time preparation for the comprehensive examination they would sooner or later face. Further, such teaching experience was an asset on one's professional record. These features of sectioning were attractive to young teachers, and tended to draw from them their best efforts. The system also made for good morale and, with the American course, helped create a sense of community among the Americanists at all professional levels.

Recently the elementary American literature course has changed from a sectional course to a large lecture course, the lecture assignments being shared by the several Americanists on the staff and occasionally by an especially well-qualified Teaching Assistant. Each learns by listening to his colleagues, whom, oddly, he has not heard lecture before. The students presumably get first-class instruction, and the section people (since one day a week the class meets in sections taught by Teaching Assistants) profit from attending a series of lectures in their field, taught by the whole American staff, who will be their examiners on Comprehensives. The structure thus resembles that for the old TV course in English literature, except that the lecturers are multiple and are live—very much so.
A course that developed in the opposite direction—from large lecture to individual sections—is Masterpieces, an elementary two-semester course treating literature of all genres, and, as taught by some teachers, drawn from various periods and nations. It is designed to offer samples of good literature—masterpieces, indeed—to students, especially freshmen, not intending to take other courses in literature. How best appeal to them?

For some twenty years Masterpieces was a full-scale lecture course, taught by Professor Fairchild. Thereafter, for shorter periods, it was taught by Professors Prouty, Hudson, and Renner. Then, at about the time sectioned American Literature was forming, Masterpieces, too, was divided into autonomous sections, and to date has remained divided.

The problem of handling large numbers of students in a course is a perennial one. It has been solved in several ways, depending on the needs, desires, and availability of staff. No single way is ideal; all are reasonably effective arrangements.

Over the years there has not been great flexibility in curricular affairs. For one thing, conditions did not invite change. Proposals for change had to be justified before a college curriculum committee and the Dean, both of whom had to be persuaded of the need for change. They did not like multiplying courses and issuing a catalogue listing a number of courses not taught regularly. Also, they felt
that change—great or sudden change—worked against the stability desired by the Administration. 82

The Department, for its part, has not been prone to change things radically. The material is fixed, the curriculum has been regarded as more or less "standard" in the field and as having worked well, and individual courses have acquired something of a local reputation. There was no felt need for change. Probably the greatest deterrent to change has been inertia of the stable departmental personnel, unchallenged or unleavened by new voices. In recent years the additions to the staff have changed the situation, probably for the better.

What of the Department's relation to the larger currents of American higher education, especially that of literary study? Missouri, including the English Department, was influenced by the inaugural announcement, in 1869, of Harvard's President Eliot of the need for an elective system of curriculum. A long overdue breaking of the curricular strait jacket, the elective system influenced curriculum making throughout the country and from college down, in many communities, to elementary school. Several Missouri administrators, at this time when Missouri was becoming a university, traveled to the East to learn about the new ideas, and before long the Missouri curriculum, including English, allowed far greater choice of courses than formerly. The liberation was not extreme, however; and when Chicago's Hutchins and others, in the 1930's, scornfully
called the elective system an academic cafeteria, where the patrons did not know how to select what was properly nourishing, Missouri did not need to feel reprimanded. It had never allowed full and free choice of courses.

Nor can the influence of German scholarship, the "philological" approach to literature, be said to have greatly influenced work in the Department. It can be seen in the work of Belden, the only person in the Department trained in Germany, and to an extent in that of Ramsay and possibly Fairchild, but not much beyond them.

Another change nationally in literary study, this in the first third of the twentieth century and beyond, was the new attention paid to the European literary heritage. The ancient classics, for instance, had become less and less familiar territory even to the "educated." The spread of higher education to greater numbers of all classes, the appeal of new, "modern" subjects like psychology and sociology, and the demands of a practical society for practical training of the young, especially in state institutions benefitting from the Morrill ("land grant") Act, devoted to supporting the "agricultural and mechanic arts," these and other forces tended to withdraw Greek and later Latin from the requirements (for entrance or for graduation), first in the western land-grant institutions and later in the traditional, private, and classics-oriented institutions in the East. It became more and more apparent that if the thought and expression of the ancient world were
to be known at all, they would have to be known in translation. Better, of course, in the original; much is lost in translation, say the knowing. But better in translation than not at all. Besides, said the humanists, trying to locate some virtue in the mandatory retrenchment, the experience of generations of school boys and girls in wrestling with Latin was hardly a literary experience. One learned the declensions and conjugations and perhaps could parse Virgil; but he would not know Dido and Aeneas—a poor bargain. Then, too, one would have to read some of the modern classics in translation, since most readers are not equipped to read many foreign languages. Translation was the answer. This would be the means of acquainting young Americans with European classics, and so of countering the tendency toward a cultural insularity that threatened in the westward-facing nineteenth century.

The efforts of educators to acquaint modern readers with European literary masterpieces are well known: At Columbia University John Erskine in 1919 "began the movement to reintroduce the study of great books into American education." He also helped in the preparation of Great Books of the Western World, edited by Robert M. Hutchins and Mortimer J. Adler, of the University of Chicago, who, in addition to their teaching at the University, sought with the published set to stimulate interest in "the Great Books" beyond the walls of academe. Influential also, and a sign of the times, was the "Harvard Report," published in 1945 as
General Education in a Free Society. It described the required Harvard humanities course as concerned with the "Great Texts of Literature."

Interest in the great Western writings at the University of Missouri is reflected in several new course offerings around the mid-century mark and somewhat before. The four-semester Humanities sequence, open to underclassmen with a high grade-point average, although administratively not under the jurisdiction of the English Department, is part of the English story if only because Professor Charles Hudson, of the English Department, was a prime mover in instituting the course. He and Professor Arthur Berndtson, of the Department of Philosophy, were commissioned by then Dean Elmer Ellis to study humanities courses in representative institutions. Berndtson visited a number of campuses, and in 1951-1952 Hudson spent a semester at Columbia University and one at the University of Florida observing and conferring about their humanities courses. Returned, they planned the course that since its inception in the mid '50's has continued to provide for the talented student a quality introduction to the humanistic tradition. Guest lecturers on campus speak of their specialties--art, history, philosophy--which the teacher tries to synthesize into a meaningful whole. But basic to the course is literature--such classics as Homer, Dante, Milton, Shakespeare, Cervantes, Moliere, Goethe. Teachers have been drawn from several departments, most of them from English, including Professors
Hudson, Renner, Hocks, Fulweiler, Hinnant, Parke, and Foley.

Two other literature courses are clearly within the purview of the English Department: General Literature, for upperclassmen not specializing in literature, and Comparative Literature (originally "World Literature"), for upperclassmen majoring in English. Instituted partly as an accommodation to the tastes and talents of the teachers involved, the courses have continued to fill a genuine need: for General Literature, the opportunity for non-majors (engineers, pre-medics, etc.) to read under supervision in a general, non-technical approach, some of the classics of the Western World; and for Comparative Literature, the chance for majors, through a reading of European classics, to gain some familiarity with the larger cultural context of which English literature is a part. Both courses have drawn well, and should continue to do so, provided qualified and interested teachers are available to teach them. Many are or could become qualified, for all like to regard themselves as well read, and are indeed generalists of sorts. But the texts are outside the recognized fields of English, and rewards usually go to the one specializing--and publishing--in his chosen field. Even so, the courses will be taught, and they should be.

Missouri experienced what probably has been the most far-reaching development in literary study in the century--what used to be called the New Criticism (after
John Crowe Ransom's title) and, more recently, merely "close reading." So familiar to the literary world is this development, that only a few names and titles need be mentioned: I. A. Richards' discovery that his Cambridge students could not read poems and his discussion of this lamentable condition and how to treat it in his Practical Criticism (1929); the work of the Nashville "Fugitives" (Tate, Ransom, Warren) and the collaboration of Robert Penn Warren with Cleanth Brooks in two extremely influential textbooks, Understanding Poetry (1939) and Understanding Fiction (1945); the "[University of] Chicago School," led by R. S. Crane, author and editor of Critics and Criticism (1952), which favored close literary analysis, but questioned some of the assumptions of the New Criticism; and many other influential critics, including Reuben Brower, T. S. Eliot, William Empson, F. O. Matthiessen, Rosamond Tuve, Austin Warren, W. K. Wimsatt, and Yvor Winters.

The Missouri reaction to the New Criticism was varied. Graduate students were said to "place" their teachers on a spectrum, ranging from enthusiastic supporter and effective practitioner, to enthusiastic supporter and ineffective practitioner, to timid disciple and erratic practitioner, to hostile antagonist and no practitioner, to, finally, one ignorant of what the fuss was all about. But there is little evidence in the Department of the heat and acrimony that elsewhere often attended the discussion of the new way of studying literature.
Those that valued it taught it; the others proceeded more traditionally. The difference was brought home to the present writer shortly after joining the staff. His announcement to a colleague in the hall that he was on his way to class to teach Elizabethan lyrics drew this response: "They're nice, aren't they. But there's really not much you can say about them, is there?" Possibly not, but no new critic would admit it. He took pride in his ability to say a great deal—about a small text. Indeed, it was said jocosely that one's critical skill could be measured by the brevity of the text he spent fifty minutes expounding; the shorter the text, the better the critic.

The debate over the New Criticism subsided, nationwide, when scholars restored to literary discussion the historical, social, political, and ideational contexts which the new critics had of course known, but which, in their zeal to clarify and so promote their new methods, they had chosen for a while to ignore. Then, too, persons added to the staff in the '60's and '70's were familiar with "close reading," having been trained in it in their literary schooling. How completely it has been assimilated in the Department is evidenced in the "critical" part of the M.A. final examination, which for some years has required students to examine closely a given poem and to tell "how" it means. The method is no longer a novelty, but an accepted requisite of critical competence.
Other critical approaches—Marxism, history of ideas, and archetypal myth—have been valued and used by the staff in class work and in publications in varying degrees. No one of them, however, at UMC, has won the allegiance as a useful method that the New Criticism won. In summary concerning Missouri's relation to schools and fashions of literary study, it can be said that the professors have been aware—some more than others—of new ways of studying literature and writing about it, but they have been eclectic in incorporating them in their own teaching and research. They have not been innovators in such matters, the breaking of new ground usually, though not always, being the province of the independent institutions. But they have been familiar with influential changes, have made use of them, and have passed them along to their students.

One majoring in English follows a program in Creative Writing, to be considered further on, or the more traditional program of the study of literature. Except for its necessary encompassing of twentieth-century literature, the literature major is much like what it was seventy years ago. Then and thereafter one concentrating in English and American literature took several electives in related subjects (history, Classics, philosophy, foreign language or literature) in addition to a number of courses in English (in writing, language, and literature). Formerly the term designating this distribution was Major-Minor. More
recently the term is Area of Concentration, the difference from Major-Minor being two-fold: Under the "Area" plan, "related" work is not concentrated in one department, a "minor," but is, or may be, spread through several; and the distribution of courses in English is more definitely specified. In place of the former requirement of at least one course in "Older Literature" (the beginnings through Milton) and one in "Later Literature" (the Eighteenth Century down to modern times), the Area plan requires at least one English course in each of seven periods or subjects (Medieval, Renaissance, Seventeenth Century, Eighteenth Century, Nineteenth Century, Twentieth Century, and American Literature). Always a popular major, English has attracted students not only in the College of Arts and Science, but also those in the Schools of Education, Journalism, and Law. Underclass work preparatory to the major includes the genre course Introduction to Poetry (required) and often one or two semesters of The Tradition of English Literature ("Strongly recommended of English majors"). Majors thus are somewhat experienced in literary study, they write quite well on the whole, and so are equipped to get good, solid training in reading in the corpus of English and American literature.

To provide an especially rich program for the talented student with a high grade-point average, the Department offers a Departmental Honors program for upperclass students—not to be confused with the underclass "General
Honors" courses, administered by the autonomous Honors College. The latter was launched in response to the "post Sputnik" national concern for quality education and the seeking out and training of especially talented young people. Departmental Honors, on the other hand, has been a fixture in the curriculum of the English Department for many years. Conceived as something of an antidote to the tendency, in an institution without stringent entrance requirements, for academic work to gravitate toward an undistinguished common denominator, Departmental Honors has attracted excellent students over the years. When the present writer taught the honors course some thirty years ago, he had a class of ten, of whom five continued in graduate school, at Missouri and elsewhere, and attained tenured professorships at Kansas, Cape Girardeau, Indiana, Kent State, and Virginia.

The seminar-like character of honors classes makes for free and open discussion and individual attention virtually impossible in regular classes. These features are discernible in a catalogue description as far back as 1912.
A. Language. The elements of phonetics; the vocabulary, inflections, and syntax of modern English traced to their origin; the relation of English to other languages; introduction to Anglo-Saxon and to Middle English. For instruction in these subjects, students will attend, without registering, course 111, History of the English Language. In addition, special work will be assigned in Old and Middle English texts.

B. Literature.

1. Readings and Literary History. Extensive readings illustrative of the important periods, types, and authors in English literature. (A prepared list, including some works on the history of literature and a handbook on versification.)

2. Special Study. The life, times, and works of the following authors, with special study of the texts named: Shakespeare (Hamlet, Henry IV, As You Like It, The Tempest, the Sonnets); Milton (Paradise Lost, Samson Agonistes); Dryden (Absalom and Achitophel); Wordsworth (Tintern Abbey, Michael, Intimations of Immortality, Ode to Duty, The Prelude, books I-IV, Sonnets in Dowden's collection).

C. Style and Criticism. The theory of criticism and the principles of prose style, studied in selected masterpieces. Critical theory will be studied in Aristotle, Poetics; Sidney, Defense of Poesy; Burke, On the Sublime and Beautiful; Coleridge, Biographia Literaria, chapter XIV; Wordsworth, Prefaces; Arnold, The Study of Poetry. The study of modern prose style will be based on Swift, Argument Against Abolishing Christianity; Addison, critical papers in the Spectator; Burke, Address to the King; De Quincey, The English Mail Coach and Suspiria de Profundis; Carlyle, The Hero as a Poet; Ruskin, selections in Little Masterpieces series; Newman, Idea of a University, chapters V-VII; Arnold, Sweetness and Light; Pater, Postscript to Appreciations.

Walter Pater does not dazzle a later generation as much as he did those around the turn of the century, but otherwise the program as outlined here is respectable for any age.
The content and method of Departmental Honors have changed over the years. Besides the schedule printed above, the course for years was a four-semester sequence, which constituted a kind of super-survey of English and (some) American literature. More recently it has come to consist of a two-semester sequence, concerned, successively, with the historical and the critical approaches to literature. In addition, the student writes a Senior Honors Essay, a rather ambitious and extensive study—historical or critical or both, or creative (e.g., a play) for students in the writing program—under the direction of the professor in charge of the program at that time, and perhaps with the added guidance of other professors. There is also a final examination over the honors work. Small classes, free discussion, individual projects, and challenge from one's peers, these traits apparently have characterized Departmental Honors since the program was founded years ago. It is a quality opportunity the Department offers the talented.
Like most American colleges and universities, Missouri from the start has required of entering freshmen a year's work in English. The content and method of the course in freshman English have changed over the years, indeed have always been under review in an effort to improve them. But the fundamental intent of the course has been the same—to improve the literacy of incoming students. How fully it has succeeded in doing this is open to question; not at all, say cynics, the more sanguine saying quite a bit. Meaningful measurement of the course's effectiveness is hard if not impossible to take. And so there has been a general faith that the course does some good, and a conviction that abandoning it would be unthinkable.

It has provoked grumbling. Students groan under the requirement of weekly themes. Deans are aghast at the administrative cost of the course. Teachers feel, with justice, that for teaching what just might be the most important course in a student's career, they are woefully underpaid. Also, numerous complaints arise from faculty in other departments: Why can't you teach the rascals to write? they ask—they who specialize largely in objective tests, don't assign papers, and expect the Department to do the whole job in one year. The only people enthusiastic about the course are the professors in the English Department; they are enthusiastic so long as someone else
teaches it. They have served the standard apprenticeship of teaching such a course, and are relieved to be shut of it. Such has been the feeling in recent years. Earlier, professors regularly taught composition, and it looks as though they may again, which might be a good thing. If they do, they will have to exert themselves to do as well as the best of the present staff, for now, as earlier, much of the course is taught by people of high competence and dedication.

Whatever one hears or says or believes about the course, one thing concerning it is quite clear: The supervisor's job of managing it effectively, guiding and encouraging the staff, and maintaining morale is a large assignment. Professor Harold Moffett supervised the course well for years. He was followed by one who ran it with considerable success during the last twenty-five years of his 49-year tenure at Missouri (quite the longest of anyone in the history of the Department), Professor Willoughby H. Johnson. For a number of years he enjoyed the help of assistants--Mary Webb, Augusta Reid, and Winifred Horner--and of such capable secretaries as Mrs. Childers and Mrs. Grant. Mr. Johnson was a no-nonsense person, bluff, direct, thoroughly honest, who might terrify a timid new instructor with a stentorian blast of colorful expletives, until the timid one learned that Mr. Johnson had his interest at heart, would take his part in misunderstandings with students (or professors), and help him or her out of
scrapes academic, amatory, and even legal. He would also help graduates find jobs.

Not all but most found the gruff exterior that covered a warm personal concern rare and refreshing and in the end endearing. This it must have been that drew many of his charges back to Columbia for the retirement banquet recognizing his long years of service to the University. That occasion was an epic event. Perhaps a brief account of it is not wholly out of place here, since the good feeling generated that night represents a side of Department life that most of the staff values very much.

After drinks and an excellent dinner at the Ramada Inn (planned and directed by Mary Webb), came a program honoring and teasing Mr. Johnson. Charles Hudson, who presided, delivered one of his best witty versified tributes, the special genre his mastery of which had won him campus-wide renown over the years. Other speakers followed, some on the program, some not; efforts by Bill Holtz, Don Crowley, and Jim Holleran, though artfully crafted, were volunteered spontaneously, and so surprised the promoters as well as tickled the guests. Speeches were punctuated by topical choruses sung by the group to the tune of "The Yellow Rose of Texas."

Backing up the singing was a department orchestra, convened for the occasion and never heard from since. It was distinguished in several ways. It lacked a clarinet; the talented young woman student clarinetist who had
faithfully rehearsed twice with the outfit and enriched its sound never showed up for the big occasion, why, nobody knows to this day. Was she disgusted with the musicianship of the professors, or embarrassed to be seen with them? Or was she simply terrified of the whole enterprise? After all, the combo included two deans; that might terrify anybody. Dean Thomas Harris was a sound straight man on piano. She had heard him play at rehearsal and knew she had nothing to fear. It is hard to see how she could have winced at Dean Holleran, for she could not have anticipated his playing any more than could the rest of the group. Jim volunteered at the last minute to drum. He was not an experienced drummer; in fact just a moment before the program began he admitted he had never before drummed at all. But he is such a fine chap that the group could not turn him down, especially since we had nobody else. He could learn by doing, the thought was, and indeed, after several choruses of "The Yellow Rose of Texas," Jim was quickly becoming a first-class percussion man.

His real test came with the show's climax, the cancan. Dickinson, fresh from a lecture by Dean Andrew Minor on Jacques Offenbach, thought it only proper that all features of an academic fete should be scholarly. Accordingly, he got from the library the score of the composer's celebrated opera Orphée aux Enfers, including the original version of the notorious cancan, which in 1874 had taken by storm first Paris and then the world. It was noted, writes an eminent
musicologist, "for its vulgarity and lasciviousness."

It hardly seems a proper dance for genteel department wives to engage in, but the program called for it, and the wives gave their all, stretching muscles for kicking, and being put through their paces by the accomplished Ann Holleran, maestra di ballo. The performance was dazzling, the orchestra providing a frenetic beat appropriate, one supposes, aux enfers.

But what is the commotion in the back of the room? Just as the department wives are at their most vulgar and lascivious, a whistle blast pierces the music, stops the dance, and a uniformed policeman strides quickly to the make-shift stage and announces that this disgraceful behavior is illegal and must stop. The MC and the orchestra leader confer quietly as to what shall be done, pleading that the gathering is an important one:

"Deans are here. You can't stop the show," they say. "President and Mrs. Ellis are here."

"I can't help it," the policeman replies. "This vulgar and lascivious dance is illegal. It's got to stop."

"But this party is for Willoughby Johnson," says the MC.

"Willoughby Johnson? Why didn't you say so in the first place. This makes it different. But I will still have to take the girls to the station."

At this, Mr. Johnson, who agreed to the whole retirement party only on condition that he not be required to speak, is
moved now to do so, and he says,

"I'll go with them."

If some thought the policeman a confederate, others were not so sure. His uniform was authentic, and he had all the air of authority and sense of outrage at conduct vulgar and lascivious that one expects in an officer of the law. In the end members of the English Department were grateful that such flagrant violation of the proprieties was cut short and their genteel sensibilities respected. But Jim Holleran rather regretted the sudden quashing of the ballet. He was just warming to his task with the drums.
From the earliest days of the University of Missouri there has been interest on the campus in creative writing. From before the Civil War and on through the 1880's, two literary societies flourished—the Athenaeum Literary Society and the Union Literary Society. A women's group, Philalethian, was formed in 1880 after the faculty had disbanded two societies for quarreling. The men's societies were an active force on campus. Each had a furnished room in Academic Hall, with a sizeable library, and the two groups (which embraced most of the male student body) held weekly meetings. The allegiance and rivalry later associated with intercollegiate athletics and Greek-letter fraternities were strong in the two societies and stimulated their activities, which were more intellectual and closer to the University's main business than were most of the doings of the fraternities and sororities that supplanted them. President Laws feared the competition of the new Greek societies, and in 1880, in one of his highhanded actions, he banned them, a ruling that stood for three years. Then it was rescinded and the days of the literary societies were nearly over.

Creative writing did not suffer thereby, however, for the societies' expression had largely been oral rather than written. Compositions were written, but their declamation was the goal, this being the age of oratory and "elocution."
Formal debate on set topics pitted the societies against each other. With the disappearance of the societies the social and competitive aspects of their work were surrendered to other agencies, but the core of their work was assumed by the English Department, which until 1940 embraced work in "speech."96

McAnally, a practicing writer and donor of a fund for an award in writing, had encouraged writing both in and outside of the classroom. But a "program" in creative writing, as we think of it today, was a relatively late development. Until about mid-century, creative writing was taught in courses chiefly elective: Versification, which included some "practice in metrical composition"; Narration; Advanced Writing; and The Short Story. Except for the slighting of poetry, these offerings are much like those of today, allowing for changes in course titles. What distinguishes the work in writing before 1950 from that which followed it are two things: the teachers involved (and consequently just what is taught and how it is taught), and degree programs (A.B. and M.A., but not Ph.D) in which creative writing is the core of the work. At both levels, writing is a kind of "major" within the Department; all students electing it are required, in addition to writing courses, to take a substantial number of courses in literature. But they take almost all the writing courses offered, from several teachers, and so gain more writing experience than formerly.
The difference with the teachers is that they are active writers themselves and have themselves been trained in the kind of work they teach. Formerly there were no specialists in creative writing in the Department. This is not to say that the persons in charge of the writing courses did not teach well; very likely they did. But their main interests lay elsewhere--Ramsay's, for instance, in language study, in which he excelled. Particularly, as the years went by, and fashions and interests changed, his writing courses must have seemed to students to be remote from the current literary scene.

A change in all of this can be dated from 1946, six years before Ramsay's retirement, when Professor William Peden was picked by Chairman Weatherly to build an active writing program. Weatherly, in Charlottesville on sabbatical leave, met Peden, then teaching in the Armed Forces Institute at the University of Virginia, where he had taken an A.B. and M.A. and, in 1942, a Ph.D. The call to teach at UMC followed Weatherly's return to Columbia, and Peden visited the campus, met Elmer Ellis and Frank Luther Mott, both of whom he had known by reputation and had admired, and was reminded of UMC's relation to Thomas Jefferson, on whom he had worked.

For several reasons, most of which are apparent in Peden's writings and in his shaping of the writing program, it was a happy choice. Not the least important aspect of it was Peden's dual interest in creative writing and
conventional literary scholarship. He valued them both, had published in both areas and continued to do so, and by precept and example inculcated in his students a respect for both kinds of literary activity. This was a healthy teaching for his students; it also helped to keep the Department amicable and to validate the assumption that writers and scholars should work together rather than, in opinion, allegiance, and administrative arrangement, work in competition. Left to themselves, writers and scholars could easily polarize; to the writer the scholar's imagined glorification of sources, footnotes, bibliographies, and other paraphernalia of scholarship would seem utterly fatuous, whereas the scholar would find it ridiculous to equate in value a solid scholarly effort and a writer's "poem," which easily could be what an eminent teacher of writing has characterized as a mere "free verse twich." For generating mutual respect in the two groups, credit must go to Professor Peden and to his writing colleagues, the late Professors Donald Drummond and Tom McAfee.

Programs or at least courses in creative writing today are found in most colleges and universities in America. Yet they often have been suspect and in need of defense. Defenses have been made, some of them very persuasive, the best ones justifying creative writing as a useful constituent in a liberal arts program. In reading some of them, the present writer found the arguments familiar, for he had heard most of them before, when as an office mate of
Professor Peden he could not help overhearing the counsel he gave to writing students. It concerned aims, hopes, chances, expectations, the values of courses in writing, what they could do for one, and, importantly, what they could not do. Over the years he heard a full and convincing justification of creative writing as a part of the college curriculum. It was sensible talk, which one would expect from a person of such wide literary interest. Peden, as teacher, writer, reviewer, editor, publisher, book collector, and launcher of the University of Missouri Press, serving on its editorial board until his retirement in 1978, probably deserves the appellation Man of Letters, common and revered in Jefferson's time, less common, word and person, today. In his hands the writing program could hardly have been trivial or unsound.

A new dimension was added to the program in creative writing when Professor Peden instituted the Summer Writers Conference, which had been discussed and agreed upon when he joined the staff. The series began in 1947 and continued each summer for some ten years. Well publicized, a Conference would attract for its ten-day program some dozen to fifteen writers from around the State who were interested in attending informal class sessions, listening to the featured speaker deliver a public lecture, and having the manuscript(s) he or she brought along read and criticized by a member of the Conference staff--the featured speaker and one or two UMC professors. The outside speakers included,
among others, Andrew Lytle, John Canaday ("Matthew Head"), Katherine Anne Porter, Nelson Algren, Walter van Tilburg Clark and James T. Farrell. They attended the social events and graciously chatted with the company, including the non-writing members of the English Department, who with wives were invited, no doubt, to add dignity and charm to the occasion and perhaps a kind of literary ballast. The conferees enjoyed the sessions and seemed to find them profitable, both for the personal instruction received and for the socializing. Writing is private work, and the chance to mingle with one's kind and share experiences is greatly cherished. The Department, flattered to be included for talk with the celebrated, came away with only the most positive feelings about the worth of the Writing Program. 98

The English Department has launched and supported two publications containing the work of young writers. Midlands, founded in 1956 and open to all students on the Missouri campus, publishes verse and short fiction. It has been supervised editorially by faculty members, Professor William Peden and the late Professors Donald Drummond and Tom McAfee. Students in the writing program help with the editing and with some aspects of publication.

Another publication, The Missouri Review, was begun in 1978. Issued three times a year, the Review draws from all places except the campus. It publishes stories, poems, interviews, essays, and reviews, and is edited by selected
professors in the English Department. Contributions may touch on any subject, though the editors favor subjects relating to literary culture. "Our only absolute criterion of judgment" of a piece, writes the editor, is "'Is it interesting?'"

Flourishing for several years under a stable staff, the publication program of late has suffered the weakening of the staff through the death, retirement, and resignation of several of its members. In charge now is Professor Speer Morgan, successful novelist and administrator, who promises to keep the publications afloat and to strengthen the program.
Graduate Work

Interest in graduate study at the University of Missouri follows the national pattern, if somewhat tardily. The last thirty years of the nineteenth century saw a dramatic increase in graduate enrollment in the United States--198 (1871) to 1237 (1887), to 4392 (1897). The growth at Missouri was proportional, though for years numbers were small--in 1910 119 graduate students at Columbia (69 in Arts and Science), and sixteen recipients of the M.A. The first Ph.D. (Botany) conferred at Missouri was in 1899. So although in McAnally's day (1879) the English Department listed six years of English study (Lord Kames and Hugh Blair in the third year, Taine the fourth year, and much Anglo-Saxon language and history the sixth year), little is said at first of advanced degrees. A program in English directed toward the Ph.D. is described in the catalogue of 1902-1903, but only in the broadest possible terms, as compared with the requirements for the M.A. For some fifty years thereafter, the M.A. was the principal graduate degree, the Ph.D. being offered nominally, but pursued in actuality by very few. When the present writer joined the staff in 1946, there were but two Ph.D. candidates in English, persons who had been around for years, teaching classes and having taken most of the courses available. The situation began to change in the fifties, but slowly, a fact that should be remembered when the
national rating of Missouri's graduate program is considered. Compared to some other institutions, Missouri was slow to offer doctoral work.

Not so with the Master's Degree. This degree attracted many students, including school teachers in the State, who, by requirement or encouragement, flocked to the University summer sessions to earn the degree that would advance them in their schools and presumably increase their salaries. Three summers, each earning the maximum eight hours, would add up to twenty-four of the required thirty-two hours; the remaining eight would be granted for the thesis. The thesis was often a substantial and "creditable" study, purportedly giving evidence of "evincing capacity for original research and power of independent thought."101 When the M.A. was the only graduate degree the student would seek, and when, before the demand for the Ph.D. developed, the Master's program was the principal work of the staff beyond the B.A., the standards for the thesis were probably higher and more stringently enforced than they later became. In the days before air conditioning, the sight of these faithful and ambitious students, after a full year of teaching school, returning to the University year after year and immersing themselves in the stewpot of Columbia summers, all in pursuit of knowledge, elicited from the staff nothing but pity and respect. Schoolmarmrs, the bulk of them, perhaps, but admirable beings. Their behavior in class was commendable. They were prompt, polite, attentive, eager to
learn and to please, they finished their coffee before coming to class, and they wore shoes. And in the classroom, whatever disadvantage they may have suffered in competition with the smart, young but inexperienced students, regarding the latest modes and fashions of literary study, was often more than offset by the maturity they brought to their study and their larger acquaintance with life, in and out of the classroom. One hopes they got the raises they envisioned, for they certainly earned them.

If, as suggested, the M.A. thesis was a kind of minidissertation, the final examination for the degree was also staged with the full scale ceremony usually reserved for the doctorate. The procedure, set largely by the Graduate School, called for a two-hour oral examination, to cover not only the thesis, but all of the student's course work as well. Four professors in English were joined by one from an outside department, who, selected by the Graduate School (with perhaps a recommendation by the student's advisor), had read and approved the thesis. For the English professors the outside reader was a refreshing variant in the examining formula. They may have felt it an imposition to require him to sit through not only a discussion of the thesis, which he could ask about, but also through an hour's questioning about the courses, to which he was expected only to listen. The visitors were polite enough to say that they welcomed the quizzing as for them a refreshe. course in English and American literature. They were always invited
to chime in if they wished, and some did, pleasantly awakening the English professors from the drowse induced by repeated listening to colleagues' familiar questions. If the visitors' questions were born of a pride to show that their culture was broader than the confines of their own disciplines, who can blame them? Occasionally the contribution was amusing and perhaps enlightening to the company, as when once the visitor, a distinguished mathematician--the discussion centering on the poetry of Browning--asked the student if Browning's grammarian, whose funeral occasions the poem, was a mathematician, since the poet says that "Calculus racked him."

The "outside reader" (and attendant at the oral), a customary fixture in academic procedure--for the doctorate, certainly, and, at Missouri in earlier times, for the Master's Degree as well--was originally intended as a means of keeping graduate work up to standard. For its reputation's sake, a department would not care to be lax before visitors. The visitor had another value: In the free fraternizing before and after the questioning, as well as in the questioning itself, closer contact of a substantial sort was made with extra-departmental colleagues than at any other time. Such contacts are fewer today.

The Master's program, with the attractions here suggested, was not without its costs. It was a rare spring or summer term that a professor was not seeing a student through his M.A. Often it was two or three. Managing this
work, on top of a 12-hour teaching load, kept the staff busy; the thesis alone meant hours of work, conferring on substance, reading and marking first drafts and their revisions, and, in more cases than one likes to admit, correcting diction and reshaping sentences. But it was all in a day's work, and it contributed to what, in retrospect, seems a solid contribution to the literary culture of the State.

But the summer influx of teachers pursuing the course for an M.A. in English has slowed almost to a trickle in recent years. There was no loss of incentive, for school boards continued to encourage further study with salary increases. But after Sputnik I (1957) the University had to share the custom with the state colleges, who at this time changed their name to university and began to offer a program leading to the M.A. For a teacher in the area of one of the new universities, attending it was cheaper and more convenient than attending the University in Columbia; and if the program was somewhat less rigorous, the degree was no less valued at the employing school. Also competing for M.A. students were the new metropolitan campuses of the University, at Kansas City and St. Louis, areas that formerly had sent many teachers to Columbia for further study. Partly as a result of the reduced enrollment for the M.A. program, that program was simplified: writing a thesis was made optional and the oral examination was dispensed with altogether. Besides course work, the only requirements
were submission of a term paper prepared for a course and declared satisfactory, and performing adequately on a final written examination. The M.A. is probably as sound a degree as it ever was. It certainly is a less elaborate one.

Increasingly, the Department turned out Ph.D.'s, most of whose dissertations were respectable, a few distinguished. Worth noting here is an administrative problem that has persisted for years and has never been solved to everyone's satisfaction. It has to do with the admission of students to candidacy for the Ph.D. The consensus in the profession is that it is unjust to allow a student to make a large investment in the doctoral program, only to be told later that he or she cannot attain the degree. Clearly the student must be told at some point that he is or is not acceptable as a candidate; the question is at what point. Also a part of the consensus is the tacit understanding by all parties that once admitted to candidacy, a student has a right to believe that the Department is "behind" him, expects him to complete the required work satisfactorily, and ultimately to earn the degree. That understanding is confirmed by the student's clearing the first major hurdle in the program, the Comprehensive Examination; but it is shared to some extent earlier, namely, when the student is admitted to candidacy, which, by rule of the Graduate School, follows upon his satisfactorily passing the Qualifying Examination.
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The Department thus has a great responsibility in granting admission to candidacy. The arguments as to when the Department should dismiss a student from the program (if he must be dismissed) are familiar to all: Do it early (at the Qualifying) and save everybody pain; but students learn, there are late bloomers, and so let them in and give them a chance to show what they can do. If there is a best way of resolving this question, one hopes it can be found. Mischief follows upon an unsatisfactory solution.
The Recent Past

How recent is recent? A convenient division is 1961, the year the Department moved from Jesse Hall and took up residence in the new Arts and Science building. Though not important in itself, the change in physical quarters, like the burning and rebuilding of Academic Hall in 1892, is a convenient dividing line, for after that event, the character of the Department changed: the professorial staff tripled, the Department became more tightly organized, as mentioned earlier, and it began to place a heavier emphasis on research and publication.102

The implications of these changes are important. With a staff three times larger than it was for years, students can get a more varied view of the literature they study. In place of one person's picture of the eighteenth century, they have three pictures; and since a professor usually has a specialty or preference within his or her field, a student, particularly a graduate student, has three times the likelihood of working with someone particularly well equipped to guide him. It is true that one good mentor can turn out many excellent products, witness the large group of Melville scholars trained by Stanley T. Williams of Yale in the last generation. But three good ones are better than one, an obvious fact that figures in national evaluation.

The variety of universities that trained the Missouri staff makes for a cross-section of academic opinion and
practice, useful to the Department in its deliberations. In 1950 nine universities were represented on the professorial staff, in 1984 twenty-one 103

Working alongside a person in one's field is another advantage of larger staff. The encouragement, possibly good-natured rivalry, and sheer enjoyment of having a colleague who speaks the same professional language are valuable conditions, best appreciated by one who for any time has not enjoyed them.

Perhaps the most notable difference between the staffs of today and yesterday is the marked increase in research and publication. These activities are encouraged (with reduced loads and time off) and rewarded. Publication is required for promotion to a higher rank. On 29 November 1983 the Department held a reception to honor members who had published books in 1982-1983. Thirteen members were so honored. It was an exceptional year, perhaps, but indicative of the new demand for publication and the Department's intention of meeting it.

How does the English Department stand nationally? Several evaluative studies over the years have limited themselves to rating graduate faculty and programs, including those in English. Only in the recent ones has Missouri figured at all, partly, one supposes, because quantitatively, at least, Missouri's doctoral program in earlier years amounted to very little. The most important recent study (1982) is the "Jones" report--"An Assessment of
Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Humanities," edited by Lyle V. Jones, Gardner Lindzey, and Porter E. Coggeshall for the project sponsored by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils. The study is more thorough in its inquiry and is statistically more sophisticated than earlier studies, a quality that presumably gives the study more authority; it also demands more application of one seeking to extract significant conclusions. The most important of these, for Missouri, are the following:

1. In both "Scholarly quality of [Ph.D.] program faculty" and "Effectiveness of [Ph.D.] program" Missouri, among "Big 8" institutions, ranks exactly in the middle—with Kansas State, Oklahoma State, and Oklahoma ranking below Missouri, and Kansas, Nebraska, and Colorado above. (Iowa State was not included in the study.)

2. In "Improvement in [Ph.D.] program" only Oklahoma (of "Big 8" schools) ranks higher than Missouri, and that by only .1 per cent. Nebraska, Kansas, and Oklahoma State rank lower. This ranking is probably the most heartening fact to emerge from all the studies, and it conforms pretty much to our own view of the matter: We began with very little, and we are doing better—which is what the study says.

One should not overvalue such reports. We live in a big country. There are many universities, quite a few better than Missouri, quite a few not so good. No doubt that at the time of the next report we will feel good if we
have gained a percentage point on Kansas in the ratings. Beyond that, we need not worry. If we do what we should do, and want to do, and can do, the ratings will take care of themselves--and ours will probably rise.

It is time to take in sail, as the poet says. This sketch is about over. It could have been twice--or eight or ten or fifty times--as long. This is a sketch only, a rough sketch, a preliminary sketch, implying that someone, sometime, can fill it out to make a resplendent portrait that would do justice to a worthy subject.

For the English Department is just that. It teaches more students than any other department of the University, trying--with some success, certainly--to give the sons and daughters of our state quality training in reading and writing, the indispensable tools for living, and to help them earn their cultural heritage through the study of literature. It is an enterprise we are glad to be part of. If the tone of this sketch strikes anyone as inappropriately light, it should be defended as one appropriate after all. Learning is not a somber business, as much writing on education would lead one to believe. It is exciting, life-giving, and a joy. We experience the joy and we value it, and try to help others value it, too. Perhaps the tone helps do this.

A fitting close is former Chairman Robert Barth's statement characterizing the Department. Professor Barth wrote it after a year in the chairman's office. One hopes
he is today no less impressed with the Department's "collegial spirit." It is hard not to agree with his opinion. In the English Department, he writes,

There is, by and large, genuine respect and affection of colleague for colleague; there is a welcome dearth of politics and politicking—those banes of academic life; there is a world of work done in a committee structure that leaves scope for imagination and creativity; and there is a strong sense of dedication to a shared endeavor.  

May it be ever thus.
Notes

Besides references to works cited, the notes, like all good footnotes, contain material of substantive interest. It can be read along with the text, or, since most of the longer notes are self-contained, can be read separately.
The principal sources of the present account are indicated in the documentation. Lists of faculty and graduates, appearing at the end of this sketch, were derived from files of the Board of Curators and from University Commencement programs. If inaccuracies are discovered, they would be welcomed by the author.

Two histories of the University of Missouri have been useful. One is Jonas Viles, *The University of Missouri: A Centennial History* (Columbia, 1939), throughout the present sketch referred to as "Viles," which contains an account of the Old University by Viles, Professor of History, and sections on the schools and colleges. Of the latter, the most useful to the present sketch are the sections on the Graduate School, by Professor Charles F. Mullett, of the Department of History, and on the College of Arts and Science, by Professor Henry M. Belden, of the Department of English.

The other useful history is that by the late Dean Frank F. Stephens, *A History of the University of Missouri* (Columbia: The University of Missouri Press, 1962), referred to throughout as "Stephens." Both "Viles" and "Stephens" treat the University as a whole, and so provide useful background, but they have little to say of the English Department in particular.

2Mardi, ch. 180.

3An exception must be made for Tom Harris. Assistant and Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Science for twenty-nine
years, Thomas B. Harris began his career at Missouri in the English Department, first as student, undergraduate and graduate (M.A., 1952), then as Instructor. His dexterity in shuffling class cards and other paraphernalia of registration caught the eye of some higher-up, and soon he was borrowed for work in the Dean's office. He learned his way around, mastered the regulations, and quickly made himself a useful fixture. By luck and by pluck, but mostly by an uncanny knack for filing away in his mind thousands and thousands of facts about the University, the College, and its many students, present and past (and for retrieving them instantaneously on demand) he quickly became the indispensable man in the Dean's office. If the administrative wheels of the College are creaking and grinding of late, as the Great Machine lumbers down the academic turnpike, it is because the Man Who Knows has moved upstairs in Jesse Hall and no longer serves as ombudsman, confidant, and adviser extraordinary. His skills must be missed sorely. Cartoonist, musician, dazzling ballroom dancer, mimic (no one is exempt!), literary scholar, devoted husband and father, Tom Harris is a man of talents. Whether the English Department can take credit to itself for discovering or developing any of them is doubtful. But it likes to claim him and to think that some of his unique skill is traceable to the department that nurtured him in his early days in Columbia.

4University of Missouri Catalogue of 1939-1940.
A descendant of the early literary societies active until recent years was ΔTK. Begun in the 1920's and fostered by Miss Lura Lewis, Instructor in English and later Assistant Professor, the sorority was open to women, undergraduates and graduates, majoring in English and achievers of a respectable grade point average. Meetings were held in professors' homes; professors gave informal talks, and refreshments were served. An annual banquet, featuring a formal address on a literary topic, was a high point. An initiation ceremony for new members gave dignity to the organization. The president would speak and would ask the Department Chairman, in an ex officio capacity, to read an appropriate passage from Scripture--from Proverbs 4, the present writer remembers from the time he read it, impressing himself as much as he hoped he impressed the initiates. The organization expired not long after the retirement of Miss Lewis in 1952, no enthusiastic successor arising to continue fostering it. Formation of the English Graduate Students Organization was also a factor, as were the changing attitude toward privileged organizations and the greatly increased number of eligible students. An award of $25, for outstanding work in English--the "Lura Lewis Award"--given in memory of the group's long-time sponsor, was established in 1958. Recipients include Lyman Baker, Jeanette Williams Mann, Mary Carolyn Lang, and Daniel Hays, among others.

University of Missouri Catalogue of 1890-1891.
There had been much talk and writing during the age of social reform, the quarter century before the Civil War, of higher education for women. There also had been action in the East: in 1837 the influential Mary Lyon opened the Mt. Holyoke "female seminary" (attended by Emily Dickinson), later Mt. Holyoke College; Elmira College opened in 1855; and in Ohio women were early admitted to men's colleges: Oberlin (1833) and Antioch (1853). In our own "western" Columbia, a Female Academy was established in 1833, later called Baptist College (1857), and ultimately Stephens College. But the great expansion of women's education came after the War, in the new colleges for women--Vassar (1865), Smith and Wellesley (1875), and Bryn Mawr (1885)--and in the western institutions, including those founded or supported by the Morrill Act of 1862. Some western universities admitted women from the time of their founding: Utah (1850), Iowa (1856), Washington (1862), Kansas (1866), Minnesota (1868), and Nebraska (1871). Some already founded opened their doors to women: In 1871, California, Illinois, and Missouri. Missouri was thus following a national trend. (Facts drawn from the Encyclopedia Americana, edition of 1956.)

Quotations are from the University of Missouri Catalogue of 1873, quoted in Viles, p. 132.

University of Missouri Catalogue of 1890-1891.
The large appropriation of 1883 included an item of one hundred thousand dollars for the enlargement of Academic Hall, the "first appropriation ever made by the state for a University building for class purposes." Announcement of this appropriation is famous in University lore. Isadore Loeb, who often told the story and later became Professor of Political Science, Dean of the School of Business and Public Administration, and a prominent and useful figure in administrative circles, at the time of the appropriation was a Western Union messenger, aged fourteen. When he delivered the telegram announcing the news, President Laws "was so excited that he exclaimed to his wife, 'Anna, hand the boy a quarter!'" (Stephens, pp. 276, 319.)

3 Stephens, p. 320.

4 University of Missouri Catalogue of 1907-1908.

5 William F. Switzler, History of Boone County (Columbia, 1882), p. 269.


7 Several short-term chairmen preceded McAnally. Two that are remembered are Hosmer and Hamill. James Kendall Hosmer was chairman 1872-1874. He came from Harvard, recommended by President Eliot and William Dean Howells, and was the first
Harvard appointee at UMC. He stayed two years, then moved to Washington University in St. Louis, where he taught for years. Most of his publication after leaving UMC was not in literature (he did write a history of German literature), but in American history—the Colonial period, the Civil War, and Lewis and Clark. S. S. Hamill served briefly after Hosmer's departure. A practical speech instructor, he resigned from the University just before Laws' tenure began. The several rapid turnovers in the chairmanship indicate a want of permanence, direction, and stability in the English Department. McAnally's tenure, with Laws' support, therefore, marks the first successful effort to establish these qualities. (Hosmer is mentioned in Viles, p. 156, Hamill in Stephens, p. 269.)

18 Marcus L. Gray in Centennial Volume of Missouri Methodism—Methodist-Episcopal Church South, 1907.

19 Switzler, p. 921.

20 John W. Connaway, MS biographical sketch of D. R. McAnally, Jr. inserted in the latter's book, Irish Wonders (London, 1888), housed in the Rare Book Room of Ellis Library.

21 Switzler, p. 912.

22 Viles, pp. 156, 157.

23 Switzler, p. 913.

24 P. 40.
25 Connaway's sketch in *Irish Wonders*.

26 Letter of 25 August 1877 to James S. Rollins, Chairman of the Board of Curators, quoted in Stephens, p. 288.


29 Switzler, p. 912.

30 Most of the facts about Professor Allen are taken from this work, *An Allen Lineage c. 1500-1979* (Washington, 1980).

31 Allen apparently is using "philology" in the later, restricted sense of "language study." See in the section on Belden, below, the discussion of the term "philology."


34 Ibid., p. 362.

35 *University of Missouri Catalogue, 1910-1911*, p. 12.

36 Recipients of University of Missouri honorary degrees include:

- Samuel Langhorne Clemens ("Mark Twain") .......................... 1902
- General John Joseph Pershing ........................................... 1920
- General Omar Bradley ...................................................... 1946
- Helen Traubel ............................................................... 1948
- Thomas Hart Benton ......................................................... 1949
- Harry S. Truman ............................................................. 1950
- Herbert Clark Hoover ....................................................... 1962
- Walter Cronkite ............................................................. 1970

37 Quoted in Belden, An Allen Lineage, p. 81.

38 How the professor maintained his equilibrium in such a menage has not been recorded, although in An Allen Lineage grandson Allen Belden supplied a convincing hint when he divulged a family recipe: "Grandfather [Edward Archibald] Allen's toddy: Fill a tall glass with crushed ice, about two ounces of bourbon, a scant teaspoon of sugar, a sprig of fresh mint, and a little water. Stir and enjoy." He knew the thing, but the word is questionable, remarkable in one so learned and astute about the mother tongue. He describes a julep, or mint julep, known in the U.S.A. as early as 1800. Traditionally a toddy is made with hot water, and does not require mint.


Belden was appointed to replace George A. Wauchope (Ph.D., Washington and Lee University, 1889), who had joined the English staff at Missouri in 1891, and left it in 1895, "when he secured a better position elsewhere" (F. F. Stephens, A History of the University of Missouri [Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1962], p. 356). He moved to the University of Iowa, though whether it was truly to a "better position" is debatable, for after only three years he moved to the University of South Carolina, where he taught until his retirement in 1934. He was a productive scholar in English, but is best remembered at Missouri as the composer of the alma mater song, "Old Missouri, Fair Missouri," who set local words to the tune of Cornell's "Far Above Cayuga's Waters." (The University of Kansas borrowed the same tune--originally an English folk-tune--for its alma mater song. In former years, during half-time festivities at the Kansas-Missouri football game, the two bands would join in playing the common tune while the rooters in each stand sang the words appropriate to their school.) In 1911 Wauchope composed "A Health to Carolina," later titled "We Hail Thee, Carolina," again
setting local words to a familiar tune, this one of Scotch origin—the tune of "Flow Gently, Sweet Afton" and "Away in a Manger." It became the university's alma mater song and is still sung. It is a fair guess that composing two official university alma mater songs, both still sung, has earned Wauchope a unique distinction. (Facts about the songs were supplied by Charles L. Emmons and James K. Copenhauer, of the university bands of Missouri and South Carolina respectively.)

46 A Belden Lineage, p. 197.

47 In "Oxford Standard Authors" series, Oxford University Press, pp. xlix-liv.


49 A Belden Lineage, p. 204.

50 Viles, pp. 248-250.

51 A Belden Lineage, p. 197.

52 Viles, p. 274.

53 A Belden Lineage, p. 197.

54 Ibid.

55 Professor Ramsay's retirement in 1952 called for a search for a strong successor to his post. It resulted in the naming, to everyone's satisfaction, of George B. Pace. Scholar, teacher,
judicious contributor to Departmental counsels, and, to use a term unfortunately becoming obsolete, a gentleman, George served the Department faithfully and with distinction until his death in 1979. As a linguist he kept up with modern changes in the study of language, but he also, to the satisfaction of his colleagues, maintained an interest in language study as they had known it. He knew of the scientific methods of linguistics, but he did not abandon his belief that language and language study were essentially humanistic matters. This belief lay behind his literary interests, for George was not only the Department's language man but its medievalist, as well. He found *Gawain and the Green Knight* and the works of Chaucer interesting linguistically, as a linguist would, but he taught them as literary works. His learning was brought to bear on his editing, with Alfred David, of Chaucer's minor poems, *Part One*, as an important portion of *A Variorum Edition of the Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*. A room on the third floor of the Arts and Science building, dedicated 24 November 1980 as the George Blocker Pace Memorial Library, is open to graduate students as a convenient retreat for study. It would be an exaggeration to say that it required five persons to carry on his work, but five there are—Professors Cooke, Lance, Camargo, Youmans, and Foley—teaching the courses he taught and happy to carry on the Missouri tradition of excellence in his fields of work.

The Junior English Examination, wrote Professor Belden, was "intended to assure a reasonable degree of literacy in the holder
of a bachelor's diploma."

Those that passed Freshman Composition marginally "were often found in their later work to be sadly deficient in their use of the vernacular. They seemed to consider the proper use of language something demanded merely by the English instructor, to be forgotten as promptly as possible one they had achieved a passing grade in English 1. It was thought that a test confronting them in terrorem in their junior year would persuade them to be more assiduous in perfecting themselves in the use of the mother tongue." ("The College of Arts and Science" in Jonas Viles, The University of Missouri: A Centennial History [Columbia, 1939], p. 291.) The results were not altogether satisfactory. Over a five-year span (1935-1940) fifteen per cent of those taking the examination failed it. (Memorandum of Chairman Fairchild to the Department, in the Robert L. Ramsay Papers in the Western Manuscripts Collection, folio 23.) The examination, begun in 1914, was handled in various ways over the years: First it was an objective test, administered by the Counseling Service, and required of all university students; later it was limited to transfer students and students making less than C in English 2; later still the form changed to an essay-type of test, which made for confusion and dissatisfaction, and prompted abandoning the test altogether, though it lingered on awhile in the School of Journalism. In the College of Arts and Science it was abandoned in 1957.
Professor Archer Sloane's death in the novel, even if one were to construe it as a virtual suicide, can have no relation to the actual suicide of Professor Edward Ainsworth in 1940, an event that Professor Williams had not heard of.

Lomax's attack on Stoner, through his defense and encouragement of his candidate Walker, resembles slightly, though with differences, Fairchild's badgering a candidate of Ramsay's in an oral examination. Proceeding "Socratically" with the student, Fairchild pressed the point that since Aristotle had established the principle that great literature must be universal, local color writing, the student's subject, must by its nature be something less than great. Ramsay and one or two other examiners came to the defense of the befuddled student, no doubt recognizing that Fairchild was less interested in upholding the great Aristotelian principle than in getting at Ramsay through his student and at Ramsay's work, which in both language and literature was concerned with the local. Author Williams could not have known of the Ramsay incident, but he would not have needed to. Stories of warring professors having at each other over the quivering body of a hapless candidate are legion in the profession and in written accounts of it---in, for instance, George R. Stewart's novel Doctor's Oral (New York: Random House, 1939). (Source for the above Fairchild-Ramsay incident is Papers of Robert L. Ramsay, folio 21, in Western Historical Manuscripts Collection.)
The closest that Ramsay came to cruelty in an oral Master's examination, in the six-year experience of the present writer, was to tease a candidate about the quality of his thesis. "Do you think you have written a masterpiece?" Ramsay would ask a candidate, toward the end of the examination. The student would reply, in humble self-disparagement, "Oh, no, sir," whereupon Ramsay would rally him with "Why not? What is a masterpiece?" Then it was explained that in an earlier day a masterpiece was a piece of work done to qualify a craftsman for the rank of master. "So your thesis is a masterpiece, isn't it?" Ramsay would say, amidst soft chuckles all around, and the student would assent happily. Colleagues came to expect the concluding pleasantry, which invariably ended the session on an amiable note.

Creating a separate department of Speech followed a national trend. Speech was a growing discipline in American universities. Besides the traditional oratory and rhetoric, it came to include such new areas as speech pathology, phonetics, and speech in radio. By 1937, it had a national association and a journal. In addition there was an internal reason for a split. Because of the college 40-hour rule (the limit of credits from one department acceptable on the regular 120-hour program for the A.B. degree) and the English Department's continuing insistence on many literature courses in a major's program, it was virtually impossible for an English major (there were no Speech majors before 1940) to include in a program enough speech
courses to qualify him or her for a job in Missouri teaching speech. Missouri students were being advised to go to neighboring states for their training. These and other arguments in favor of an autonomous Department of Speech were summarized in a 1937 report drawn up by the senior speech person in the English Department, Professor William E. Gilman, and concurred in by his speech colleagues in the Department. One of them was Assistant Professor Loren Reid, whose resignation in 1939 to accept a position in the flourishing and respected department of speech at Syracuse University showed that Missouri's unwillingness to support a full-scale program in speech was very likely going to drive away not only potential speech majors but strong and promising young scholars on the faculty as well. Missouri was fortunate to be able to lure him back in 1944 to accept a full professorship in the recently-established Department of Speech and Dramatic Art.

Not everybody in English rejoiced in the split. Professor Ramsay did not. He deplored it, attributing it to Chairman Fairchild's lack of sympathy with the problems of the people in speech in the Department. Even allowing for bad blood between Ramsay and Fairchild, and consequently a possible exaggeration, independent testimony has convinced the present writer of a measure of justice in Ramsay's charge. To Fairchild, Ramsay wrote the following (28 May 1942): "Your overbearing attitude and unwillingness to share supreme control [of departmental matters] was, I believe, the primary cause that drove our
brother teachers of speech, oratory, and dramatics to press for
the setting up of a separate department—a step I cannot help
thinking disastrous for our students and our common interests."
(Robert L. Ramsay Papers, Western Historical Manuscripts, folio
21). Today, some forty years after the separation, rhetoric as
a discipline is again offered in the English Department as well
as in the Department of Speech and Dramatic Art, a development
that Ramsay would have applauded.

It was at New Haven that Ed Weatherly met Anne Ferring, a drama
student, whom he later married. Mrs. Weatherly, loved and
admired as the Department's First Lady, taught courses in drama
for awhile at Stephens College. She wrote and published several
social comedies, some of which were produced locally. The last
one, published in 1945, bore the happy title Two Gentlemen and
Verona.

A separate history of the Department could be written, consist­
ing exclusively of anecdotes concerning the idiosyncrasies,
quirks, crotchets, and assorted oddities of the professors—to be
compiled by students, of course. The present writer could supply
at least two anecdotes, one from his graduate school days at
another university, one from his teaching days at Missouri.

Many anecdotes involve the habits of professors with pipes. A
memorable one concerns an eminent professor's lighting of his
pipe. During seminar, while delivering a learned disquisition
to the class, he would strike a long wooden match and then hold it near the pipe. But totally engaged in what he was saying, he let the match burn down till it threatened his finger, and then shook it out with a flick of his wrist. He would continue talking, his eyes constantly on the class, light another match, let it burn down, and shake it out. This went on and on. What he said was substantial; he never said anything that was not substantial. But the guess is the students could not possibly have heard what he was saying, so mesmerized were they by the drama of his hands, so consumed with anticipation, hope, and anxiety. It would make a good story--"The Light of Learning."

Years later the present writer, no doubt quite as inadvertently as the professor with pipe, gave a performance containing the stuff of legend. It was in the days of isometric exercises, when, according to a system publicized by the U. S. Air Force, one could exercise in one spot. No need to jog around town all afternoon; one could work his muscles well without going anywhere, could do it even while sitting in a chair. The secret was to make a muscle pull against some force--another muscle (by locking hands before one's body and trying to break the grip, each arm pulling against the other) or a fixed object, like the seat of the chair one is sitting in. The latter was chosen for use in seminar, as being quiet and unobtrusive. One could flex his muscles during student reports. It was worth a try.

One day the professor chose to exercise during the delivery of an excruciatingly dull report. All went well, he thought; he
could feel his biceps stretching, and he jokingly told himself to be careful lest he pull the seat right up through his bottom. The minutes flew by, and before he knew it the report was over.

A few students lingered after class. One, less timid than the others, said,

"We're glad to see you smiling, sir."

"Why? Don't I smile often?"

"Yes, but during that report _________. It wasn't the most enthralling one we've had, and we sensed that you thought so, too. In fact we thought you were getting up a head of steam and were about to blow your stack. You're usually so patient and so gentle in your criticisms. We thought 'This time he's had about all he can take; he's getting set to blast that student into the next county.'"

"Did I look that ominous?" he asked.

"Well, you were beet red in the face, the tendons in your neck were taut as fiddle strings, the veins in your forehead bulged out, and, most frightening of all, your knuckles white, you appeared to have a death grip on your chair seat, as though if you hung on tight enough you could perhaps restrain yourself from erupting. We take it you didn't care for the report."
"The report? Yes. That is, no, it wasn't one of our better ones. But what you describe was not mounting ire (though I'm glad to learn I can appear ferocious at will; it may come in handy). No, I was doing my isometrics. They're good exercises, you know."

"Oh, so that was it, was it? Well, I'll be ________."
throughout the State, thus continuing what from the University's inception had been an indispensable service of the English Department to state-wide education in Missouri. Upon Belden's retirement Moffett took over some of the courses in American Literature, which he taught until his retirement. High on the list of his contributions, in the opinion of students at all levels, was his course in Chaucer. When asked about the course, students without exception would praise his reading of Middle English. In an age before polite reticence was totally passé, Moffett would observe the proprieties in reading Chaucer and would stop his reading when he came to a naughty passage. Marking the text at that point would, if done thoroughly elsewhere, too, provide an easy index to the scatological passages for those who were interested, meaning the whole class. They were secretly amused at what they took to be their teacher's inadvertent benevolence, not realizing that he had been at the game a long time and knew very well what he was doing. He was probably secretly more amused than they.

Hardin Craig, Woodrow Wilson at Princeton (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1960). This book may have surprised Columbians who knew Craig mainly as a Shakespearian; and members of the Department, although Craig attended its meetings and spoke up on issues, did not hear him say much about educational philosophy. Perhaps there should have been no surprise, for Craig's interest was always in mind--its powers, its possibilities, its capacities for growth, its way of operating.
These concerns, at the core of university life and fundamental to all thought about curricular and other arrangements, Craig had addressed at least as early as his years at Princeton, first as a graduate student and then as a faculty member. His book is properly titled; he does focus attention on Woodrow Wilson, who returned from teaching jobs at Bryn Mawr and Wesleyan to his alma mater in 1890 to teach political science and to serve as university president 1902-1910 before entering the political life through which he became known to all. Craig saw a great deal of Wilson, admired him very much, and was at the center of the movement for academic reform that Wilson engineered. It was not Wilson the political figure or Wilson the personality that interested Craig so much as the educational ideas and ideals that Wilson fostered. Briefly they include the following propositions:

1. A university should contribute to the national welfare.

2. It contributes to the national welfare best by stimulating and enriching the nation's intellectual life through providing strong leaders.

3. Strong leaders are best provided, not by cramming minds with information so much as by developing a person's intellectual culture. (This point implies two others:

   a. It departs notably from the German university system that was becoming so influential in new American graduate schools.)
b. It minimizes lectures, quizzes, and so on, in favor of close intellectual and social contact between student and his preceptor, who ideally guided and stimulated rather than "taught." Craig was a preceptor for a time.)

4. Curricular integration is desirable. (The faculty, including preceptors, should be a community of scholars rather than mere masters of discrete and unrelated subjects.)

5. Learning is more important than teaching.

6. The spirit of learning is more important than learning. ("What we should seek to impart in our colleges, therefore, is not so much learning itself as the spirit of learning." From Wilson's Phi Beta Kappa address delivered 1 July 1909 in Cambridge, Massachusetts, scene and occasion of Emerson's "The American Scholar" [1837]. The quotation is from Craig's Woodrow Wilson at Princeton, p. 107.)

64 Hazelton Spencer, The Art and Life of William Shakespeare, 1940.

65 His pronunciation seemed a cross between French renaissance and English renascence.


67 Perhaps the best source of information on Neihardt is the work of Lucille Aly, who taught in the English Department at Missouri,

68 Laureate Address of John G. Neihardt . . . . (Chicago: The Bookfellows, 1921).

69 (New York: Macmillan).

70 Neihardt taped his lectures for closed-circuit television, to permit the course to be offered after his retirement. It was so presented, though with less appeal, understandably, than when the man had appeared in person.


72 The phrase is the title of a brief article in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 48 (April 1962), 198-201.


74 Quoted in Mott, "Resurgence of Neihardt," p. 200.

75 *All is But a Beginning*, p. 38.
76 The above quotations are from All is But a Beginning, pp. 57-58.


78 Some changes that defy classification but deserve mention are included in this note, an undistributed middle. The Department caught up with the twentieth century in adding women to the professorial staff. It was a positive move, long overdue. Walter Daniel's appointment and his teaching Afro-American Literature is another advance. One notices also changes possibly trivial, but of some interest. The Department does more traveling, including the acceptance of grants and exchanges. It hosts more visiting foreign scholars--from India, England, Belgium, and Germany. It exercises more (jogging, swimming, tennis, golf, paddle tennis, weight lifting) to fulfill the often neglected half of the scholarly ideal--mens sana in corpore sano. It smokes less--a gain all around. (No data available on drinking habits.) There is more religious activity than there was thirty years ago. A totally unscientific head count (concerning involvement, attendance, commitment) reveals a 20% church association in 1950, a 50-60% association today. Political preferences are not discernible.
In terms of Meyer Abrams' kinds of criticism (The Mirror and the Lamp [New York: Oxford University Press, 1953], "Introduction"), the survey course could be relied on to treat or imply the mimetic, pragmatic, and expressive kinds of criticism, but not the objective. Concerning the value of the historical survey and when the course should be required of students, the present writer remembers well the comment of an honors student about the then chronological organization of the four-semester sequence in the honors curriculum. (He was a top-flight student, who in later years has entered the profession and distinguished himself in it.) "Now I can see relationships I never saw before," he said—and this despite his having been exposed already to the grand survey in his sophomore year. The comment does not solve the problem, but it does raise the question of just when in the program is the integrating course best required. Missouri critics of the survey in sophomore year, like those in many other institutions, thought it best deferred until after course or courses in close reading.

For years when the staff was small and teaching loads were normally 12-15 hours, each teacher on the professorial staff was assigned a grader. The grader was an Instructor (for years the term to designate a teaching graduate student; later it became Teaching Assistant, known as T-A). Usually he or she was experienced, was well into the graduate program, and as a rule
had taken the course he or she was to grade for, and usually from the professor to be assisted. At time of a test, the professor would confer with the grader about the questions, what could be expected (the grader might have seen some of the questions when a student), how to mark the papers, what kind of a grading scale to use, and would often include such directives in writing to accompany the papers. Some teachers would ask only for number grades on papers; they themselves could then read a few papers at the possible border lines to determine how to translate numbers to letter grades. Professors also made themselves available to students to explain grades and comments on papers. Although they preferred to back up their graders' decisions and usually did so, they might and occasionally did modify a grade or correct a mistake. In short, conscientiously administered as it was, the system worked well--better than offhand characterizations of it imply.

In the early '60's the University sought aid for handling swelling enrollments in a system of closed-circuit television. Multiple screens were installed in large auditoriums and materials prepared for projection from a central point in Jesse Hall. With a grant from the Ford Foundation and relieved of teaching duties for a year, Professor Donald B. Clark wrote out and delivered before the camera a series of lectures covering the material in the two-semester survey, English Life and Literature. The tapes were then projected in several equipped rooms at various hours of the day. If a student missed his
regular class, he could pick up the lecture at another time. The arrangement saved man-hours for the Department. Several professors were relieved of teaching the survey, as were a number of Instructors; the latter attended the two weekly lectures and met their section of the class in person for the third meeting, to administer tests and to consider the two lectures of the week, to amplify, clarify, explain—and perhaps to take issue with—what they all had witnessed on the screen. The text used was *English Literature: A College Anthology* (1960), edited by Clark and colleagues Dickinson, Hudson, and Pace. A feature of the text encouraging self-help in literary study made it especially suitable for a course in which the principal teacher was only an image on the screen.

Clark was a good choice for the job. He was learned, had a following among students, and appeared well before the camera. He read freely from his prepared lecture, his rich, modulated voice helping him convey an author's sense in his interpretive readings from literary texts. If the course had drawbacks as presented, few persons if any thought them traceable to Don Clark's performance on tape.

But drawbacks there were, most of them inherent in the medium and the sectioning arrangement. Sectional Instructors felt bound by their assignment; they were supposed to spend their fifty minutes not on their own view of the literature but on Clark's. In time this could prove frustrating, and it did. Students, for their part, although they admired Clark's
renditions, found them shadowy and monotonous; the speaker was a disembodied voice, the lecture invariably neat, well-timed, smoothly delivered, but lacking the relief of classroom interruption, questions, change of pace, change of tone. They could never know their teacher. Nevertheless, the TV course was offered for several years, even some time after 1965, when Clark died suddenly. Then the objection of shadowiness became even more pertinent, and before long the TV course was abandoned.

John Neihardt also taped a course--his Epic America. Useful for awhile, it was subject to the same objections as Clark's course. In person Neihardt chanting his verse was an impressive figure. In image only, unfortunately, much of the power was gone.

82 Two arrangements have made curricular change easier. The undergraduate "Topics" course, available at three levels, has provided a means of offering a variety of subjects beyond the regular, permanent courses. The course may be offered once or several times. All that is required is approval of the appropriate departmental committee. For several years at the graduate level the problem of flexibility has been solved by the courses in the several fields titled "Studies in _______." The content of such a course is determined by the teacher, usually with the approval of the senior person in the field. The specific content of both "Topics" and "Studies in _______" courses is normally announced at least a semester in advance in a publicized departmental listing and description of course
offerings, designed to aid in course planning and registration.


84For several years (1914-1936) Professor James Rankin (Ph.D. Harvard) offered a course titled "The Foreign Debt of English Literature," apparently a study of "influences" or "sources" of English literature more than a study of the foreign writings for their own sake.

85"World Literature" has been called "a presumptuous and arrogant term . . . [which] we should refrain from using . . . ." (Quoted in Haskell M. Block, (ed.), The Teaching of World Literature, in University of North Carolina Studies in Comparative Literature [Chapel Hill, 1960], p. 14 and reprinted in Robert C. Pooley, "General and Interdisciplinary Courses," in John C. Gerber, (ed.), The College Teaching of English [N.Y.: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965], p. 70.) Possibly in sympathy with this view, the Missouri Department in 1973 changed the title "World Literature," used since the course's inception in 1937, to the more generally acceptable "Comparative Literature."

86The New Criticism "appears at its best," wrote Professor William DeVane, "when it operates as a partner with other kinds of scholarship," such as Louis L. Martz's Poetry of Meditation (1959), Meyer H. Abrams' The Mirror and the Lamp (1953), and Walter Bate's The Stylistic Development of Keats (1945). (Cited


88 Henry Noyes, at UMC 1940-1945, was well acquainted with Marxist thought, though to what extent it influenced his scholarship is uncertain. An echo of Henry Noyes was sounded in an interview with Jack Conroy, proletarian novelist, reported in The Missouri Review, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Fall, 1983), p. 168. Noyes, said Conroy, is "head of the China Books and Periodicals in San Francisco."

89 A. O. Lovejoy taught at UMC 1908-1910 before moving to Johns Hopkins. Six of his influential articles appeared from 1921 to 1936, when The Great Chain of Being appeared. There is little to indicate that his short stay at Missouri influenced the English Department.

90 Influential myth studies are Maude Bodkin, Archetypal Patterns in Poetry (1934), and Northrup Frye, Anatomy of Criticism (1957).

91 In spite of the later term "Area of Concentration," the term "Major" has persisted in general use as noun (a course of study or the person pursuing it) and as verb (to pursue such a course).

92 The name of the honors curriculum was changed to "Distinction" in 1927--the "Distinction Program" and, on the student's diploma,
"Graduation with Distinction." In 1959, however, the older term was revived, and since that time one speaks of the Departmental Honors Program and diplomas read "With Honors in English."

Students who took the Honors Program and graduated "With Honors in English" or "With Distinction," are listed in the Appendix.

Besides Harris and Holleran, mentioned above, the players were Howard Hinkel (trumpet), Howard Fulweiler (banjo), and Maestro Leon Dickinson (trombone).

Nobody likes the phrase "creative writing," but long usage has established it to denote the writing of poems, plays, and prose. Fictional narrative, i.e., stories and novels. "Imaginative writing" is no better and its use not so widespread. Some such word as "creative" is needed for clarity in discussion. More than once the present writer, speaking of "the writing program," has had to qualify the phrase with "creative" to distinguish his subject from Freshman English and Exposition. Usually context—speaker, topic, situation—keeps the matter clear, but not always. The remarks below follow accepted usage of "creative writing" as defined above.

For accounts of the literary societies, see Viles, pp. 41-44 and passim, and Stephens, pp. 102-104 and passim. Literary societies, including the debating that they fostered, were dying out elsewhere. See, e.g., Hardin Craig, Woodrow Wilson at Princeton, pp. 7-8.
A later series, not of writing sessions, but of literary lectures, was conceived and promoted by Professor Donald Crowley. Seven or eight public lectures, spaced through the academic year, were divided between visiting professors of English and professors in the Missouri Department. The rationale of this mixture of local and imported talent seems justified by the event; if the visitors were more eminent than the Departmental speakers, as in many cases they were, their talks were not always superior, a fact which probably did everybody good to notice. Still, it was a pleasure, and valuable to graduate students, to see in person and to hear figures known earlier only through their writings. Most members of the Department have appeared in the series at least once since its inauguration in 1968. Visiting lecturers include, among others, Reuben Brower, Wayne Booth, Cleanth Brooks, Mark Schorer, Leon Howard, William Gibson, M. L. Rosenthal, Jay Martin, Helen Vendler, Patricia Meyer Spacks, Carl Bode, and Morton Bloomfield.

Various other lecturers have appeared on campus, as their schedules permitted. One notable one was Dylan Thomas, who, on a swing around the country on a tour sponsored by John Malcolm Brinnin, gave a recitation of his verse in one of the most impressive readings of poetry ever experienced at the University. If the listeners had never quite understood what a
Celtic bard was, they knew after hearing Dylan Thomas intone his verse.

The socializing in homes following lectures is a pleasant and civilized personal welcome to the visitors and a valued opportunity for informal talk with them.


100 University of Missouri Catalogue of 1879-1880, pp. 48-50.

101 University of Missouri Catalogue of 1902-1903, p. 60.

102 The tightening of organization had its counterpart in the professionalizing of the Departmental office. The present writer was fond of the earlier secretaries, usually students, but deplored their rapid turnover. He wanted a steady appointment, a person resembling the secretary of his graduate school days, who knew all the rules and regulations and could answer all one's questions--in a soft and pleasant voice. He found such a one in Rose McClure, academically experienced at Westminster College, a knowledgeable telephone operator, stenographer, and general handy person. Her efficient ways and pleasant manner eased the task of a new chairman and of successive chairmen for twenty-one years. The Department is grateful to her.

103 Below are last names of present staff members, grouped by area and listed in order of joining the staff, together with the university where they took the Ph.D., abbreviated and in parenthesis. The full Department roster appears in the Appendix.
Language - Lance (Texas), Horner (Michigan), Youmans (Wisconsin)

Medieval - Cooke (Pittsburgh), Foley (Massachusetts), Camargo (Illinois)

Renaissance - Jones (Northwestern), Anderson (Duke), Holleran (LSU), Bender (Michigan), Meyer (Minnesota)

Seventeenth Century - Roberts (Illinois)

Eighteenth Century - Holtz (Michigan), Hinnant (Columbia), Parke (Stanford)

Nineteenth Century - Fulweiler (North Carolina), Hinkel (Tulane), Barth (Harvard), Lago (Missouri)

Twentieth Century - Devlin (Kansas), Porter (Oregon), Materer (Stanford)

American Literature - Hocks (North Carolina), Crowley (Ohio State), Sattelmeyer (New Mexico), Daniel (Bowling Green), Quirk (New Mexico)

Creative Writing - Morgan (Stanford), Santos (Utah)

Teaching of English - Nelms (Iowa)

Below are Departmental chairmen, from Weatherly to the present time, together with the dates of their tenure in office:

1945-1952 Weatherly
52-55 Moffett
55-56 Peden
56-57 Hudson (Acting Chairman)
57-60 Hudson
60-63 Dickinson
63-65 Clark
65-66 Hudson
The other studies of English Departments consulted are these:

1. The "Hughes" study (1925). Lists sixteen outstanding departments of English--four Big 10 schools, no Big 8 schools.

2. The "Kenniston" study (1957). Lists sixteen outstanding departments of English--five Big 10 schools, no Big 8 schools.


4. The "Cartter" report (1966). Of 51 departments of English, personnel was graded "Distinguished," "Strong," "Good," "Adequate Plus." Big 10 schools (in all categories)--8; Big 8--2. Missouri's English Department does not appear here or in the ranking according to "Effectiveness of Ph.D. Program."

All of these reports are available for consultation in the office of Dean of the Graduate School.

For some of this clientele we are a service department, for English courses are required in many programs throughout the University. Some students come to us because they have to; many come because they want to. Some students, for instance, who are
attracted to Columbia by the more celebrated School of Journalism find their wants better satisfied in the English Department.

One who seems to share this belief, and to show it, is former University President Elmer Ellis. It was apparent in his deanship of the College of Arts and Science, necessarily less so, because of reduced visibility, in the University Presidency. One applauds the move to name the University Library for him. To be sure, he is author, scholar, book collector, a true friend (and Friend) of the library; he also loves learning. The portrait in the Library catches something of this. It is instructive to compare this portrait with those of other University officials of an earlier day, as displayed in Dean Frank F. Stephens' History. Life may not be any less Serious Business now than then, but the dour, forbidding expressions of the figures in the formal Victorian poses are of people who would brook no nonsense. Sternness, they show, but little joy.

The Newsletter of the English Department--University of Missouri-Columbia. Vol. 7, No. 1, Winter, 1981. This newsletter, which announces activities and honors and moves of members of the staff, and news from contributing alumni, has appeared annually since 1974.
APPENDIX A

Roster of Professorial Staff
Department of English

ROSTER OF PROFESSORIAL STAFF

The roster includes names of persons who have served at least four
years on the professorial staff, or are serving on it at the time of
writing. Dates indicate length of service. The name of the university,
abbreviated, indicates, unless specified otherwise, where the professor
took the Ph.D.

NOTES

1 First dates refer to Department of English; second
dates refer to Department of Speech and Dramatic
Arts, separated from English and made autonomous
in 1940.

2 First dates are dates of service as Instructor;
second dates refer to years on the professorial
staff.

3 First dates include years in military service.

Ainsworth, Edward Gay, Jr., Cornell, 1930-1940.
Aly, Bower, Columbia, 1930-1940; 1940-1957.1
Anderson, Donald K., Jr., Duke, 1965-----.
Barth, J. Robert, S.J., Harvard, 1974-----.
Belden, Henry Marvin, Johns Hopkins, 1895-1938.
Bender, Robert J., Michigan, 1968-----.
Brashear, Minie M., North Carolina, 1919-1943.
Camargo, Martin, Illinois, 1980-----.
Clark, Donald B., George Washington, 1945-1946; 1947-1964.2
Cooke, Thomas, Pittsburgh, 1967-----.
Crowley, J. Donald, Ohio State, 1967-----.
Daniel, Walter, Bowling Green, 1973-----.
Devlin, Albert, J., Kansas, 1969-----.
Foley, John Miles, Massachusetts, 1979-----.
Fulweiler, Howard W., North Carolina, 1960-----.
Gilman, Wilbur Elwyn, Cornell, 1923-1940; 1940-1946. 1
Greenblat, Daniel, Michigan, 1974-1978.
Hinkel, Howard, Tulane, 1968-----.
Hinnant, Charles Haskell, Columbia, 1972-----.
Hocks, Richard A., North Carolina, 1965-----.
Holleran, James V., Louisiana State, 1966-----.
Holtz, William V., Michigan, 1970-----.
Hongo, Garrett K., California, 1984-----.
Horner, Winifred, Michigan, 1967-1975; 1975-----. 2
Hosmer, James Kendall, Harvard, 1872-1874.
Hudson, Charles M., Jr., Yale, 1939-1943; 1945-1974. 2
Jones, William M., Northwestern, 1959-----.
Lago, Mary, Missouri; D.Litt., Bucknell, 1964-1978; 1978-----. 2
Lance, Donald J., Texas, 1969-----.
Levis, Larry, Iowa, 1974-1983.
McAnally, David R., M.A., Arcadia College, 1877-1895.
Materer, Timothy, Stanford, 1972-----.
Meyer, Russell J., Minnesota, 1976-----.
Moffett, Harold Y., Iowa, 1925-1959.
Morgan, Speer, Stanford, 1972-----.
Nelms, Benjamin F., Iowa, 1967-----.
Noyes, Henry Halsey, University of London, 1940-1945.
Pace, George G., Virginia, 1951-1979.
Parke, Catherine N., Stanford, 1973-----.
Porter, M. Gilbert, Oregon, 1971-----.
Prouty, Charles T., Cambridge University, 1940-1948.
Quirk, Tom V., New Mexico, 1979-----.
Rankin, James Walter, Harvard, 1910-1940.
Roberts, John R., Illinois, 1968-----.

Santos, Sherod, *Utah*, 1983———.

Sattelmeyer, Robert D., Jr., *New Mexico*, 1975———.


APPENDIX B

Lists of Graduates

B.A. - With Honors or With Distinction

M.A.

Ph.D.
William Allen Aitken
June 1971
With Honors

Asad Mohammad Al-Ghalith
May 1980
With Honors: Cum Laude

Cynthia Jeanne Anderson
May 1981
With Honors: Magna Cum Laude

Sharon Marie Anton
May 1979
With Honors: Magna Cum Laude

Stephanie Ann Bruff Auner
May 1977
With Honors

Sharon Esther Bachmann
May 1975
With Honors: Cum Laude

Lyman Allen Baker
June 1964
With Honors

Thomas Sebree Baskett, Jr.
June 1970
With Honors

Louis Erwin Batts
June 1949
With Distinction

Janet V. Bear
August 1977
With Honors

Susan Elaine Bentzinger
May 1972
With Honors

Bebe Berenson
June 1949
With Distinction

Carolyn Elizabeth Bergmann
June 1968
With Honors

William Alan Bickel
June 1971
With Honors

Jayne Blankenship
August 1967
With Honors

Winfred Ernest Blevins
June 1960
With Distinction

Thomas Dean Boll
May 1978
With Honors: Magna Cum Laude

Robert Wayne Bowman, Jr.
August 1972
With Honors

Neil Stewart Bregenzer
May 1977
With Honors

James H. Bridwell
June 1968
With Honors

Harvey Harter Brimmer, Jr.
June 1948
With Distinction

William Gail Bronnoman
June 1948
With Distinction

Barbara Jean Brooks
June 1971
With Honors

Donald Joe Byrd
June 1966
With Honors
Sandra L. Carroll  
June 1964  
With Honors

Michael Edward Casey  
June 1971  
With Honors

Eric Richard Chaet  
June 1966  
With Honors

James Miller Cleton  
June 1968  
With Honors

Americus James Cleffi  
June 1953  
With Distinction

Caryn Sue Cline  
May 1976  
With Honors

Farrell Ann Collins  
May 1975  
With Honors

May LaRue Collins  
May 1978  
With Honors

Anne-Marie Conlisk  
May 1982  
With Honors: Magna Cum Laude

Brenda Joan Constance  
June 1953  
With Distinction

George Allan Cook  
Jun. 1938  
With Distinction

Barbara Jo Crawford  
June 1960  
With Distinction

Jacqueline Kay Crim  
August 1973  
With Honors

Melody Richardson Daily  
January 1969  
With Honors

Hyman Herbert Datz  
June 1949  
With Distinction

Carol Lee Davis  
May 1977  
With Honors

Joan Allene Davis  
June 1953  
With Distinction

S. Kristen Dean  
May 1982  
With Honors

Cheryl Lyn Denney  
June 1971  
With Honors

Linda Frances Dethman  
June 1970  
With Honors

Kathleen Jean Dietrich  
May 1974  
With Honors

Carl Ray Diltz  
June 1970  
With Honors

Pamela Lee Doak  
May 1981  
With Honors: Cum Laude

Mary Beth Doll  
June 1963  
With Honors
Gregory Edward Donovan  
May 1972  
With Honors

Clarissa Ellen Easton  
May 1974  
With Honors

Calvin Roger Edwards  
June 1948  
With Distinction

Nancy Marie Elliott  
May 1972  
With Honors

Walter Everett Evans III  
June 1968  
With Honors

James Lee Felty  
June 1965  
With Honors

Joanne Ferris  
June 1953  
With Distinction

Nancy Kathleen Fleming  
May 1980  
With Honors: Magna Cum Laude

Richard Alan Francis  
December 1981  
With Honors

Martha Alice Freeman  
June 1962  
With Honors

Colleen Ann Geraty  
May 1983  
With Honors

Karen Lee Garrett  
May 1979  
With Honors: Summa Cum Laude

Philip Brodie Garrison  
August 1963  
With Honors

Lisa Ann Ghan  
May 1983  
With Honors: Summa Cum Laude

Robin Beth Goldman  
May 1981  
With Honors: Summa Cum Laude

Madelyn Faye Jones Gonnerman  
June 1965  
With Honors

Robert Landon Gurnee  
June 1976  
With Honors

Carolyn Hagan  
June 1957  
With Distinction

Andree Marie Close Hall  
June 1968  
With Honors

James Harlan Hall  
June 1967  
With Honors

Patricia Ann Hall  
June 1971  
With Honors

Peggy Lynn Hallenberg  
May 1979  
With Honors

Christine Louise Hansen  
May 1979  
With Honors: Cum Laude

Ellen Catherine Harbourt  
August 1975  
With Honors: Cum Laude
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Garth Hays</td>
<td>June 1960</td>
<td>With Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Heinbert</td>
<td>June 1964</td>
<td>With Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Lee Price Herman</td>
<td>May 1982</td>
<td>With Honors: Cum Laude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bart William Hettenbach</td>
<td>August 1983</td>
<td>With Honors: Cum Laude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Lee Hettenbach</td>
<td>May 1977</td>
<td>With Honors: Summa Cum Laude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Jean Hocevar</td>
<td>June 1969</td>
<td>With Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Anne Hoesly</td>
<td>May 1978</td>
<td>With Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Elizabeth Hohn</td>
<td>June 1963</td>
<td>With Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Kay Holtkamp</td>
<td>June 1966</td>
<td>With Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Jane Horton</td>
<td>August 1979</td>
<td>With Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Jean Hoverder</td>
<td>June 1944</td>
<td>With Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Charles Hubb</td>
<td>June 1949</td>
<td>With Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adele Israel</td>
<td>December 1978</td>
<td>With Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Beth Jackson</td>
<td>June 1962</td>
<td>With Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Anne Jehorek</td>
<td>May 1974</td>
<td>With Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie Helen Kelly</td>
<td>May 1975</td>
<td>With Honors: Cum Laude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Ann Kennett</td>
<td>June 1966</td>
<td>With Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Ruth Kenyon</td>
<td>June 1965</td>
<td>With Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Ann King</td>
<td>June 1965</td>
<td>With Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Friedman Klopper</td>
<td>June 1961</td>
<td>With Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Carolyn Lang</td>
<td>June 1962</td>
<td>With Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Ann Loomis</td>
<td>June 1970</td>
<td>With Honors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nancy Elizabeth Lucido
May 1980
With Honors: Cum Laude

Susan Mary Luipersbeck
December 1978
With Honors: Cum Laude

Mary Jean Lyon
June 1964
With Honors

Cris Lynn Madsen
May 1975
With Honors

Jennifer Harlow Martin
December 1981
With Honors: Summa Cum Laude

Joan Kent Martin
August 1974
With Honors

Stephen Allen Martin
December 1977
With Honors

Miriam Lee Marty
May 1977
With Honors: Magna Cum Laude

Charles John Matheny
June 1971
With Honors

Leslie Ann Mayberry
July 1976
With Honors: Cum Laude

Laura Ann McClary
June 1967
With Honors

Moira Kathleen McCormick
May 1979
With Honors: Cum Laude

Margery McKinney
June 1957
With Distinction

Jody Lin McPherson
August 1981
With Honors: Cum Laude

Walter Duncan McQuie
May 1978
With Honors

Barbara Ann Meyer
June 1967
With Honors

Carolyn Kay Miller
June 1962
With Honors

Michael Terry Mitze
June 1968
With Honors

Jennifer Renee Monroe
May 1981
With Honors

Kimberly Helen Monroe
June 1970
With Honors

Kathryn Cornell Moore
June 1971
With Honors

Linda Ann Moore
June 1969
With Honors

Glenn Morrison
June 1970
With Honors

Dale Edward Muckerman
May 1973
With Honors
Iris von zur Muehlen  
June 1966  
With Honors

Michael Charles Mullen  
June 1970  
With Honors

Jo Nel Newman  
May 1983  
With honors: Summa Cum Laude

Anne Elizabeth Nichols  
August 1969  
With Honors

James William Nichols  
June 1949  
With Distinction

Mary Ned Nyberg  
June 1966  
With Honors

Jeanne Martha Odell  
June 1967  
With Honors

Elizabeth Ann Olson  
August 1983  
With Honors

Michael Anthony Orlando  
June 1971  
With Honors

Carol Faye Ortman  
June 1963  
With Honors

Robert Papell  
June 1949  
With Distinction

Jane Carolyn Parks  
June 1960  
With Distinction

Clay Haines Phillips  
May 1973  
With Honors

Barbara Sue Platz  
August 1969  
With Honors

Kelly Ann Potter  
May 1983  
With Honors

Corless Ann Prade  
June 1969  
With Honors

Ruie Jane Pritchard  
June 1967  
With Honors

Patricia Ann Pitman  
August 1964  
With Honors

Catherine Alice Eyer Renner  
June 1961  
With Honors

Delissa Ann Ridgway  
August 1974  
With Honors

Patricia Lou Anderson  
June 1965  
With Honors

Timothy James Riney  
December 1974  
With Honors: Cum Laude
Laura Marie Riske
May 1975
With Honors

Kim M. Roam
May 1980
With Honors: Cum Laude

Barbara Ann Robinson
June 1970
With Honors

Robert Bruce Rogers, Jr.
June 1969
With Honors

Nanette Louise Roloff
January 1971
With Honors

Rebecca Jeannine Roussin
June 1966
With Honors

Lao Elisea Rubert
May 1973
With Honors

Gregg Noland Rugolo
May 1982
With Honors: Cum Laude

Linda Ann Ruigh
December 1973
With Honors

Linda Salisbury
August 1978
With Honors

Eva Jo Sapp
July 1976
With Honors: Cum Laude

Harriett Elizabeth Scheidker
June 1948
With Distinction

Jan Shelly
August 1978
With Distinction

Dennis Frederick Siebert
June 1963
With Honors

Dana Lee Sims
May 1975
With Honors: Cum Laude

Carolyn Ann Brewer Smith
June 1963
With Honors

Angela Kay Sneller
May 1977
With Honors: Magna Cum Laude

Helen Gertrude Sobel
June 1949
With Distinction

Susan Ann Sobin
May 1972
With Honors

Betty Lou Spitzmiller
June 1966
With Honors

R. Eric Staley
June 1969
With Honors

Roslyn Marie Stendahl
August 1978
With Honors: Cum Laude
Timothy William Stoffregen  
May 1980  
With Honors: Cum Laude

Patrick Lee Story  
June 1962  
With Honors

Lisa Marie Stoutz  
May 1974  
With Honors

William Bowne Stuart  
June 1969  
With Honors

Wendy Jo Surinsky  
December 1983  
With Honors: Summa Cum Laude

Claude Bennett Tarleton, Jr.  
June 1965  
With Honors

Susan McComb Tatman  
June 1970  
With Honors

Emily Ann Taylor  
June 1961  
With Honors

Dale Newton Thorn  
June 1971  
With Honors

Creath Snowden Thorne  
June 1970  
With Honors

Carol Anne Turner  
June 1965  
With Honors

Virginia Veltrop  
May 1983  
With Honors: Summa Cum Laude

Kenneth Allen Wagoner  
December 1973  
With Honors

Sandra Lee Wallace  
May 1981  
With Honors: Magna Cum Laude

David Gregory Warren  
June 1971  
With Honors

Judy Kay Wasserman  
May 1978  
With Honors: Magna Cum Laude

Robert Marsh Watkins  
May 1980  
With Honors: Magna Cum Laude

Jane Ann Webb  
May 1980  
With Honors

Ernest H. Weiner  
June 1949  
With Distinction

Carolyn Leah Head Wheeler  
June 1966  
With Honors

Linda Jean Whitaker  
May 1973  
With Honors

William Haute Wiatt  
June 1949  
With Distinction
Darryl Lloyd Wilkinson  
December 1983  
With Honors:  Summa Cum Laude

Clair Eugene Willcox, Jr.  
August 1975  
With Honors:  Cum Laude

John Luther Windrow  
May 1972  
With Honors

George Maurice Eingor  
June 1948  
With Distinction

Jonathan Carl Wood  
May 1976  
With Honors:  Magna Cum Laude

Norman Burns Wright  
June 1969  
With Honors

Susan Rose Zachman  
June 1967  
With Honors

Michael Carl Zerbe  
June 1964  
With Honors
Walter Steve Anderson
January, 1967

Charles Arnold
August, 1925

Ellen Cauthorn Arnold
August, 1969

Frank Ames Arnold
August, 1964

Rebecca Lee Arnold
May, 1980

Anne Eliza Atchison
August, 1937

Veda Marie Atkinson
August, 1937

Penelope Wilkinson Austin
May, 1980

Etholine Grigsby Aycock
August, 1940

Beverly Ann Ayres
August, 1966

Lawrence Babb
August, 1926

Alice Margaret Bailey
August, 1938

Thomas Cullen Bailey
January, 1964

Max Cato Baird
June, 1955
Sheryll Lee Baker
May 1980

Patricia Lynn Baltimore
June, 1968

Franklin Coleman Banner
April, 1921

Edith Ellen Barker
December, 1980

Jack Bruce Barnhouse
May, 1974

Kevin Joseph Barr
August, 1975

Mary Helen Barrett
February, 1950

Beatrice Crana Bartlett
August, 1967

Mark Travis Bassett
July, 1976

Franklin Pierce Batdorf
June, 1933

Lynnanne Welch Baumgardner
August, 1968

John George Bayer, Jr.
August, 1969

Victoria Lynn Beatty
December, 1975

Virginia Beatty
August, 1934

Elizabeth Bedford
June, 1904

Myron Eugene Beebe
August, 1952

Robin Kathleen Behn
May, 1982

Helen Marie Winston Bell
January, 1958

Margaret Ellen Bell
June, 1933

Peter Thomas Bellos
August, 1956

Emily May Louise Bennett
August, 1954

Anne Caroline Benson
August, 1937

Marlene Joan Bentijen
June, 1956

Carolyn Belle Benton
August, 1908

Susan Elaine Bentzinger
August, 1973

Esther Schumn Berndtson
August, 1957

Charles Edgar Bess
July, 1931

Dudley June Bidstrup
August, 1940
Edwin Lee Bierschenk  
December, 1980

Harold Lynn Birkett  
August, 1966

Charles William Thomas Bishop  
June, 1963

Willis Clinton Bisson  
January, 1966

Valeri A. Blair  
May, 1980

Danielle A. Blanck  
June, 1961

Martin Robert Blank  
May, 1979

Wayne Ernest Blankenship  
May, 1979

Frances Elizabeth Blosser  
June, 1948

Robert Charles Bloesser  
June, 1961

Jack Babbitt  
February, 1951

Michael James Bocklage  
December, 1974

Edward Lynn Bode  
August, 1962

Grace Allen Boehner  
June, 1948

Alice Harriet Bohannon  
August, 1941

Denny R. Bohenkamp  
June, 1969

Rick L. Boland  
August, 1980

Robert Joseph Boltz  
August, 1979

Julie Dale Eger Bondeson  
August, 1968

Dale E. Bonette  
August, 1964

Robert E. Boon  
May, 1981

David Eric Booth  
August, 1970

Sr. Sylvia Marie Boothby  
August, 1929

Umran Emine Boral  
June, 1960

Susan Dell Bourgeois  
August, 1966

Kathryn Grey Bowen  
August, 1964

Wanda Marie Bowers  
February, 1950

Sara Frances Bradham  
June, 1931
Beverly Joan Brennan Brainlee  
August, 1963

Minnie May Brashear  
April, 1922

Andrea England Braun  
August, 1971

David Lee Braun  
June, 1971

Peter Michael Braun  
December, 1974

Vivian Honora Bresnehen  
June, 1911

Robert Irving Brigham  
August, 1940

Vivian Ruth Preston Brigham  
August, 1965

Marsha Gray Briscoe  
August, 1962

Rachel Hallas Brittingham  
December, 1975

James Ira Brode  
April, 1922

William John Brondell  
January, 1961

Nancy Jill Brooker  
August, 1968

Charles Edward Brown  
June, 1948

Donald Elliott Brown  
June, 1970

Esther Ernestine Brown  
July, 1931

Jeanne Evelyn Brown  
December, 1927

Lucy Carvell Brown  
June, 1955

Mary Karen Brown  
August, 1966

Michael Duncan Brown  
August, 1968

Zella Vivian Brown  
June, 1925

Oscar Lee Brownstein  
June, 1956

Suzanne Brooks Brownstein  
August, 1957

Ann Hughes Brueggen  
December, 1982

Jean Young Brunk  
June, 1958

Rober Scott Buchanan  
January, 1963
Jean Ruth Buchert
July, 1948

David Earle Buck
June, 1967

Peter John Buchanan
August, 1968

Louis John Budrewicz
August, 1942

James H. Bullis
January, 1971

Gregory Francis Burgard
December, 1971

James Lee Burke
June, 1960

Hattie Lucille Burroughs
July, 1936

Hillier McClure Burrowes
June, 1916

Ray Heyden Burson
June, 1960

Sam Milton Bushman
June, 1937

Mary Louise Bussabarger
August, 1963

John W. Butcher
August, 1979

Karen Ann Butery
August, 1967

Brian Richard Butler
May, 1977

Neil Warren Byer
June, 1949

Ruth Elizabeth Bynum
August, 1934

Donald J. Byrd
August, 1967

Phyllis Kay Cafer
August, 1969

Martha Grate Callicott
June, 1929

Evan La Salle Caram
May, 1977

Jetta Carleton
August, 1939

Patricia Anne Carman
August, 1968

James Barrett Carother
June, 1964

Virginia Maude Carpenter
August, 1968

Penelope B. Carroll
August, 1968

Floyd Weldon Casey
August, 31, 1945

Edgar M. Castellini
August, 1973
Julia Ann Cato
August, 1961

Thelma Daily Cave
August, 1956

Thera Pauline Cavendar
July, 1943

Robert Michael Chandler
August, 1968

Chi Ying Chen
August, 1951

Alice May Childs
August, 1929

Mary Jane Robinson Chinn
July, 1948

Clive Alexander Chisholm
August, 1962

Cecil Clark Chism
August, 1950

Sung Hee Cho
May, 1982

George Edward Christian
August, 1952

Shu Yang Chu
June, 1949

Cland Clarence Clapp
August, 1927

Ann Hackward Clark
May, 1974

Mary B. Clark
December, 1971

Roger Gordon Clark
January, 1961

Elizabeth Mills Clendaniel
June, 1961

Americus James Cleffi
June, 1956

Linda Jane Cliervi
June, 1968

Caryn Cline
August, 1978

Trilbie Lovina Clukey
August, 1972

Shirley Kleweno Clyde
January, 1960

Lynne Patricia Cochrane-Rossi
August, 1980

Bruce John Cole
August, 1960

Janet Chase Collins
August, 1964

Judith Lively Collins
August, 1973

Doroth Hazel Conant
June, 1932

Janet Elizabeth Conboy
December, 1971
Brian Gerald Gonlan
June, 1967

George Allan Cook
June, 1939

Jean Walker Cooke
August, 1971

James Lawrence Coomer
August, 1966

Carl Bradford Cooper
May, 1978

Mary Edith Corn
June, 1967

James L. Cornelius
August, 1963

George William Corporon, Jr.
June, 1941

Harold Davis Cox
August, 1952

Estella Faye Cratty
June, 1916

Macy A. Creek
August, 1969

Nancy Cressler
December, 1982

Elijah Harry Criswell
August, 1924

Thomas Crockett
May, 1983

Cathleen A. Crooks
August, 1972

Louis Ida Crooks
August, 1959

Beth Ann Croskey
August, 1952

Victoria Lee Cullimore
May, 1983

Iris Rozelle Culver
August, 1947

Laurence Anthony Cummings
August, 1952

Ray Cummings
June, 1936

Donald Hayward Cunningham
August, 1962

Keith K. Cunningham, Jr.
August, 1966

Marie Isabel Cunningham
June, 1941

Ruth Cunningham
August, 1952

Jeanne Carol Curtis
August, 1939

Melody Ann Richardson Daily
January, 1971

Joan Allene Davis Dallam
June, 1960
Diana Kimberly Dalton
December, 1971

Sue Ann Maxwell Dalton
June, 1959

Kenneth Oscar Danz
June, 1959

Susan Darley
May, 1977

Hugo John David
August, 1940

William Earl Davidson
June, 1946

Barbara Davis
August, 1968

Harvey Davis
August, 1938

Virginia Lucile Davis
June, 1961

William Parrish Dawson
May, 1976

Carmen Decker
December, 1971

Laura Greer Decker
August, 1938

Susan J. Decker
August, 1977

Francis Lawrence DeGangi
June, 1930

Brenda Carol DeMartini
May, 1982

Lillian Demendi-Connor
May, 1983

Robert Michael Dennison
Deborah Der Bing

Bonnie D. Devet
July, 1976

E. Christine DeVries
May, 1973

Ora Beatrice DeVilbiss
June, 1940

Elizabeth Landis Dibert
June, 1969

Mary Francis Dick
July, 1936

R.P. Dickey
January, 1969

Paul Wesley Dieckmann
August, 1966

Deborah Digges
July, 1981

Dorothy Richardson Dill
August, 1982

Harika Hidayet Dincel
June, 1959

Edward H. Dinger
May, 1978
Duellen Roberts Distelhorst
August, 1970

Sarah Margaret Dodge
August, 1968

E. Jane Donnell
January, 1971

Anna Elizabeth Donnelly
June, 1925

Anita Alibertini Donovan
August, 1966

Ronald Anthony Dougherty
August, 1967

Diane Dowdey
May, 1977

James W. Drier
May, 1981

Ellen Ryan Dubinski
August, 1982

Samuel Edward Duff
April, 1923

Larry Dean Dunham
August, 1959

Linda Sue Dunker
August, 1978

Russell Claron Duntley
August, 1967

Aarmel Dyer
August, 1937

Mary Paul West Dyer
August, 1965

Robert Lee Dyer
August, 1966

Eugene Robert Eastin
August, 1968

Margaret Sellars Edward
June, 1936

Calvin Roger Edwards
June, 1949

Dixie Lee Ehrenreich
June, 1964

Elaine A. Eilermann
December, 1971

Gail S. Elderidge
January, 1969

Brownlee Wilmoth Elliott
July, 1953

Katherine Elliott
August, 1938

Seth Howard Ellis
June, 1954

Frances Guthrie Amberson
June, 1930

Buryl Frederick Engleman, Jr.
January, 1963

John Lawrence Epps
May, 1974
Ernestine Ernst
August, 1932

Minnie Agnes Essig
August, 1928

Ronald Luther Estes
January, 1959

Seaford William Eubanks
June, 1940

Patricia Lightbody Evans
August, 1973

Robert Everett
December, 1983

Beverly J. Eversole
May, 1980

Martha Kennedy Ewing
June, 1929

Joe Poley Fagan
June, 1917

Sandra Eileen Falloon
December, 1978

Rachel Bernice Faries
August 1954

Paul Page Faris
August, 1928

Julie Michele Farris
December, 1982

Peter Howard Feldman
May, 1976

Stephen Fendelman
January, 1967

Joanne Ferris
June, 1954

John Charles Fiedler
February, 1957

Rachel Kibler Field
July, 1936

Eric Fields
December, 1971

Chlo Fink
June, 1917

Juanita Fink
June, 1929

Joseph Holferty Firman
June, 1948

Paul Leslie Fisher, Jr.
June, 1947

Rodney B. Fitch
June, 1948

Oriene Flomerfelt
August, 1945

Jack Gerald Florida
January, 1970
Stephan Kelso Foland
August, 1969

Carolyn W. Ford
August, 1960

Mary Lee George Forderhase
August, 1965

Bill R. Foster, Jr.
May, 1979

Don Landrum Francis
December, 1976

Peggy D. Frank
August, 1964

Charles Edward Frehn, Jr.
June, 1958

Jeffrey Henry Friedman
May, 1978

Mary Denise Frein
June, 1967

Randall Roy Freisinger
August, 1964

Lucille Pauline Frey
August, 1963

Mildred Flynn Frisbie
August, 1977

Charles Edward Fuchs
May, 1978

Rose Ann C. Gaeta
May, 1982

True G. Gaines
August, 1935

Nemesio Abejon Gambito
June, 1932

Evelyn Miller Doolin Galbraith
June, 1948

Sally Marie Gallion
January, 1971

Michael Leroy Irving Gardine
June, 1962

Corinne L. Garner
August, 1927

Nancy Ann Garrison
January, 1965

Philip B. Garrison
August, 1964

Viola Marie Garza
May, 1983

Anne Cooper Gay
June, 1961

Edith Ursula Geery
June, 1910

Richard Edward Geha
June, 1965

Robert John Giest
June, 1934

Karlene Madalaine Gentile
June, 1969
Diana L. George  
May, 1972

Sr. M. Neri Gerhart, OSF  
August, 1968

Paul Louis Gianoli  
June, 1970

Linda Rea Gibbens  
August, 1982

Michael A. Gilles  
August, 1973

Carol Lee Gilliam  
August, 1967

Jeannie Loye Gillmore  
May, 1978

Gail Michiko Ginoza  
August, 1982

Betty Jean Gipson  
August, 1965

Alice M. Giroux  
August, 1971

Irwin Lee Glatstein  
June, 1940

Nancy Ann Glenn  
August, 1966

Charles Harold Gold  
August, 1960

Netta Murray Goldsmith  
August, 1964

Deborah Mills Gordon  
August, 1934

Richard Evarts Gordon  
August, 1980

Sarah Ellen Gordon  
August, 1965

Margaret Bramble Garrell  
August, 1929

Deborah Jean Goss  
December, 1975

Ruth Sweeney Gossen  
August, 1972

Rua Jean Braebner  
August, 1969

Louis Nepolean Gray  
June, 1897

Daniel Green  
August, 1982

Elsie Fern Green  
August, 1940

John David Green  
August, 1980

Smith Cooper Gretter  
June, 1942

Deborah Joann Griffin  
August, 1975

James John Griffith  
May, 1975
Margaret Jayne Griswold
June, 1965

Annabelle Lee Gross
June, 1970

Gail Lee Gross
June, 1963

Robert Landon Gurnee
May, 1979

Authur William Gutekunst
August, 1941

Richard Carl Hackman
August, 1961

Esther Carolyn Phillips Hager
August, 1932

Theresa Diane Goodrich Hale
May, 1979

John Michael Hall
June, 1968

Waston Adrian Hall
August, 1939

Charles F. Hallenberg
May, 1979

Karen R. Hamer
July, 1981

Goldy M. Hamilton
June, 1904

Sandra Ellen Hamilton
August, 1963

Mayme Lucille Hamlett
August, 1938

William Carl Hamlin
June, 1953

Leigh S. Hampton
May, 1978

Margaret E. Hamra
August, 1968

Lawrence William Haney
August, 1971

Culah Ann Hanlin
June, 1965

Karen M. Hanrahan
May, 1978

Elizabeth Anne Hardwicke
August, 1975

Hubert Lee Harral
August, 1958

Eileen A. Harrington
May, 1979

James Griffith Harris
July, 1948

Patricia H. Harris
June, 1964

Ruth Patton Harris
June, 1934

Thomas Burford Harris
August, 1951

Willie Viola Harris
June, 1929

Eugenia L. Harrison
September, 1943
Sarah Katherine Harvey  
August, 1938

Yvette Harvey  
December, 1971

Mary Ann Hatton  
August, 1926

Mayme Yancey Hawkins  
August, 1926

Donald Eugene Hayden  
June, 1937

Warren D. Hayes  
August, 1970

William Spencer Hayes  
September, 1942

John Que Hays  
August, 1932

Cleetis Juanita Headlee  
July, 1943

Jack Heflin  
May, 1979

John Paul Hendry  
May, 1973

James Thomas Henke  
August, 1966

Robert Hamilton Henigan  
June, 1961

Phillip A. Hennessy  
May, 1977

Patricia Henshall  
May, 1978

Daniel L. Hensley  
August, 1983

Craig Eugene Hergert  
August, 1980

Thomas Edward Hertz  
January, 1965

Wilhelmina Augusta Herwig  
August, 1926

Anita Jane Hill  
June, 1936

Marvin Duane Hinten  
May, 1980

Bonnie Jean Hocevar  
August, 1970

Elaine D. Hocks  
August, 1979

Robert Raymond Hedges  
February, 1955

Mary Elizabeth Hodgson  
May, 1973

Carl Lindroth Hoffsten  
August, 1968

Robert Goode Hogan  
June, 1954

Kathleen Elizabeth Hohn  
August, 1966
Brian Ray Holloway  
August, 1975

Mary Webster Housman  
June, 1925

Carol Nina Holloway  
June, 1971

Katherine Nelson Houston  
June, 1943

Sr. Marcella Marie Holloway  
September, 1943

Clayton Allen Hubbs  
June, 1966

Kenneth Burnham Holmes  
August, 1965

Florence Hudson  
August, 1947

Leigh Howard Holmes  
August, 1965

Mildred Hudson  
August, 1926

Wayne Holmes  
August, 1965

Virginia Orear Hudson  
April 26, 1922

Frank Scott Hook  
June, 1947

Linda Kay Hughes  
December, 1971

Janice Kay Hopkins  
June, 1969

Earl Herman Hull, Jr.  
August, 1969

Robert Morris Hopkins  
August, 1964

Judith Ann Humphrey  
August, 1963

David Hamilton Horne  
August, 1946

Joan F. Hunter  
August, 1964

George Frank Horneker  
June, 1966

Helen Rank Huntley  
June, 1966

Winifred Bryan Hornr  
August, 1960

May Miller Hurst  
August, 1937

Jewell Mae Hoskins  
August, 1954

Cleora Jewell Hutchison  
August, 1938

Paul R. House  
May, 1980

Gregory Lewis Hutchison  
August, 1939
Paul Michael Hutchison  
August, 1966

Robert Hutchison  
January, 1964

Clay Hutto  
May, 1983

Emma Fisher Hyde  
June, 1925

John Rennolds Innes  
August, 1958

Gloria Ann Behrens Irwin  
January, 1963

Nobuko Ishimoto  
August, 1969

Bernita Pearl Isley  
June, 1941

Frances Jean Jackson  
August, 1964

Emma Jean James  
August, 1950

Eula James  
June, 1918

Judith Brandli James  
June, 1960

Patricia A. Jansen  
August, 1970

Paul Franz Janz  
January, 1960

Catherine Morrow Jarrell  
May, 1982

Kay Eileen Jarrett  
June, 1969

Sears Reynolds Jayne  
June, 1942

Christie Frances Jeffreis  
June, 1925

Judith Anne Jenkins  
June, 1960

Richard Douglas Jenkins  
August, 1972

Mary Kay Patrick Jennings  
May, 1982

Ida Adele Jewett  
June, 1918

Leticia Vega Jiminez  
August, 1961

Bernice Eugenia Johnson  
August, 1933

Dora Johnson  
July 31, 1931

Jeffrey Stephens Johnson  
August, 1983

Joy Maurine Johnson  
August, 1964

Louis George Johnson  
June, 1947
Mary Irene Johnson
August, 1947

Stanley Dean Johnson
August, 1930

Josephine Johnston
June, 1926

Robert DeSales Johnston
August, 1952

Thomas William Jolly
August, 1940

Ercel Carmen Jones
August, 1968

Mary Elizabeth Jones
August, 1950

Mary Jane Jones
January, 1963

Laura King Kadwell
August, 1966

Theckla Kahn
June, 1907

Harold Marion Kane
August, 1964

Kay Callison Karnes
August, 1968

Dorothy Kaucher
April 22, 1920

Ethel Kaufman
June, 1927

Joan Bernadette Keating
December, 1979

Joyce Gillilan Keitel
December, 1983

Beulah Grace Keith
June, 1940

Norman A. Kelley
January, 1970

Allen Bond Kellogg
August, 1928

Sharrell Grace Keyes
June, 1965

Linda Lee Kick
December, 1978

Ann Lorraine Kieffer
June, 1966

James Columbus Kilgore
June, 1963

Bernice Geraldine Killam
September, 1944

Chung Gun Kim
August, 1979

Steinberg Sucksan Kim
January, 1960

Nova North Kimzey
August, 1951

Ruth Ann Hansen Kinder
August, 1965
James Gordon Kingsley, Jr.
August, 1956

Violet Irene Krischel
August, 1960

Berte Leroy Kinkade
June, 1924

Vera Sophie Kroencke
June, 1948

Darrellyn Ruth Kiser
August, 1973

Emma Marie Krumsick
August, 1946

William Albert Kleckner
June, 1932

Vernon David Kruse
August, 1966

Wilfred Huning Klick
August, 1932

John N. Kuhlman
August, 1982

Barbara Ann Harris Knipp
May, 1976

Louise Churchill Lacy
April, 1922

Barbara Harris Knispel
August, 1966

Mary McClelland Lago
June, 1965

Richard Alan Knudsen
August, 1959

Barbara Elise Lamy
June, 1960

Ophelle Frances Koontz
April, 1923

Alfred W. Landwehr
August, 1964

Martin Leonard Kornbluth
June, 1952

Spencer Park Lane
June, 1948

Barbara Lee Kramer
August, 1963

Alice Rose Langendorf
August, 1933

Michael Kramer
August, 1966

Arthur DeKalb Langston, Jr.
June, 1962

John T. Krieger
August, 1968

Tudor Lanius
June, 1918

Authur Sidney Kriral
August, 1949

Nancy Lankford
August, 1979
Roland Louis Lanser  
July, 1948

Terry Russell Lass  
May, 1975

Myrna Cox Lauer  
June, 1930

Deborah Marie Laughney  
December, 1980

Thomas Gene Lavazzì  
July, 1981

Joe Keith Law  
December, 1975

Albert James Lawrence  
May, 1977

Fern Ledgerwood  
August, 1933

Dwight Augustus Lee  
February, 1950

Ester Gladys Leech  
August, 1933

Sharon Ruth Lehr  
August, 1966

Mande Elizabeth Lenoy  
June, 1941

Leonard J. Leon  
May, 1973

Joel Rimell Levitt  
January, 1968

Florentine Rhoda Leweke  
June, 1925

Lawrence Bernard Lewis  
August, 1955

Lura Lewis  
April, 1919

Nina Dawn Lewis  
August, 1983

Ronald Scott Librach  
December, 1972

Clara Edna Lick  
August, 1939

Marilyn Louise Linstromberg  
December, 1972

Gertrude Jennie Lippert  
June, 1948

Betty Jacqueline Littleton  
August, 1962

James R. Lockhart, Jr.  
December, 1983

Robert Finley Long  
January, 1949

Patricia Ann Loomis  
December, 1971

Sandra Maria Loureiro  
December, 1981

James Lilburn Lowe  
January, 1949
Marla Sue Lowenthal  
August, 1975

Willis Lee Loy  
August, 1964

Malta Clarrie Lukens  
June, 1915

Linda Hasselstrum Lusk  
January, 1969

Jean Joseph Madden  
August, 1951

Trudy Linger Madden  
August, 1966

Amelia Madera  
August, 1933

Theresa Rose Maffia  
August, 1942

Lessie Dee Jones Mahan  
July, 1948

Mabel Irmyn Major  
June, 1917

Nora Jeanette Williams Mann  
June, 1963

Joel Barry Margulis  
June, 1963

Alma Borth Martin  
August, 1929

Ruth Ellen Massey  
May, 1973

Edward George Matousek  
June, 1940

William Erwart Matthews  
April, 1922

Frances Maupin  
June, 1940

Marsha Jane Maxwell  
January, 1967

Alice L. Mayfield  
December, 1973

Linda Leigh Mazzucchi  
December, 1979

James Thomas McAfee  
August, 1950

M. Beth McCaleb  
August, 1970

Ralph Alan McCanse  
June, 1925

Patrick Francis McCarthy  
January, 1966

Alice Pauline Buchanan McConnell  
June, 1949

Maudeva McCord  
July, 1936

P. Kathleen McCoy  
August, 1982

Jack Jasper McCubbin  
August, 1951
Mary McCutchan
August, 1928

Barbara Jane McDermott
August, 1949

Agnes Hamblen McDonald
June, 1954

Annette B. McElhiney
August, 1968

Almo Leslie McElmurry
August, 1968

Kathryn Winston McFarland
February, 1955

Harriet LaVonne Winten McGee
June, 1947

Ida Belle McGill
June, 1933

Myrta Ethel McGinnis
June, 1917

Marjorie Jeanette McGrath
July, 1948

Edna Ernestine Schupp McGuire
June, 1944

Cynthia Wilkes McHarg
June, 1942

Michael Peter McKeon
August, 1983

James Courtright McKinley
June, 1968

Margery Mulkern McKinney
June, 1965

Orion Wade McLain
June, 1962

Helen R. McNally
June, 1971

Alan D. McNarie
August, 1978

Mary Catherine Mc Nerney
July, 1953

Douglas J. B. McReynolds
August, 1969

William Gilbert McWhorter
August, 1940

Linda Kay Mealiea
June, 1967

William Joseph Meyer
August, 1965

Helen Michailoff
July, 1948

Greg Peter Michalson
August, 1978

Donald Michael Michie
January, 1960

James Lee Miles
August, 1962

Charles Louis Miller
June, 1957
Donald Ray Miller  
June, 1949

Florence Anne Miller  
June, 1928

Leslie Adrienne Miller  
August, 1980

Lynette Marie Miller (Ballard)  
August, 1969

Patricia Hall Miller  
December, 1972

Virginia Eileen Miller  
August, 1969

Gerald David Mills  
June, 1966

Grace Elizabeth Mingus  
August, 1940

Anne Collier Minor  
August, 1983

Laura Kathryn Mitchell  
May, 1982

Thomas Mitchell  
August, 1980

Stella Marilyn Mitwede  
August, 1955

Michael Terry Mitze  
August, 1969

Janet Jacobs Moler  
May, 1980

Kimberlie Helen Monroe  
August, 1981

Ethel Moore  
June, 1917

Eva Lura Moore  
July, 1931

John Robert Moore  
June, 1914

Linda Ann Moore  
August, 1970

Jane S. Morgan  
August, 1979

Marion Darlington Morris  
June, 1927

Maxine Virginia Ellsworth Mosley  
August, 1965

Dale E. Muckerman  
August, 1974

George McMurry Muldrow  
June, 1953

Dennis Lorin Murphy  
June, 1927

Eugenia Fox Murphy  
May, 1983

Adrein M. Myers  
June, 1970

Robert Lee Myers  
June, 1930
Frank Shozo Nakada  
June, 1958

Yosuo Nakanishi  
February, 1957

Frances Louise Nardin  
June, 1913

Terence M. Neason  
August, 1972

Frederick Louis Neabe  
June, 1937

Margaret McBride Neff  
August, 1960

Sharon Kaye Neiger  
May, 1972

James Wheeler Nelson  
August, 1971

Walter H. Nelson  
December, 1971

Edward Thorpe Nichols  
August, 1951

Anne Elizabeth Nicholson  
January, 1969

Patricia Sue Noland  
August, 1969

David Carl Noren  
December, 1976

Frederick Christian Norlin  
August, 1951

Charles Heckert Norris  
August, 1946

Lillian Anita Nothdurft  
August, 1939

Lena Lacey Notson  
August, 1926

Charles Edward Noyes  
June, 1940

V. Demorell Tullis Nunley  
January, 1971

Pamela Edwards Nunnery  
August, 1980

Anna O'Brien  
August, 1939

John Woolf O'Connor  
August, 1927

Gerald Wallace Odom  
January, 1971

Thomas P. O'Donnell  
August, 1969

J. J. Offutt  
August, 1969

Charles Henry Olendinning  
August, 1955

Walter Scott Olsen  
December, 1981

Judith Ellen Olson  
August, 1966
Stephen A. Orlich  
December, 1971

Patricia Lynne O'Rourke  
August, 1978

Henry Francis Ottinger  
August, 1967

Gregory Allan Overfelt  
August, 1980

Kathy Lynn Overhulse  
May, 1976

Fauna Robertson Overlay  
September, 1943

Mabel Owen  
August, 1932

Nadine Pace  
June, 1928

Satya Sheel Pachori  
August, 1966

Joan Dunaway Packer  
August, 1970

Pearl Chu Pai  
June, 1960

Mary Ellen Pangle  
June, 1933

Achara Panichapat Wangsotorn  
January, 1970

Barbara Shirk Parish  
June, 1966

Alice Parker  
August, 1927

Jane Carolyn Parks  
June 6, 1961

Timothy Parshall  
July, 1976

Cristy Watson Passman  
May, 1973

Jerry Walter Passon  
August, 1980

Mary Ellen Patt  
August, 1968

Martha Davis Patton  
December, 1979

Edith Lee Payne  
August, 1928

Sister Mary Ralph Payne  
August, 1972

Raymond Peats  
August, 1978

Patricia Ann Pride Pemberton  
January, 1964

Herbert Milton Penick  
August, 1928

Orvan Bernard Peterson  
August, 1960

Michael R. Pfeifer  
May, 1976
Rick W. Pfeiffer  
May, 1974

Pansye A. Hawkins Powell  
September, 1942

Arthur James Pflughaupt  
August, 1960

Ray Ferdinand Powell  
June, 1959

Panayotis George Phialas  
August, 1939

Alice Pragman  
June, 1953

Emily Margaret Phillips  
June, 1970

John Harvey Pratt  
August, 1966

Maria Pia Pierce  
August, 1966

Joseph Andrew Preston  
August, 1965

James Leland Pinson  
July, 1976

Ronald Stephen Preuss  
August, 1963

Frank M. Pisanio  
December, 1982

John Anderson Price  
June, 1952

Mary Elizabeth Pitney  
June, 1935

John William Proctor  
August, 1960

Edna Rosine Polster  
August, 1925

Mary-Joe Purcell  
January, 1953

Eugene Philip Pomerantz  
June, 1964

Ann Hundley Purvis  
August, 1966

Georgeanne Barlow Porter  
May, 1979

Erich Frederic Radtke  
August, 1965

Cora Ann Pottenger  
August, 1946

Martha Marple Rainbolt  
June, 1971

Gerald Dale Potts  
August, 1964

Erna E. Raithel  
August, 1954

Katherine Powell  
August, 1939

Elizabeth Louise Rambo  
August, 1978
John Richard Ramer
June, 1953

Mary Claire Randolph
June, 1929

Marion Francis Rasmussen
August, 1966

Orna Raz
July, 1981

Carol Jean O'Brien Reed
May, 1974

Catherine Alice Eyer Reneer
January, 1963

Everett John Rees
August, 1960

Jerald L. Reeves
January, 1960

Junita Kruse Rehder
June, 1933

Mary Lynn Reid
August, 1969

Stephen Dudley Reid
August, 1964

Thomas John Reigstad
January, 1971

Alice Margaret Reinbold
August, 1938

David Reis
May, 1975

Stephen Thomas Renner
December, 1982

Loren D. Reser
June, 1966

Gilbert Hewitt Reynolds
July, 1948

Donald T. Rhoads, Jr.
December, 1974

Linda Sue Rich
June, 1971

John Thomas Richards
June, 1962

Jeptha Riggs
June, 1904

Verda Grace Riller
August, 1941

Mary Mande Rion
August, 1962

Dennis J. Riordan
May, 1972

Donald Ray Roberts
January, 1960

Jeff L. Roberts
August, 1963

Lorraine M. Roberts
December, 1971

Elda Eliza Robins
June, 1925
Juliet M. Lackman Rodeman
May, 1978

Hiluard G. Rogers, Jr.
August, 1971

Alan John Rohrbough
August, 1979

Nanette L. Roloff
August, 1972

Olive Crocker Rolston
June, 1937

Barbara Ruth Romanofsky
August, 1969

Maxwell Edward Rosen
June, 1947

Dorothy Jane Ross
September, 1944

Woodburn Overstreet Ross
August, 1927

Charles Henry Rowell
August, 1962

Julia Ann Lapp Rugh
July, 1953

James I. Ruppel
August, 1979

Edna Frances Russell
June, 1940

Effie Russell
June, 1926

Richard August Russell
August, 1949

David L. Ryan
August, 1969

Susan Mae Sackman
May, 1972

Nell Louise Sadler
August, 1966

Julie Barbara Sandblom
May, 1978

Gordon Ray Sanders
February, 1957

Mary Liddane Sanders
June, 1968

Stephen L. Sangirardi
August, 1977

Sara Serene Sapers
June, 1925

Maurice C. Savore
June, 1931

Mary Morelock Saxon
August, 1940

Mark W. Schaefer
May, 1982

Sherri Lynn Schaefer
January, 1967

Ted W. Schaefer
January, 1969
Kevin Paul Schehr  
May, 1978

Margaret J. Schillinger  
August, 1968

Samuel Schnieders  
May, 1979

Helen Margaret Schuette  
August, 1971

Mary Imelda Schuster  
August, 1942

Gweneth Boge Schwab  
January, 1970

Mary Ruth Scott  
August, 1962

Rebecca Kathryn Scott  
June, 1943

Albert Taylor Scroggins, Jr.  
August, 1949

Laurence Samuel Seale  
June, 1965

Hannah Elizabeth Hanley Seelen  
August, 1961

William Earl Seelen  
August, 1940

Christ James Seibel  
May, 1975

Helen Severs  
June 5, 1935

Lynnda Seyfried  
August, 1975

Robert Shacochis  
August, 1979

Marian Alice Shaver  
June, 1934

John William Shaw  
August, 1977

Robert S. Shelor  
July, 1976

Mary Ann Sherby  
August, 1968

Margaret Breckner Shewmaker  
June, 1966

Bettie Bronson Shull  
June, 1953

Hillary Anne Shurtleff  
May, 1983

Richard Mark Sickman  
August, 1966

Sr. Mary Helen Siegel  
August, 1930

Florence Rosine Sigmund  
August, 1941

Nancy Carol Silberstein  
July, 1976

James D. Simmerman  
May, 1976
Andrew Maynard Simmons  
June, 1964

Daphna Lucille Sipes  
June, 1937

Corless Ann Smith  
August, 1970

Elmer Lee Smith, Jr.  
August, 1947

Ruby May Smith  
July, 1936

Walter R. Smith  
May, 1977

Angela K. Sneller  
August, 1978

Suzanne C. Snyder  
May, 1979

Sharon L. Sommers  
May, 1975

Lynda Marie Sonner  
June, 1971

Patricia Ann Sorrells  
May, 1978

Catherine Hilderman Sosensky  
August, 1956

Rhoda Sotiropoulou  
June, 1962

Olivia Diamond Sowayan  
December, 1971

Helen Chadwell Spaith  
December, 1972

Aurelia Spalding  
June, 1925

Mabel Ruth Sparks  
August, 1941

Nadine Garland Sparks  
August, 1942

Noreen Dee Sparks  
May, 1974

Margaret Kinkead Spicer  
August, 1927

Betty Lou Spitzmiller  
August, 1967

Nancy Anne Splinter  
June, 1969

Laura Lynn Spradley  
August, 1977

Josef Ivan Spudich  
June, 1941

Mary Ann Stacey  
August, 1969

R. Eric Staley  
August, 1970

Mary Lee Stapleton  
August, 1963

Charles Lowell Steevens  
January, 1967
Gloria Sue Calahan Stephenson
June, 1966

Bruce Edward Strosnider
January, 1967

Walter Marion Stepp, Jr.
June, 1964

Wayne Douglas Stubbs
May, 1979

Myra Christine Slater Stiles
August, 1963

Marcia Diane Sublett Johnson
August, 1970

Lillian Lois Steckman
April, 1923

Jennie Kathryn Suddeth
February, 1943

Florence Potter Stedman
August, 1932

Etta May Suetterlin
August, 1939

Ava D. Steele
June, 1900

Zay Rusk Sullens
April, 1919

Carole Ann Steiner
August, 1961

Patricia Anne Sullivan
January, 1971

George Toomey Stewart
August, 1968

Mary Alice Summers
August, 1962

Glenn Dennis Stoker
May, 1982

Silas Edward Summers
June, 1936

Debra K. Stoner
May, 1978

Mary Rose Sweeney
June, 1948

Sam Stowers
December, 1980

John Wood Switzer
June, 1957

Mildred Pollack Strassberg
June, 1953

Marla-Ann Tannenbaum
December, 1973

Gregory J. Stratman
May, 1983

Tamara Tanner
July, 1976

Charles William Strong
August, 1967

Shirley Anita Tarbell
August, 1983
Donna A. Taryle
August, 1968

Elizabeth Cornelia Taylor
June, 1953

Jean Elsie Taylor
June, 1915

Penelope Taylor
August, 1982

Richard Burton Taylor
August, 1947

Susan Beth Taylor
May, 1977

Kathryn Sabina Tedford
August, 1945

Ernest W. Tedlock
June, 1933

Alexander Gates Thomas
June, 1925

Constance Susan Thomas
August, 1977

Laura Maebell Thomas
June, 1953

William Miles Thomas
August, 1938

Donald Clair Thompson
August, 1934

Robert S. Thompson
May, 1979

Ann Elizabeth Thorne
August, 1972

Esther L. Thornton Renshaw
August, 1970

Beverly McKewen Thrush
January, 1967

Jane Alison Thurlo
August, 1972

Sharon Kay Tiffany
August, 1965

Michael Timko
June, 1950

Catherine Fontelle Titus
August, 1950

Margaret Ruth Toalson
August, 1947

Thomas J. Robben
May, 1976

Miriam S. Toibb
January, 1970

Nancy Lee Provost Tomhave
January, 1970

Virginia Lee Danford Toulouse
June, 1949

Newton Ira Townsend
June, 1949

George Young Trail
August, 1964
Homer Cook Trail  
January, 1970

Alan Wesley Trapp  
June, 1960

William Lewis Trogdon  
August, 1962

William Leigh Trowbridge  
August, 1965

Laura Jean Trovato  
December, 1971

Charles Richard Troy  
May, 1974

Donna Maize Truitt  
June, 1932

V. Demorell Tullis  
January, 1971

Sylvia Bland Guffin Turner  
June, 1959

Frances Anne Lawrence Tyler  
June, 1950

Wilford Burton Tyler  
June, 1949

Maude Leona Uhland  
June, 1924

Samuel T. Upton  
June, 1968

Grace Evelyn Valentine  
January, 1960

Billy Mikel Vanderbeck  
August, 1977

Dennis Paul Vannatta  
December, 1972

Alma Florence Leaver Vaughan  
June, 1959

Rebecca Merle Vaughn  
June, 1934

Richard Darrell Vick  
June, 1966

Gail Helen Vieth  
August, 1965

Marie Chrisman Vilhauer  
June, 1932

Penny Villegas  
August, 1971

Mary Lee Vincent  
August, 1960

Grace Esther Vinson  
June, 1924

Mark W. Vogel  
August, 1982

Suzanne Waddill  
August, 1966

Frances Winifred Waggner  
June, 1937

Lucien Wagner  
August, 1975
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elsbeth Victoria Wahlin</td>
<td>August, 1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Waldrop</td>
<td>June, 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael L. Walker</td>
<td>July, 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Edward Walker</td>
<td>August, 1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Andrew Walter</td>
<td>August, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Alma Warden</td>
<td>June, 1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleman Scott Ware</td>
<td>June, 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Harris Warren</td>
<td>December, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Hudson Washington</td>
<td>June, 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Marvin Wasson</td>
<td>August, 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Patrick Waters</td>
<td>January, 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia House Watson</td>
<td>August, 1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Howell Weatherly</td>
<td>June, 1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett M. Webber</td>
<td>August, 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Thomas Ewing Weber</td>
<td>August, 1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Elizabeth Webster</td>
<td>June, 1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Henry Weiner</td>
<td>August, 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil Charles Weis</td>
<td>August, 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank R. Weltner</td>
<td>January, 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois Welty</td>
<td>June, 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Welty</td>
<td>August, 1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Renee Westbrook</td>
<td>April, 1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minette Westbrook</td>
<td>August, 1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary E. Weston</td>
<td>June, 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Francis Whealen</td>
<td>August, 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamsen Elizabeth Whistler</td>
<td>May, 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott Adams White</td>
<td>June, 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Jan White</td>
<td>June, 1969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Patricia Anne Whittington
August, 1964

William Haute Wiatt
August, 1950

Barbara Jean Wichlan
August, 1962

Sr. M. Columbiere Wicka, OSF
August, 1968

Linda Marie Wiegand
May, 1978

Steven Christopher Wiegenstein
December, 1981

Judith A. Wilkerson
August, 1968

Clair E. Willcox, Jr.
August, 1979

Irene Pearl Williams
June, 1932

Mary-Lou Williams
August, 1983

Maureen Patricia Williams
December, 1979

Page W. Williams
June, 1968

Sam Pemberton Williams
August, 1958

Shirley Elaine Williams
August, 1957

Elsa Wade Williamson
July, 1931

Franceil Murrow Willis
June, 1937

Phillip Gerald Wilson
January, 1968

Vencil Willard Wilson
July, 1948

Sadie Gertrude Winebrenner
June, 1926

LuCerne Donnon Winfrey
June, 1956

Brenda Winkelmeyer
December, 1980

John T. Winkler
January, 1967

Florence Therese Winston
August, 1961

Beulah Grace Wohlbeck
August, 1935

Mary Getrude Wolfe
September, 1942

Betty Louise K. Wolverton
August, 1961

Sarah Cordell Womack
December, 1973

Lesta Luan Wood
May, 1979
Michael Dan Wood
December, 1976

Robert Elmer Wood
June, 1952

Emma Orr Woods
June, 1932

Mary Adams Woods
June, 1918

Mary Ellen Woods
December, 1980

Noel Austin Woods
February, 1954

Leonard N. Wright
June, 1925

Sarah Morris Wright
December, 1979

Linda Lee Wyman
August, 1960

Green DeLamar Wyrick
June, 1949

Pansy Castle Yates
June, 1948

George Humphrey Yetter
January, 1967

Les Golden Yoder
January, 1967

Robert S. Yonker
December, 1972

Barbara J. Young
May, 1977

Margaret Mary Young
May, 1979

Alan Harris Yount
December, 1972

ADDENDUM TO M.A. GRADUATES:
(keyed by number to main list)

1. Steve Adams
   May, 1984

2. Richard Canning
   May, 1984

3. Theresa Eppard Cook
   May, 1984

4. Phillip Dale Davis
   May, 1984

6. Lucinda Johnson
   May, 1984

7. Grace Krag
   May, 1984

8. Leigh Anne Porcher
   May, 1984
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Patricia Anna Abel
June, 1957

Albert Cone Adams
August, 1961

Daryl Boyd Adrian
August, 1967

E. Paul Alworth
January, 1958

Walter Steve Anderson
August, 1974

Evelyn Roma Ball
August, 1975

Beth Ann Croskey Bassein
August, 1961

Billy Paul Batesel
December, 1973

Susan E. Bentzinger
December, 1979

Dale K. Boyer
August, 1969

Robert Washington Brinlee, Jr.
August, 1968

Ester Ernestine Brown
June, 1948

John Joseph Brugaletta
August, 1970

Martin Bucco
August, 1963

David Earle Buck
August, 1972

Dowling Gray Campbell
August, 1973

Frederick Henry Candelaria
June, 1959

Anne Carman
May, 1983

Clifford Mack Caruthers
January, 1968

Robert M. Chandler
August, 1978

Libbyrose Dalton Clark
August, 1979

Edward Miller Clay
June, 1965

Mary R. Clearman
June, 1969

Bernice French Coffee
August, 1956

William F. Conner
May, 1979

Douglas Wayne Cooper
August, 1966

Robert Marvin Cooper
December, 1973

Jeffrey Scott Copeland
July, 1981
Cynthia Edelstein Cornell
May, 1976

James Arthur Edwards
December, 1972

Sr. Mary Doretta Cornell
May, 1984

Donald Ray Eidson
August, 1969

Don Richard Cox
August, 1975

Frances Guthrie Emberson
June, 1932

Elijah Harry Criswell
July, 1936

Rachel Bernice Faries
August, 1967

Donald Hayward Cunningham
May, 1972

Robert Julian Fehrenbach
January, 1968

Motier DuQuince Davis, Jr.
December, 1973

Dana Gillespie Finnegan
August, 1968

Thomas M. Davis
June, 1968

Albert James von Frank
December, 1976

William Parrish Dawson
December, 1982

Diana Freisinger
December, 1981

Joseph M. Ditta
December, 1982

Randall R. Freisinger
August, 1975

Paul Colman Doherty
August, 1964

Donald E. Fritz
August, 1975

Lyle D. Domina
August, 1968

Kenneth Richard Fry
August, 1966

Deborah Wheatley Downs-Miers
May, 1975

Jennie Cooper Frye
May, 1972

Larry Dean Dunham
December, 1972

Sally Marie Gallion
December, 1979

Leonard Martin Edmisten
June, 1954

Louis Jacob Gallo
May, 1973
Paul Louis Gianoli
December, 1978

Michael A. Gilles
May, 1980

Albert John Geritz
July, 1976

Netta Murray Goldsmith
May, 1983

Paul T. Graham
August, 1979

Robert Calvin Grayson
July, 1981

Stephen Leroy Gresham
May, 1975

Richard S. Grove
August, 1969

Hilda Hanson Hale
August, 1956

Susan Alice Hallgarth
August, 1967

William Carl Hamlin
January, 1963

Reuel Lynn Happy
December, 1973

John Stephen Hardt
December, 1983

Patricia H. Harris
June, 1969

Richard Henry Haswell
June, 1967

Charles Stanley Hensley
January, 1958

Peter Daniel Hilty, Jr.
January, 1958

Robert Goode Hogan
August, 1956

Alphonse John Hotze
January, 1956

James Franklin Hoy
August, 1970

Eugene Elmo Hughes
January, 1967

Linda Kay Hughes
May, 1976

Robert Lee Hughes
June, 1967

Naomi Marie Jacobs
December, 1982

Mike Jewett
May, 1972

John William Jobst II
May, 1978

Robert DeSales Johnston
June, 1959

Charlotte Ruth Kesler
June, 1954
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Month, Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chung Gun Kim</td>
<td>December, 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Leo Kraft</td>
<td>May, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary M. Lago</td>
<td>June, 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred William Landwehr</td>
<td>August, 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Keith Law</td>
<td>December, 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William M. Lawbaugh</td>
<td>December, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessie Edminster Lawson</td>
<td>December, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Lebedun</td>
<td>August, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Augustus Lee</td>
<td>June, 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin Ronald Lee</td>
<td>December, 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin Stanley Leonard, Jr.</td>
<td>August, 1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Mickelson Levitsky</td>
<td>August, 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark J. Lidman</td>
<td>August, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rufus Chin-Yu Ling</td>
<td>August, 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Burnam MacLeod</td>
<td>May, 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora Jeanette Williams Mann</td>
<td>August, 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Basil Martin</td>
<td>June, 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Ruth McCord</td>
<td>December, 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Courtright McKinley</td>
<td>August, 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Dailey McNamara</td>
<td>August, 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Moore Mercer</td>
<td>December, 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul David Miers</td>
<td>May, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Conrad Morgan</td>
<td>August, 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Louis Neebe</td>
<td>August, 1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Watson Nichols</td>
<td>August, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satya S. Pachori</td>
<td>August, 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Eugene Padgett</td>
<td>May, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Joan Patton</td>
<td>December, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Ward Parks</td>
<td>August, 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Davis Patrick</td>
<td>June, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry William Pauley</td>
<td>August, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine Anna Pearce</td>
<td>June, 1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Peavler</td>
<td>June, 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Sue Sayers Peden</td>
<td>August, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim C. Pogue</td>
<td>August, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella Marilyn M. Pogue</td>
<td>January, 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. Pratt</td>
<td>July, 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John William Proctor</td>
<td>August, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Margaret John Purcell, CSJ</td>
<td>August, 1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary-Joe Purcell</td>
<td>June, 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha M. Rainbolt</td>
<td>May, 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Arnold Renner</td>
<td>August, 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loren D. Reser</td>
<td>August, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Thomas Richards</td>
<td>December, 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don M. Ricks</td>
<td>August, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorrain Bielski Roberts</td>
<td>May, 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Ray Suacerman</td>
<td>August, 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Schwartz</td>
<td>August, 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Maynard Simmons</td>
<td>May, 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Walter Sire</td>
<td>June, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corless Ann Smith</td>
<td>August, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Leonard Stanford</td>
<td>August, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Archer Stephens</td>
<td>June, 1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Strite</td>
<td>June, 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zay Rusk Sullens</td>
<td>August, 1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon L. Summers</td>
<td>December, 1974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jean Elsie Taylor
August, 1928

Catherine Fontelle Titus
June, 1955

George Y. Trail
June, 1969

William Lewis Trogdon
December, 1973

Grace Evelyn Valentine
August, 1971

Dannie P. Vannatta
May, 1978

Linda Sue Voigts
August, 1973

Clyde Gregory Wade
June, 1967

Charles Edward Walton
June, 1953

Robert Jackson Ward
January, 1967

Bernice Sue Warren
June, 1967

Eugene H. Washington
August, 1969

Mary B. Washington
August, 1969

Alfred van Rensselaer Westfall
August, 1930

Lauren Frank Windham
June, 1966

Leonora Becker Woodman
June, 1970

James Philip Zappen
August, 1974