The collection of articles in this book, covering some of the significant events and topics in the history of the Indiana University English Department, brings together some of the material assembled by William Riley Parker, especially the reminiscences of faculty members and former students. An introductory chapter by Parker is titled "Where Do English Departments Come From?" Other material consists of chapters by several authors concerning the following periods in the department's history: 1860-1893, 1893-1920, 1920-1945, and 1945-1970. Additional material includes the Annals of the Department 1968-1972, compiled by Parker; a list of doctoral dissertations, 1914-1972; and a list of the directors of doctoral dissertations. (JM)
The Department of English at Indiana University Bloomington 1868-1970
Advertisement in *The Indiana Journal*, March 6, 1827:

State Seminary Notice

A GENTLEMAN of good moral character, and one who is well qualified to teach English Grammar, Geography with the use of Maps and Globes, Natural Philosophy, Trigonometry with its application to Surveying and Navigation; and who can also instruct students in Book-keeping, is wanted to take charge of the English department in the State Seminary at Bloomington by the 15th day of May next.

The compensation to a teacher at the present time, cannot be very great; but the Trustees of the Institution, hope to have it in their power in a few years, to make the superintendence of this department in the Seminary, an object worthy the attention of scientific gentlemen.

By order of the Board of Trustees

D.H. Maxwell
Secretary of Board
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During his term as Chairman of the Department of English at Indiana University, from 1966 until his death in 1968, William Riley Parker began collecting material concerning the history of the Department. His intention was to compile its history as part of and a prelude to the writing of a larger history of English studies in America. This collection is neither of the works Professor Parker would have written. It offers only to suggest some of the significant events and topics in the Department’s history and to bring together and preserve some of the material Professor Parker had assembled, especially the reminiscences of faculty members and former students which he invited and published in the English Department Newsletter and the Annals he compiled of the Department’s first century.

Perhaps the publication of these materials will realize another of Professor Parker’s intentions as well. Writing in the spring of 1968, he noted:

NEXT FALL, when we celebrate our centennial as a Department, exactly half of our full-time faculty (i.e., thirty-nine persons) will have no memory of the Department earlier than the fall of 1960. Out of seventy-eight, only forty of us will have known James A. Work, who did more than anyone else to give the Department national prestige. As we inaugurate a two-course “load,” only thirty-four of us will remember the four-course load—and the old English Building, and the birth of Victorian Studies, and the last of the Visiting Critics, and starting salaries as high as $5,200 for those with the Ph.D., $4,800 for those without. We shall begin our second century with half of the Department born since February 1929—when two of our present colleagues were already teaching here, when our full-time English faculty totaled twenty-eight, when the salary range was from $1,800 to $5,200, and when Agnes Elpers had been on the job as departmental secretary for two and a half years. As George Herbert said, “Youth lives on hope, old age on remembrance”; and next fall will be a time for remembering, so that hopes can be more solidly based. We are now what we are, in part, because of what we have been.

Now that the Department has begun its second century and
has entered a period when the condition of growth and development will be constraint and consolidation rather than the extraordinary expansion of the past quarter century, it is all the more important that we look to what we have been and should not lose as we imagine freshly what we can and should become.

I wish to thank the faculty members and former students who have written portions of the chronicle which follows for their recollections and their permission to include them in this collection. I wish also to thank Roy Battenhouse, Philip Daghlian, Mary Gaither, Rudolf Gottfried, William Wilson, and Samuel Yellen for their suggestions of what to include and their counsel about how to organize the material. Mag Parker first suggested that her husband's research into the history of the Department could be consolidated and extended, and she was generous in making his papers available. Agnes Elpers knew much of the information we all needed in order to edit this collection, and she knew where we might find most of the rest. Warren Shirey and the staff of the Office of the University Registrar and Mary Craig of the University Archives were also helpful in providing data about enrollments and University bulletins and catalogues. The publication of this work has been made possible by a grant from the Indiana University Foundation.

Finally, I wish especially to remark gratefully on the contribution of Frank Davidson to the planning and writing of this material. He came to the Department and the University as an undergraduate in 1907 and remained serving them both well past his retirement from the faculty in 1956 until his death in 1971. I cannot presume to decide the dedication of a collection in which so many people have had a part. But two men have been much on my mind as I have prepared this collection for the press: Frank Davidson, who lived and helped to fashion so much of the Department's history; and William Riley Parker, whose essay on the beginnings of departments of English in America begins this collection of materials and suggests how much was lost when he did not live to complete the work he had so carefully prepared.

Donald J. Gray
Where Do English Departments Come From?

William Riley Parker


My Topic-Question—Where do English departments come from?—is not intended to be funny, but my answer may strike you as at least ironic. I shall try to answer with something clearer and more illuminating than “Out of the everywhere into the here.” I shall try, in fact, to be very definite, and I want you to know at the outset my purpose. If this were a sermon instead of a history-lesson, I would take my text from Cicero, who said, you will remember, “Not to know what happened before one was born is always to be a child.” He said this, of course, in Latin, which is the language in which English studies began and, to some extent, long continued, and which is still a language that all serious students of English literature had better know, despite the fact that we are now allowing it to disappear from our public schools. But that is a sermon for another occasion. Cicero’s dictum points up my purpose on this one. Even if history does not truly repeat itself, knowledge of it may, at least sometimes, give current problems a familiar, less formidable look. Moreover, neglect of experience, personal or recorded, condemns us to repeating its follies. To live intellectually only in one’s own time is as provincial and misleading as to live intellectually only in one’s own culture. These truisms, if you will accept as well as forgive them, apply to the history of the teaching of English as much as they apply to the history of other matters. And they apply to the recent as well as the distant past. It can be most useful to know with certainty how raw and how new some of our problems really are. So let us be-
gin with recognition of a simple fact: the teaching of English, as a constituent of college or university education, is only about 100 years old, and departments of English are younger still. Let me underline this by defining “English.” A recent dictionary will tell you, not to your great surprise, that it can mean “English language, literature, or composition when a subject of study.” It may surprise you, however, to know that you will not find this definition or anything like it in the 1925 Webster’s unabridged dictionary or in the thirteen-volume Oxford English Dictionary. Its absence from these is significant. Its absence from the new Random House dictionary is shocking.

Since I am myself an English teacher, I cannot resist answering my question first with a flourish of rhetoric, and finally with what I hope will be a full and clear explication. If I may begin by twisting a tired Shakespearean adage, it is a wise child that knows his own parents. “English” as a recognized academic subject was not self-begotten, nor did it spring fully armed from the forehead of ancient rhetoric. It is a normal and legitimate child. It is not a foundling. Present-day professors and graduate students of English should be more aware, therefore, of its once proud parents, both of whom are still very much alive—though living apart. The child, grown to vigorous manhood, is today somewhat ashamed of both, and sees as little of them as possible. Proud of its own accomplishments, confident in its present prestige, it would like to forget its origins. A little more than fifty years ago, after neglecting its mother for some time, it became alienated from her, and became more than ever its father’s son. Then, exactly ten years later, it broke with its father. Since increased maturity and a sense of maturity sometimes carry the promise of reconciliation in such domestic tragedies, there is still the possibility, of course, that the child will some day not only feel proud of its parents but even be willing to learn something from them.

As I have said, English was born about 100 years ago. Its mother, the eldest daughter of Rhetoric, was Oratory—or what we now prefer to call public speaking or, simply, speech. Its father was Philology or what we now call linguistics. Their mar-
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riage, as I have suggested, was shortlived, and English is therefore the child of a broken home. This unhappy fact accounts, perhaps, for its early feeling of independence and its later bitterness toward both parents. I date the break with the mother, however, not from the disgraceful affair she had with Elocution, but rather from the founding of the Speech Association of America in 1914, which brought, as was hoped, the creation of many departments of speech. I date the break with the father, not from his happy marriage to Anthropology, but from the founding of the Linguistic Society of America in 1924, and the developing hostility of literary scholars to non-prescriptive grammar, new terminology, and the rigors of language study. Splinter groups form when their founders feel their interests neglected, and English teachers, absorbed in what they considered more important business, were indeed neglecting speech by 1914 and losing all vital concern with linguistics by 1924.

I might go on to speak of the unfortunate divorce of linguistics and speech, who, in my unromantic opinion, were obviously “meant for each other.” Optimists like me can hope for an eventual family reunion, but pessimists will, of course, point out that this is impossible because, with the passage of time, the parents have actually forgotten each other and the child has almost forgotten the parents. Because there is an element of truth in this charge, I choose to begin by telling (or reminding) you of the family history; reconciliation requires remembrance along with wisdom and good will.

But now I must drop this domestic metaphor and turn to the prosaic details of the history of English studies and of the teaching and eventual departmentalization of English language and literature.

To prevent some potential confusion, let us recall that English studies—or serious scholarship or criticism devoted to English language or literature—are much older than any teaching of English. English studies date from Tudor time and are a fruit of the English Renaissance and Reformation. Let me hammer this point home with some illustrations; if in every instance I have not yet found the very first example of a now familiar phenom
enon of our,field, I very much hope that you will correct me. Serious linguistic scholarship on English begins in the 1560's with the work of Laurence Nowell, John Josselin, William Lambard, and Archbishop Matthew Parker on Anglo-Saxon. Serious biographical and bibliographical scholarship on English literature begins even earlier, in the 1540's, with the impressive Latin catalogues of John Leland and Bishop John Bale. Important lexicographical scholarship also dates from the sixteenth century, though the first really English dictionary was Robert Cawdrey's, as late as 1604. Unless you choose to begin with Caxton or, perhaps, Polydore Vergil, serious editing of important English authors is inaugurated by Thomas Speght's Chaucer in 1598, which, in a prefatory life, also gives us, to the best of my knowledge, the first separate biography of an English literary figure written because he was a literary figure. Francis Thynne's prompt review of Speght's edition is probably our first example of scholarly reviewing; as you may recall, it greatly influenced Speght's second, revised edition of 1602. The first publication of variant readings of a single work was in 1640, John Spelman. T.S. Eliot was not the first poet to annotate his own work (in The Waste Land, 1922); Thomas Watson did this for his Hekatompethia in 1582. Perhaps the first annotation of separate works begins with the notes by "E.K." on Spenser's Shepheardes Calender of 1579 and John Selden's notes on Drayton's Poly-Olbion of 1613. The first whole volume to be devoted to annotation of a single literary work was Patrick Hume's 321 closely printed pages on Paradise Lost in 1695. Recognizable criticism of English literature dates from the sixteenth century, and the collection of critical opinion on authors begins with Sir Thomas' Pope Blount in 1690 and 1694. Source study of English drama begins with Langbaine in 1691. Perhaps the first truly scholarly biography, with ample footnotes and indication of sources, was Thomas Birch's life of Milton in 1738.

One could easily go on; it is fun to collect "firsts"; but perhaps I have said enough to remind you that there was a considerable and venerable tradition of serious scholarship and criticism on English language and literature long before there was
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any continuous teaching of these subjects. I have to put it this way, carefully, because Archbishop Ussher and the Spelmans, father and son, tried hard to have it otherwise: a chair of Anglo-Saxon was actually established at Cambridge in the 1640's, but the English civil war and the deaths of both the Spelmans and the first and only holder of the chair, Abraham Wheloc, aborted this experiment, and Cambridge did not have another professor of Anglo-Saxon until 1878 and did not have a professor of English literature until 1911. It is interesting to speculate on what the history of our profession might have been like had the academic study of English actually begun in 1640, two years after Harvard College opened. But Harvard was not to have a professor of English until 1876 when, ironically, it granted its first Ph.D. in English to a man who never entered the teaching profession. Oxford had a professorship of poetry as early as 1708, but this was to mean classical poetry only until long after the teaching of English literature had otherwise established itself as an academic subject. Even Matthew Arnold, who in 1857 broke all traditions by lecturing in English instead of in Latin, never thought of himself as a professor of English. Oxford did not have a university chair of English literature until 1904. When the Modern Language Association of America was founded in 1883—only eighty-three years ago—twenty leading institutions were represented at the organizational meeting in New York, and at all twenty of these institutions there were only thirty-nine faculty members in English.

I stress these dates in order to remind you that the teaching of English is a Johnny-come-lately—a fact that has some relevance to any answer given the question “Why can’t Johnny read?” Our research and criticism are old; our jobs are new. Our profession as scholars demonstrates richly the lessons learned from four centuries of experience; our profession as teachers is still wrestling strenuously and confusedly with initial problems that mass education has suddenly and greatly aggravated. As scholars we have matured; as teachers we—the same people—are still children in our ignorance or innocence, still fumbling and faddish and lacking well-defined goals. These, I
realize, are strong statements, and I mean to explain and support them before I finish. Meanwhile, however, let me say that I think I am talking to you about one of the central problems of our profession—and one which, in my experience, is almost never discussed.

When, where, and by whom the formal teaching of English began at any level of education is not, I believe, known and probably will never be known. From very early times it inevitably formed some part of the “petties” (or primary, elementary education as conducted in the parish, or under private tutors, or however). Exactly when it extended upward into secondary education, in private day or boarding schools, is only approximately known; “grammar schools” were originally designed to teach Latin grammar; but in the second half of the eighteenth century a slowly increasing number of such schools in English were professing what was called an “English education,” in contrast to the usual-classical education preparatory to a university, as their aim. This term is now potentially misleading; it embraced considerably more than English language, literature, or composition, but it normally included composition or “rhetoric” in the mother tongue. On this side of the Atlantic, when Benjamin Franklin published in 1750 his Idea of an English School, he had in mind a very radical idea indeed—a utilitarian education for citizenship conducted entirely in the English language. Naturally, it was never tried, but a compromise was attempted. An academy in Philadelphia opened in 1751 with a so-called “English School,” and when the academy became a college in 1755 (later to be called the University of Pennsylvania), the second head of its English School, Ebenezer Kinnersley, was given the title Professor of the English Tongue and Oratory. Significantly, he was both a Baptist clergyman and a scientist; his experiments in electricity were second in importance only to those of his friend Franklin. Even more significantly, the title given to Kinnersley, who was probably our first college professor of English in any sense, contained the word “Oratory.” Oratory, you may remember, I have called the mother of “English.” We shall see in a moment how this hap-
pened, but meanwhile let us notice that when Kinnersley resigned in 1773, his successor at Pennsylvania, the lawyer James Wilson, actually gave some lectures on English literature.

In order to understand this momentous development we must turn, not to England, but to Scotland. During the four decades from, roughly, 1742 to 1783, George Campbell, Henry Home (Lord Kames), the philosopher-historian David Hume, the political economist Adam Smith, and other influential Scotsmen agreed on the importance of the arts of public speaking and reading, not only for prospective clergymen, but also for educated citizens in general. As a young man, Adam Smith lectured on rhetoric and literature at Kirkcaldy in 1748-51. Another member of this “Scottish school of rhetoric,” the popular Edinburgh preacher Hugh Blair, began to read lectures on composition in the University late in 1759, and the following year the town council made him professor of rhetoric. The experiment was given both significance and permanence in April 1762 with the founding of a regius professorship of rhetoric and belles-lettres, to which Blair was appointed. Rhetoric was, of course, one of the oldest subjects in university education, but something now happened to it. Blair held this post until 1783, and, unlike the Oxford Professor of Poetry, who had a similar opportunity, he chose to lecture in English on English literature. Moreover, when he resigned in 1783 he published his lectures and thus gave other institutions a popular textbook, which Yale adopted in 1785, Harvard in 1788, and Dartmouth in 1822. Blair’s was not the only textbook available, however, and the titles of some other influential ones may help me to make the point I am now concerned with. There were, for example, John Ward’s two-volume System of Oratory (1759) and Thomas Sheridan’s Lectures on Elocution (1763); and William Enfield’s The Speaker (1774), which quickly became, and long remained, the authoritative anthology of “recitations” from Shakespeare, Sterne, Pope, and more recent writers.

In an age that produced Charles Fox and Edmund Burke in England and Patrick Henry and James Otis in America, the atmosphere was right for a mushrooming of popular interest in
oratory and "elocution." What had caused this, I suspect, was the dramatic development of parliaments in the eighteenth century and the emergence of great orators who were not clergymen. In the second half of the eighteenth century the idea caught on quickly in America, inside, and even more outside, classrooms. The coming century was to witness the fame of Henry Ward Beecher, John Calhoun, Henry Clay, Stephen Douglas, Robert Ingersoll, Wendell Phillips, Daniel Webster, and others—to say nothing of a short, simple address delivered at a place called Gettysburg. Early teachers of "English" were also, usually, teachers of speech. As in ancient Greece and Rome, the art of "rhetoric" once again embraced non-clerical oratory.

In 1806 the Boylston professorship of rhetoric and oratory was founded at Harvard, and the first appointee was John Quincy Adams, who later became President of the United States, thus setting a provocative precedent for all future teachers of English! Adams' lectures, published in 1810, were the first attempt by an American to reunite rhetorical theory with classical doctrines. The Boylston professor from 1819 to 1851 was Edward Tyrrel-Channing, teacher of Dana, Emerson, Holmes, and Thoreau. The first half of the nineteenth century in the new republic was a time of many public lectures, of lyceums and other popular societies for literary and liberal education, of literary and debating societies on college campuses, and, in general, of much amateurish and informal attention to both rhetoric and belles-lettres. Although Emerson's famous "American scholar" address was delivered in 1837, it is important to remember that this was not a time that produced in America any literary or linguistic scholarship of real substance, and the professor of English language and literature did not immediately emerge. In the United States before 1860 only a very few colleges ventured to mention English literature as a subject in their catalogues or announcements. Dartmouth dared to do so in 1822. In 1827 Amherst offered "Lectures in English and American Literature" as a part of a bravely projected modern course of study to parallel the traditional one for the ancient languages and literatures, but the offering was soon withdrawn.
Another American pioneer was Middlebury, whose 1848-49 catalogue announced "Critiques on the British and American Classics" as a course in the third term of the junior year, and this offering survived for some decades. On the other hand, Oberlin College considered Shakespeare unsuitable for mixed classes until 1864. The regius professorship at Edinburgh and the Boylston professorship at Harvard were harbingers of things to come but were not, essentially, first steps in the development of an academic discipline that could demand, and get, equal recognition with the classical languages. For such a revolutionary change in established patterns of education some other factors were necessary—among them, a new, scientific linguistics, a new and rigorous methodology adaptable to literary studies, and a new concept of liberal education. These three factors were all to emerge during the last three quarters of the nineteenth century, but their impacts and results were to be different in the United States from what they were in England.

There were only seven universities in the entire British Isles from 1591 to 1828, a period in which more than seventy colleges or universities were founded in America, to survive down to our own day. In 1828, however, what is now University College, London, opened as the University of London, and during the remainder of the nineteenth century the number of British universities doubled. This "red-brick" explosion of higher education in England, which tardily reflects a similar phenomenon in the United States, is complex in its origins, but one of the factors was popular reaction against exclusiveness and traditionalism in the curriculum, especially the domination of the classical languages. It is not, therefore, mere coincidence that the sudden proliferation of universities in England produced formal instruction in the modern languages, including English, and even in English literature. Nor is it coincidence that both Oxford and Cambridge were the last universities in the entire English-speaking world to establish professorships in English language and literature. Even after they had reduced to meaningless formalities the medieval exercises in the Schools, the narrow system of written final examinations which succeeded,
in 1780 and 1800, prevented the growth of any new kind of learning. The entrenched classical curriculum was not only re-confirmed in the venerable universities which had been looked up to as models by Harvard, Yale, and other institutions; effective means had been found to discourage any possible competition. Moreover, until as late as 1871, graduates of Cambridge and Oxford still had to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles, proving their adherence to the Church of England. This fact accounts for the growth during the eighteenth century of the many nonconformist academies, which served as theological seminaries for non-Anglicans, and often, not incidentally, were receptive to ideas of an “English” education. Although it soon added an Anglican college, King’s, the new University of London began as a non-sectarian institution, and it is not surprising, therefore, that when it opened its doors on Gower Street in 1828, it had a professor of English language and literature. His name was Thomas Dale; he was a popular preacher in London and an old-fashioned high church evangelical; in his first year as professor he wrote and published *An Introductory Lecture to a Course upon the Principles and Practice of English Composition*. Dale was the author of seventy some other works, including some minor poetry, a translation of Sophocles, and an edition of the poems of William Cowper. We need not be ashamed of England’s first English professor. We shall meet many other clergymen as English professors in the decades to follow, in both Great Britain and the United States. The fact is significant; until another new university, the Johns Hopkins, insisted that English professors needed a special kind of preparation, the literacy and oratorical skills and genteel acquaintance with literature that clergymen presumably had were considered preparation enough. What eventually made that preparation seem inadequate was the development of a new scientific linguistics and a new historical-criticism.

For my personal edification I have tried to trace the growth of the teaching of English in many dozens of institutions in Great Britain, the United States, Canada, and elsewhere, and I wish there were time to give you some of the more interesting
details and to name some of the more interesting people. One other phenomenon, however, I must not fail to mention, for it is important to what I shall later want to say about the departmentalization of our subject. Unlike Thomas Dale of London, many early professors of English were simultaneously professors of modern history. This was the case at Cornell, Toronto, Manchester, Queen’s University (Belfast), Queen’s College (Cork), the University colleges at Cardiff and Liverpool, and elsewhere. On the other hand, one year after Springhill College, Birmingham, opened in 1838, it appointed the *Edinburgh* reviewer Henry Rogers as its professor of English literature and language, mathematics, and mental philosophy. By the time of the commencement of the American Civil War, the embryonic or new universities of England had made English a familiar if not yet wholly acceptable part of the curriculum, and the ancient Scottish and Irish universities then followed suit in their own way. Aberdeen, founded in 1494, in 1860 led the way with the appointment of Alexander Bain as professor of logic and English. This was not an unnatural combination; logic as an academic subject used to be associated with rhetoric, and argumentative composition was even thought of as a branch of logic. In any case, logic and English were not separated at Aberdeen until 1894. At St. Andrews the early professorship embraced logic, metaphysics, and English literature. Dublin University, which had been founded in 1591, in 1855 finally attached to the normal duties of its professor of oratory the obligation to give instruction in English literature, but when this man gave up the post in 1866 to become professor of Greek, Dublin appointed Edward Dowden as its first professor of English, a post he held until his death in 1913.

These titular details, with their suggestions of compromise and uncertainty about the sufficient substance of English as an academic subject, make a revealing background for the stubborn unwillingness of the two most ancient universities to get on the bandwagon of modernity. But in 1873 English was finally admitted into the Oxford “pass” examination for the final Schools—the tacit assumption being that students not bright
enough to try for honors in the classics could somehow obtain adequate instruction in English from their college tutors. In 1877 an attempt was made to extend this gain by establishing an honors school of modern literature, including English, but it of course failed.

From 1854 to 1868 Friedrich Max Müller had been the second Taylorian professor of modern European languages. Oxford, but this new post, so widely unwelcome in the University, was abolished when he abandoned it to take the new chair of comparative philology. Here was the shape of things to come. The English Philological Society had been founded in 1842; the Cambridge and Oxford Philological Societies in 1868 and 1870, respectively. Max Müller, who probably did more than any other man to popularize Germanic philology or linguistics in England, had published his two-volume *Science of Language* in 1861-63. When Oxford finally acquired a Merton Professor of English Language and Literature, he was to be another eminent philologist (A.S. Napier)—unhappily, as critics immediately complained, an expert on early English language with little or no interest in literature. In the United States the first professor of the English language and comparative philology was the scholarly Francis Andrew March, who was given this title by Lafayette College in 1857 and held it until 1906. The title was highly significant; it spelled out the new field of linguistics that was eventually to give English studies solidity and respectability and influence at even the old, established universities. At Harvard, for example, that fine scholar Francis James Child, who had been Boylston professor of rhetoric and oratory since 1851, and had actually been lecturing on English language and literature since about 1854, in 1876 became the first professor of English literature. English was now moving toward a new *image* or identity.

We need occasionally to remind ourselves of what English amounted to only eighty-three years ago, when a few leaders in the emerging profession felt it necessary to organize a *Modern Language Association*, joining forces with French and German to challenge the entrenched classical curriculum. In most of the
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colleges that had pioneered in teaching it, the place of English was still quite subordinate, both as to time allotted and results expected. The usual offering consisted of an hour or two of lectures for ten or twelve weeks by the professor of belles-lettres, who also taught such courses as history, logic, evidences of Christianity, moral philosophy, rhetoric, and oratory. The professor who taught only English was still a great rarity. The typical survey course was likely to be historical, biographical, and esthetic, with Chaucer, Spenser, and Shakespeare the most important figures. There was rarely any attempt to study the language historically or comparatively, for almost no English teachers had been trained to do this. The simple truth is that by 1883 almost no English teachers had been trained (period). The typical professor, as we have seen, was a doctor of divinity who spoke and wrote the mother tongue grammatically, had a general “society knowledge” of the literature, and had not specialized in this or any other academic subject.

But graduate education was, as everyone now knows, vigorously launched in the United States when the Johns Hopkins University opened in 1876, frankly setting out to import European (particularly German) ideals and methodology. It meant to naturalize, if possible, the spirit of specialization, the concept of the teacher as investigator and producing scholar, and, for our field, the “scientific” approach to literary and linguistic research. The fame of Paris and of the German universities had spread in this country for many decades, and so the stimulating example of Johns Hopkins was soon followed enthusiastically as other graduate schools sprang up in the institutions that could afford them. A new standard of post-baccalaureate work had been set. It was almost a symbolic act when English and German were combined into a single department at Johns Hopkins in 1882-83, with a future professor of German as head. Linguistically speaking, of course, this was not a strange marriage. Nor was it practically speaking, for if the young graduate student or recent Ph.D. in English had something to publish (as was now expected of him), the logical place to send it before 1884 was either the *Englische Studien* or *Anglia*, both published in Ger-
many and both devoted to English philology. No publication in any English-speaking country was yet exclusively devoted to the study of any of the modern languages.

Graduate work in English on the Johns Hopkins pattern meant rigorous training in linguistics and textual analysis. It also meant that little or nothing beyond seventeenth-century English literature was worthy of serious attention in graduate instruction; after all, there was the practical problem of time; with the now accepted need of mastering Anglo-Saxon, Middle English, old and modern French, old and modern German, and, preferably, several other Germanic languages or dialects, how could one possibly take graduate courses in recent English or American literature, even if they were offered? The linguistic emphasis of graduate training at Johns Hopkins—and subsequently at Harvard, Yale, and elsewhere—was to produce, during the next fifty years in America, a completely new kind of English professor, later to be rendered obsolete by the same educational revolution which had created him.

I must now repeat what I have had occasion to write elsewhere: the main objectives for which the MLA was founded would have been achieved during the next few decades whether or not the MLA had ever existed. From about 1883 onward, the classics declined in power and prestige, and the star of the modern languages rose. At least four factors in the decline and fall of the prescribed, classical curriculum are now quite clear. There were the impact of science, the American spirit of utilitarianism or pragmatism, and the exciting, new dream of democratic, popular education, an assumed corollary of which was the free elective system. A fourth factor may be described as a widespread mood of questioning and experimentation in education, a practical, revisionary spirit that challenged all traditions and accepted practices. Ironically, this attitude was later, in the third and fourth decades of the twentieth century, to disparage all foreign language study, but meanwhile it suffered the modern foreign languages to compete on equal terms with, and almost to supplant, the classical languages. English, on the other hand, was not to encounter the same reverses in favor; as
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we have seen, it was almost providentially prepared by recent events to be "scientific" and difficult in the most approved Germanic manner, but it was also, when provided with the means soon after 1883, quite willing to be utilitarian and popular. Since we still live with this paradox, and enjoy its precarious benefits, we had better understand it. It was the teaching of freshman composition that quickly entrenched English departments in the college and university structure—so much so that no one seemed to mind when professors of English, once freed from this slave labor, became as remote from everyday affairs as the classicists had ever been. To the best of my knowledge, no one has ever shown why it is more "useful" to know Anglo-Saxon than to know Latin, or educationally more valuable to know English literature than to know Greek literature; and, in my considered judgment, either would be a very difficult case to make. But no one needs to persuade the American public that freshman composition is essential, despite the fact that it rarely accomplishes any of its announced objectives.

Surprising as the idea may first appear to you, there was, of course, no compelling reason at the outset why the teaching of composition should have been entrusted to teachers of the English language and literature. Teaching the language meant teaching it historically and comparatively, according to the latest methods of scientific philology. It was a far cry from this to freshman themes. As everyone knew in 1883, composition was a branch of rhetoric, a subject which had been a basic part of the college curriculum since medieval times. As everyone also knew in 1883, composition involved oratory in addition to writing intended only for silent reading. Another relevant fact was a matter of recent history: composition was now permitted in the mother tongue. But these facts do not add up to the conclusion that the professor of rhetoric and oratory should disappear, to be supplanted by the teacher of English language and literature. In 1876, when Francis Child became Harvard's first professor of English, his post as professor of rhetoric and oratory was immediately filled by someone else. And naturally so.
Chronology is the key to what finally happened; if "English" had been somewhat later in gaining academic recognition and respectability in the United States (as it actually was at Cambridge and Oxford, for example), it would probably never have been so strongly affected by the educational events of the 1880's and 1890's which we must now consider. This was a period in which the whole structure of higher education in America underwent profound changes, yielding to the pressures of new learning, the elective system, increased specialization, acceptance of the idea that practical or useful courses had a place in higher education, and, not least in importance, the actual doubling of college enrollments during the last quarter of the century. So long as there had been a narrow, prescribed curriculum and not too many students, departments of instruction had little or no administrative significance, and although the word "department" was sometimes used earlier, it was not really until the 1890's (at Harvard, for example, not until 1891; at my own university not until 1893) that departments became important administrative units, pigeon-holes into which one dropped all the elements of a rapidly expanding curriculum. Delegating responsibility, college officials looked to the various departments to judge the suitability of course offerings, the relationships of courses, prerequisites, and programs for majors and minors; to make recommendations for appointments, promotions, and salary increases; and to seek money or equipment or both. Perhaps inevitably, departments soon became competitive and ambitious, looking anxiously at any unoccupied territory between themselves and neighboring departments.

It was in this atmosphere that "English" in the United States, very recently became an accepted subject, grew to maturity, over-reached itself, and planted deeply the seeds of most of its subsequent troubles as an academic discipline. Early chairmen and early professors of English literature were willing if not eager to increase the prestige of their subject and the numbers of their students and course offerings by embracing, not only linguistics (including English grammar and the history of the language and even, whenever possible, comparative philology),
but also *rhetoric*, which normally included, of course, oratory, elocution, and all forms of written composition. How this latter coup was possible I shall explain in a moment, but first let us remind ourselves of the full scope of the aggressiveness (some would say acquisitiveness) exhibited by departments of “English.” They were later to embrace, just as greedily, journalism, business writing, creative writing, writing for engineers, playwriting, drama and theater, and American literature, and were eventually to be offering courses in contemporary literature, comparative literature, the Bible and world classics in translation; American civilization, the humanities, and “English for foreigners.” In sum, English departments became the catchall for the work of teachers of extremely diverse interests and training, united theoretically but not actually by their common use of the mother tongue. Disintegration was therefore inevitable. Since there was no diminishing of the various forces that caused the original creation of departmental structure in colleges of arts and sciences, splintering of departments eventually ensued, often with great bitterness and an unhealthy increase in competitive spirit.

Let us pause a moment to recognize the practical implications of what I have been saying. Thanks first to its academic origins, and then to the spirit of competition and aggressiveness engendered by departmentalization, “English” has *never really defined itself as a discipline*. Before 1883, as we have seen, it was associated chaotically with rhetoric, logic, history, and many another definable subject. In 1885 Professor John McElroy of Pennsylvania was boasting to his MLA colleagues: “Today English is no longer, as it once was, every modern subject of the course except itself.” He was a Professor of Rhetoric and the English Language, and his self-congratulations came just on the eve of history repeating itself. The typical English teacher in the 1890’s and later no longer had a multi-title, but he belonged to a department that had multi-purposes, and normally his graduate training had almost nothing to do with what he found himself doing in the classroom. Having recently mastered Anglo-Saxon and the techniques of textual analysis, he
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began by teaching composition or speech, with perhaps an occasional survey course to lessen the pain. Much later, if he survived, he might be allowed to teach his specialty to graduate students who, in turn, would begin by teaching freshman composition.

How did it happen that newly created departments of English, with some variety of titles, were able at the close of the nineteenth century to preempt instruction in the skills of writing and speaking, to assume administrative control over the teaching of composition in any form? (This was not, to be sure, universal; at some few institutions, departments of rhetoric, oratory, or elocution developed alongside departments of English; but the prevailing administrative practice was to lump all these subjects under the rubric of "English.") As we have seen, historically the academic study of English literature was a protege of the study of one of the oldest subjects in the curriculum, rhetoric, which during the latter eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, particularly in the Scottish universities, became increasingly identified with belles-lettres and literary criticism. But the Scottish school of rhetoric had also associated rhetoric with secular oratory. What probably changed this in the first half of the nineteenth century, and caused rhetoric to be more and more associated with belles-lettres, was the shift in attention from the written word to the voice and body control involved in the increasingly popular study of "elocution." Although taught in a number of American colleges during the nineteenth century, and required at some, elocution not only failed to achieve academic respectability; it caused a flight of teachers from oratory to imaginative literature (e.g., Hiram Corson at Cornell, or Bliss Perry at a later period), and it seriously damaged the once great prestige and importance of speech training. Elocution in the colleges was taught for the most part by specially trained itinerant teachers rather than by regular faculty members. In 1873 it ceased to be a required subject at Harvard. By 1900 the new School of Oratory at the University of Texas was carefully explaining that its purpose was not training in elocution. When the Speech Association of America was
founded in 1914, it disdainfully dissociated itself from the "elocutionists" of the private schools. Perhaps in the hope of gaining academic respectability, elocution at the close of the nineteenth century associated itself more and more with literary criticism and appreciation, but this simply caused it to be swallowed up the more easily by English departments, which could then conveniently deemphasize it.

To sum up: the ancient subject of rhetoric, which at first showed signs of adapting itself to changing times while preserving both its integrity and its vitality, in the nineteenth century lost both integrity and independent vitality by dispersing itself to academic thinness. It permitted oratory to become identified with elocution, and, as for written composition, it allowed this to become chiefly identified with that dismal unflowering desert, freshman theme-writing. It is little wonder that speech and composition were readily accepted by administrators as appendices of English literature, especially when various events conspired to tie the knot tightly. In 1888, for example, the New England Commission for Colleges set a list of books for reading as preparation for college entrance examinations in English composition. In 1892 the "Committee of Ten" of the National Education Association formally recommended that literature and composition be unified in the high school course. That did it. Increasingly, thereafter, college entrance exams linked composition with literature, and, not unnaturally, linked high school work in "English" with beginning college work in composition. Speech training, once so important in education (as, indeed, it still is or should be), tended to get left out of this convenient combination, with results that should have been predictable.

And you know the sequel. Little by little English departments lost journalism, speech, and theater, and recently we have seen the development of separate undergraduate departments of comparative literature and linguistics. There have been polylingual grumblings from foreign language departments about the English department monopoly of courses in world literature. For a time there was a real threat of separate departments of
"communications" (e.g., at Michigan State University), but "English" has somehow managed to hold on stubbornly to all written composition not intended for oral delivery—a subject which has always had a most tenuous connection with the academic study of language and literature, but which, not incidentally, from the outset has been a great secret of strength for "English" with both administrators and public, and latterly has made possible the frugal subsidizing of countless graduate students who cannot wait to escape it. Should our graduate students some day be subsidized instead by the Federal Government (as seems to me likely to happen eventually), it remains to be seen whether or not the nineteenth-century union of literature and composition was a true marriage or merely a marriage of convenience.

I have been tracing for you some not very ancient history, and I should like, finally, to draw some personal conclusions from it. They are rather drastic, and you may not be able to accept any of them. History teaches different things to different people, and some people believe that nothing can be learned from it. As I stated initially, I believe that we can learn a great deal. You may think me unfitted to be a chairman when I say, now, that the history of our profession inspires in me very little respect for departments of English; their story is one of acquisitiveness, expediency, and incredible stupidity. I care a lot about liberal education, and I care a lot about the study of literature in English, but it seems to me that English departments have cared much less about liberal education and their own integrity than they have about their administrative power and prosperity.

We cannot turn back the clock and bring speech back into English departments, but this realistic fact seems to me no justification for English abandoning all training in speech and oral composition for its majors—especially for those who intend to become teachers at any level of education, including the graduate level. English needs still to learn something from its mother.

And even more from its father. It strikes me as ironic and more than slightly ridiculous that we increasingly want "English" to mean the close reading of words while we steadily in-
increase our ignorance of the nature and history of language in general and the English language in particular. Study of literature without more than casual or amateurish knowledge of language is destined, in my considered judgment, to share the fate of elocution. The penalty most fitting this crime would be to make us a sub-department of linguistics.

It also strikes me as ironic and more than slightly ludicrous that we take it on ourselves to teach, not only literature in English, but also world literature, in a monolingual vacuum. Our early associations with the classical languages and the modern foreign languages were meaningful and valuable; we have abandoned them at a high cost to our integrity and our common sense.

The history I have sketched for you shows “English” changing its character many times in the brief century of its academic existence, and these changes have of course continued in the past four decades, about which I have said nothing but am tempted to say a great deal, since they are the period in which I have been an active, conscious member of the profession. Let me say only that, so far as I know, few if any of the many changes have come about as a result of deliberate, long-range planning on the national level, despite the existence of the MLA and the NCTE. And that suggests my final thought: there will certainly be further changes in the years to come, but are we not now mature enough as a profession, and “hep” enough as historians, to frame our own future history, not for the benefit of English departments, but for the welfare of the young and the benefit of American education? I believe that we are, and I care about where English departments came from only because I care very deeply indeed about where they are going. Let me urge you to strike while the irony is hot.
The author of this account of the Department of English at Indiana University during its first decades must acknowledge his great indebtedness to William Riley Parker, the results of whose research into that subject and whose pertinent essay, "Where Do English Departments Come From?" are but a small part of the scholarly legacy he left to us. The results of his research into the history of the Department were first printed in the English Department Newsletter, which he founded and edited from 1966 to 1968, and some of the reminiscences he collected are reprinted elsewhere in this collection. More to my immediate purpose is his essay, also reprinted in this collection, on how departments of English were established in colleges and universities generally. For at Indiana University the development of a department of English was in the beginning in conflict with forces similar to those described by Professor Parker in his essay.

At Indiana University in the first half of the nineteenth century, as elsewhere in America, classical languages and literatures were entrenched in the curriculum. The faculty members who taught English literature were often clergymen professors, trained in the classical tradition, whose doubts about the sufficient substantiality of English as a teaching subject were reflected in their professorial titles: Professor of English Literature and Theory and Practice of Teaching, Professor of English and Elocution. The earliest curriculum of the University, instituted by Andrew Wylie when he became its first president in 1829, put the study of English literature and language among
the traditional parts of a liberal education in ancient languages, mathematics, ethical philosophy, and rhetoric: “Latin, Greek, and English for freshmen; Greek, algebra and Cambridge mathematics for sophomores; mathematics, astronomy, and mathematical and physical geography for juniors; and evidences of Christianity in connection with natural religion, political economy, Greek, Latin, and English classics, and moral and mental philosophy for seniors.”* This curriculum with few changes remained in place into the 1850's. In the 1830's, according to Samuel B. Harding, the uniform course of instruction leading to a bachelor's degree also required compositions, perhaps one in English every ten days, in English and Latin in each of the four years, and “Rhetoric, with a review of select portions of the Greek, Latin, and English classics” in the final year (Harding, p. 39). Curricula in the 1840's omit any mention of English classics but continue to prescribe a third-year course in “Blair's and Campbell's Rhetoric, with lectures” and “Declamations, Essays, and Rhetorical Reading, by the Classes, on every Saturday” during the four-year course. When in the 1850's one term of “English Literature” returns to the curriculum, it is again surrounded by reading in Greek and Latin classics in each year, along with “Latin, Greek, and English Composition” and elocution in the first two years, and “Exercises in English Composition and Declamation” in the final two years. These references are found in Harding's early history of the University (pp. 41-45).

At Indiana University, however, again as at other places, forces opposed to a rigidly classical education were also in play. The state, with a farming population, was but twenty-two years old when its university was born, and people soon began complaining about the cost of attempting to have Greek taught in

---

The Department of English at Indiana University, 1868-1970

the district and high schools to meet an entrance requirement of the University. In addition, there was very early a scientific course paralleling the classical; and there was the dream of a popular education.

In the fall of 1860, when war clouds were gathering that would be years in passing, Indiana University's ninety-nine students must have felt some astonishment to note that exactly half of the collegiate faculty of eight were newly elected members, and that two of these would occupy chairs of learning just established, one of them a newly founded chair in English literature. Cyrus Nutt had just been named president of the University, succeeding John Hiram Lathrop, who had returned to the University of Missouri as professor of English (he had previously served as president of that institution, and was soon to serve as its president again). Nutt also held the faculty title of Professor of Mental, Moral, and Political Philosophy. The other members of the faculty, according to the University catalogue of 1860-61, were: Reverend Theophilus Wylie, A.M., Professor of Natural Philosophy and Chemistry (a teacher for twenty-three years in the University); Reverend Elisha Ballantine, A.M., Professor of Greek and Latin Languages and Literature (starting his seventh year); Daniel Kirkwood, LL.D., Professor of Mathematics (since 1856); Reverend Henry Hibben, A.M., Professor of English Literature; Honorable James R.M. Bryant, Professor of Law (the professor of law was not then formally a member of the faculty); Richard Owen, M.D., State Geologist; Emanuel L. Marquis, A.M., Professor of Modern Languages (a new chair); and James Woodburn, A.M., Adjunct Professor of Languages and Principal of the Preparatory Department, in which some students were enrolled before their admission to the University. Following this list of names, degrees, titles, and fields of instruction are the names of two tutors and the information that Daniel Kirkwood is Secretary of the Faculty and Theophilus Wylie, Librarian.

In 1860 Nutt, Hibben, and Marquis were starting their first year of teaching at Indiana; Owen, though his name was in the faculty list, was in the army and would not report until January
I; 1864, for duty as Professor of Natural Philosophy and Chemistry (Woodburn, I, 268). Names of these professors were doubtless familiar to the students: Hibben, Nutt, and Marquis had been recruited from Asbury College (now DePauw) at Greencastle, Indiana, and Owen was well known over the state as a scientist whose father had been associated with New Harmony. Nutt had earned a degree from Allegheny in Pennsylvania where he served as principal of the preparatory department. He had come to Asbury in a similar role and also held the title of Professor of Greek and Hebrew from 1837 to 1843 as well as serving as a minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church in Greencastle. Later, he held pastorates in Bloomington and Salem, Indiana, and was presiding elder of his church for the Richmond district. He was for a year president of the Fort Wayne Female College and for five years president of Whitewater College at Brooksville, Indiana. He returned to Asbury in 1857 as Professor of Latin and Greek, devoting a part of his time to the duties of acting president of the school (Clark, I, 103). Marquis, born in Germany, had made his way to the United States in 1851 and on to Indiana the following year. He had been instructor in German and French at Asbury from 1856 to 1858. "In 1860, when the chair of modern languages was established at Indiana University, Professor Marquis was placed in charge of it as instructor in French, German, and Hebrew. He was later [it must have been before the 1860-61 catalogue was set up] called professor of modern languages" (Woodburn, II, 267-68).

Hibben is, however, our chief interest. He had "studied at Jefferson College, Pennsylvania," the same from which Andrew Wylie, the first president of the University from 1829 to 1851, had graduated, but received his degree from Transylvania of Kentucky in 1848. "He taught in Indiana high schools and academies and was for two years an itinerant Methodist minister. For five years he held a professorship in Asbury from whence he came to Indiana University to fill the chair of English literature" (Woodburn, I, 267).

At that time there were but two collegiate courses at Indiana from which a student could choose—a classical course in the
ancient languages, and a scientific course, which, in the words of
the catalogue, "is the same as the above without Ancient Lan-
guages." In 1877-78 there would be a third course, modern lan-
guages, to compete with the other two. English became ancillary
to all three, and was not, in its early stages, an entity in itself.
The programs of the established courses probably determined
the scheduling of English for first, second, and third terms of
each of the four years of work. During 1860-61 Hibben instruc-
ted first-term freshmen in "Introduction to English Composi-
tion," a sixth subject in a group including Livy, Graeca Majora,
Grecian and Roman Antiquities, Latin and Greek Composition,
and Algebra. In the second term he presented two subjects in a
group of seven, Analytic Elocution and English Composition.
In the third term he taught Analytic Elocution in a group of
five courses. Sophomore offerings were, respectively, through
the three terms, English Composition, English Analysis, and
Rhetoric. Juniors had no assigned courses in English. Seniors,
first term, studied Elements of Criticism (Kames') and, in the
third term, English Literature. In the catalogue, immediately
below the curriculum for the senior year, was the statement,
"Weekly Elocution and Composition throughout the course."

It is to be understood that students preparing to enter
the University grounded themselves in English grammar, composi-
tion, and declamation in the institution's preparatory depart-
ment, which one might enter at age twelve, and studied and
passed examinations in these subjects. In 1873 a convention of
superintendents and principals of the larger high schools of the
state proposed that "the high schools should prepare pupils in
orthography, arithmetic, English Grammar, physiology, United
States history, algebra, geometry, Latin Grammar, Caesar and
Vergil" (Woodburn, I, 281) and that Greek be dropped as a
University entrance requirement. When the University's Board
of Trustees accepted this plan, students were admitted to the
University who had graduated from schools certified (by the
State Board of Education) to teach and examine students in
these subjects (Clark, I, 127).

In 1861 Hibben resigned his professorship, joined the army
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as a chaplain, and, in 1864, was transferred by President Lincoln to the navy where he remained for several years. Between 1861 and 1868 there was no active chair of English. The subject remained a part of the classical and scientific programs but in an abbreviated form. With Hibben it had appeared in eight of the twelve terms of each of the four-year courses.

By 1866-67 English appeared in only four terms: composition in the first two terms of the freshman year and the first of the sophomore, and English literature for the third-term seniors. This pattern continued through the next two years. 1867, however, was one of those years which the most recent historian of the University describes as “pivotal”: “In this year the first woman was admitted to the University’s classrooms, a final chapter was written in the location of the land grant college at Lafayette, the students began the publication of The Student, the first baseball team was organized, and university enrollment increased to 140 students” (Clark, I, 198). In 1867-68 the University catalogue announced what was either a new chair of English, or a resuscitation of the old, with the title for its occupant, “Professor of English Literature and Theory and Practice of Teaching,” a designation broad enough to make pedagogics a part of English. No occupant was assigned to the chair, however, until the following year, when the Honorable George Washington Hoss assumed the title.

Hoss, when he came to Indiana University, had a degree from Asbury (1850) and had taught in Muncie Academy, the Fort Wayne Female College, the Institution for the Blind at Indianapolis, and Butler College, where for eight years he had been Professor of Mathematics. He was a man of considerable administrative and editorial ability. He had served as State Superintendent of Public Instruction and as president of the State Teachers’ Association and had founded the Collegiate Association, which met and worked with the teachers’ group. He had editorial control of the Indiana School Journal for nine years (1862-71), and, following his resignation at Indiana, was editor of the leading school journal in Kansas, where, at Baker University, he became Professor of English Classics (Woodburn,
During his first year at Indiana Hoss made no change in the program. In 1869-70 his hand began to show in the addition of two terms of composition and one of English synonyms and sentential analysis for sophomores and English literature for third-term seniors. In the succeeding year a course that Hibben had introduced, “Criticism (Kames’),” found a place in the first term of the junior program. From 1871 to 1873 Hoss absented himself to serve as president of the State Normal School at Emporia, Kansas, and the Reverend John L. Gay and the Reverend George Parrott, in turn, filled in for him. He returned in 1873-74, as “Professor of English Literature, and Elocution,” and immediately added courses in rhetoric for first- and second-term sophomores. In 1877-78, “Weekly Literary Exercises” were introduced as second- and third-term freshman and first-term sophomore work, and one term of rhetoric was shifted to the third sophomore term.

Parker, in his short history of departments of English in American colleges and universities, speaks of the “revisionary spirit”; it was here, and in Hoss’ teaching it was strongly directed to the practical ends of training in the rhetoric of writing and speaking. Along with his new courses in rhetoric, Hoss introduced two terms of elocution in the junior year, a term given to the art of discourse in the senior year, and a third-term sophomore course in grammar and writing which came to be titled “Writing and Analysis of Style.” Senior “English Literature” of 1873-74 was supplanted by “English Criticism,” which, in Hoss’ final years, was replaced by “History of the English Language.” In the middle of the 1870’s English began appearing as an elective. For the catalogue of 1874-75 Hoss prepared an introductory statement about his program and its intent which continued to appear annually until he resigned his professorship at Indiana University in 1880. The title of the program was “English Literature, Elocution, and Oratory.”

This department [he stated, using the term loosely] aims to present a connected work from the sentence to the public discourse. In addition to the usual instruction in
Rhetoric, the student is trained in the analysis and synthesis of the various kinds of sentence—long, short, balanced, periodic, and loose. Extended training is given in writing, analysis of style, and in criticism. In criticism, the aim is to discover the elements in any given style that difference it from another; also to show the relation of Rhetoric to Logic, Aesthetics, and Psychology.

Careful attention is given to the History of the English Language.

In Elocution, the training has constant reference to public speaking, includes not vocal culture alone, but attitude, gesture, facial expression, and action in the wider sense. In the recently added work of Oratory, the above will be extended, including analysis of select orations from Burke, Webster, and others; also training in composition and delivery.

A guiding principle in instruction throughout this department is, that we learn to write by writing and to speak by speaking.

In the 1870's while Hoss, who had made himself familiar with the schools and teachers of the state, was trying to build a program in English for the University, the University was striving to make its right to stand as head of the educational system in the state through "a general system of education," as it is described in the state's constitution, "ascending in regular gradation from the township schools to a State University, wherein tuition [would be] gratis and equally open to all." It would thus help to fulfill the dream of the trustees of 1860-61 that

Common Schools and Colleges go together. They are natural friends and helpers. They flourish in the same soil. They harmonize in the same system. The Common School furnishes the younger classes of the University well-trained scholars. The University, in return, elevates the standard of teaching and qualifications of teachers, and supplies well-trained teachers to the Common School (1860-61 University Catalogue).
In the year preceding Hoss' resignation (1878-79), the President of the University, Lemuel Moss, was proclaiming that the University is part of the public school system of the State. The high schools, on certain conditions, can graduate their pupils into our Freshman class. We have, and can have, no other preparatory department. This relation must be maintained and improved, so that we may find our enlargement in the growth of the public schools (1878-79 University Catalogue).

It is reasonable to think that Hoss, with his wide knowledge of educational conditions in the state and his active participation in them, had a part in the achieving of this ideal. In the same year (1878) President Moss, in his report to the Trustees, made a plea for the study of English.

To observe clearly [he said], to think accurately, and to speak correctly and forcibly, in English, is the chief goal of all liberal training with us—the outward form with us of that disciplined mind and spirit which is the one great end of education everywhere . . . . Our own language, in its history and composition, and in its masterpieces, as richly merits minute and critical study as any language ever spoken by men, and will largely repay it (1878-79 University Catalogue).

English in the 1870's and '80's found a close ally in the University's literary societies, the Athenian and the Philomathean, which dated back to 1830 and 1831, respectively. The Hesperian, a female organization, was founded in 1870, shortly after the graduation of Sarah Parke Morrison, the first woman to receive a diploma from Indiana University. These groups were, for the most part, earnest and effective and promoted activity and efficiency in essay writing, declamation, addresses, and debate. Woodburn speaks of the 'widespread influence and effect of the old literary societies, whose debates were often real contests with clashes of minds and arguments as if real decisions were being made. In the earlier days oratory was the field of 'college activities' to which students aspired and in which
honors were won" (Woodburn, I, 317-18). Clark considers the literary societies in the first three quarters of the nineteenth century to be "as necessary institutional adjuncts as sports and fraternities came to be in the twentieth century . . . . For unsophisticated country students the literary organizations filled a social and intellectual void. Many a boy unleashed his tongue for the first time in a speech before a society. Too, the boys learned to express themselves in the written essays required of society members. These organizations were important training grounds for future Hoosier politicians, ministers, and barristers" (Clark, I, 169). *The Indiana Student* often gave detailed accounts of the societies' activities. Of the "Valedictory Exercises of Literary Societies" at one commencement time, it says: "This entertainment is considered one among the most enjoyable of Commencement week. Such it proved this year. The best representatives of the three literary societies are generally chosen, and the best effort of these representatives are generally made" (June, 1885).

It was in the 1870's, too, that interest was stirred in having public lectures made a part of the educative process at Indiana University. There existed at the time Sunday afternoon lectures by members of the faculty, but President Moss looked further:

> It has seemed to me that increased attractiveness and very great profit might be secured at small expense by supplementing our regular college work with courses and lectures by specialists [a pertinent word] in the various departments of literature, science and art. If even $1500 or $2000 a year were expended for this purpose, under the direction of our Faculty, we could call to our aid some of the eminent inquirers in mental, moral, political, historical, physical science, who would bring to us the latest results from their fields of research. That such communications should be made by strangers to the students, in fresh and novel forms, would itself be of no slight advantage . . . (1876-77 University Catalogue).

This was in 1876-77. The following year the Trustees of the University gave the project their endorsement and spoke of an
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instance:

It is the purpose of the Trustees to provide the University with special courses of lectures by persons eminent in the several departments of Philosophy, Literature, and Science. During the past year Professor George F. Barker, M.D., LL.D., of the University of Pennsylvania, delivered a course of six lectures on the latest discoveries and most recent methods in Physics. It is expected that during the coming year President James B. Angell, LL.D., of the University of Michigan, will deliver a course of lectures on International Law, illustrated by American History (1877-78 University Catalogue).

By the 1880's three separate lecture courses were in operation, with many of the lectures keyed especially to the interest of students of English.

On February 22, 1867, a news sheet, The Indiana Student, made its appearance on campus, promising an outlet for the literarily inclined among faculty and students. It suspended publication in 1873-74 but was, in 1882, revived through the efforts of William Julian (later Lowe) Bryan. At the time of its revival it spoke of itself as a "monthly magazine published and edited by an association of students and devoted to the interest of the University, has the approval of the Faculty and Trustees, and makes a special appeal for the support of the undergraduates and alumni."

Following Professor Hoss' resignation in 1880, Orrin Benner Clark, Professor of Greek at Indiana for two years, was transferred to English with the title, Professor of English Language and Literature. He made a link between the old classical education and the new diversified curriculum which was to come in when David Starr Jordan became president in 1885. Clark was a native Hoosier, born at Warsaw on January 11, 1850. He had A.B. and A.M. degrees from Chicago when he came to I.U. and, in the mid-1880's earned an A.M. at Harvard. He had taught for a year in the preparatory department of his Alma Mater, attended the Chicago Medical School for a year, and taught English for two years at Antioch College. He re-
tained his position at Indiana until 1893. Speaking generally of education in the eighties and nineties in his article on "Where Do English Departments Come From?," Parker says:

This was a period in which the whole structure of higher education in America underwent profound changes, yielding to the pressures of new learning, the elective system, increased specialization, acceptance of the idea that practical or useful courses had a place in higher education, and, not least in importance, the actual doubling of college enrollments during the last quarter of the century. So long as there had been a narrow, prescribed curriculum and not too many students, departments of instruction had little or no administrative significance, and although the word "department" was sometimes used earlier, it was not really until the early 1890's... that departments became important administrative units.

The situation at Indiana University varied little from this general one; the University catalogue of 1891-92 is witness:

During the administration of President D.S. Jordan (1885-91), a radical change was made in the methods of the University. Previous to that time the curriculum was of the ordinary composite structure, made up of those subjects which are the common heritage of all colleges, and the new ones that were demanding recognition. As most of the work was required the inevitable result was that very few subjects could obtain time enough to be made useful in training. Early in this period referred to, this unsatisfactory plan was entirely abandoned by a differentiation of previously existing departments and the introduction of new ones.

During Clark's first five years, English continued to operate as it had from the beginning; it was simply an auxiliary of the classical and scientific courses. Clark's announcements in the catalogues, however, have a definiteness that his predecessor's lacked. The first of these (1880), under the heading, "Department of English," is succinct and clear:

The course in English begins with a weekly exercises in
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the freshman year, extends through five terms in the years following, and may be continued to graduation.

The weekly freshman exercise is intended to review grammatical principles from a logical and historical standpoint, to give some practice in the elementary rules of composition, and to prepare for the subsequent study of Rhetoric, Logic, Literature and Anglo-Saxon.

In the Sophomore year, the second term is given to Rhetoric; the third to the history of English Literature, with illustrative readings from the leading authors.

In the Junior year, the first term, the English Classics in prose and in poetry are studied critically, with application of the results to all previous studies so far as they can be made to explain and enforce the thought or to enhance the beauty of our own literature. Selections are made from Langland, Wycliffè, Chaucer, Mandeville, Spenser, Hooker, Shakespeare, Bacon, Milton, Bunyan, Dryden, and most of the great writers of the 18th and 19th centuries, American as well as British. Essays on other authors and on connected subjects are prepared by the classes.

The Philology of the English Tongue is offered as an elective study the first term of the Junior year, and Anglo-Saxon and Philosophy of English Literature the second and third terms of the Senior year.

Throughout the course students are required to make constant use of Webster's (unabridged) American Dictionary of the English Language.

Individual instruction in the preparation of rhetorical exercises is given to all students desiring it, and once in three weeks, in the University Chapel, a "Public" is held, in which the parts are taken by representatives of all the College classes, with one from the Preparatory School.

This statement Clark revised each year through 1884-85. The section on English in the catalogue of 1881-82 opens with, "The course in English begins in the Sophomore year," not the freshman; and to the list of equipment that a student should have at hand, adds "the English Bible of 1611, a classical dictionary, and an ancient and modern geography." In the cata-
logue of 1882-83, the last paragraph of the statement above is amplified to read: "Every college student [not just those in English] is required to present each term a written exercise on a subject chosen from those announced for his class at the close of the preceding term. These exercises are carefully revised and corrected, and the best of them are selected for presentation at public-class exhibitions—that of the Juniors occurring in the Fall term, that of the Sophomores in the Winter term, and that of the Freshmen in the Spring term, the Seniors having no class exhibition apart from Commencement." (Clark announced these subjects in *The Indiana Student*; April 6, 1885: "Last Days of the Roman Republic," "The Dutch Republic: A Review of Motley," "Socrates as seen by Xenophon and Plato," "Lewes' Life of Goethe," "Margaret Fuller and George Eliot," "Odysseus and Achilles: The Greek Ideals," "Lycidas, Adonais, and Emerson's 'Threnody'.") Of student equipment for English classes the catalogue of 1882-83 adds, "a complete line-numbered edition of Shakespeare," and, after the list of classics to be used, states: "The authors are read in the order of time, and the history of the language is taught in connection with that of the literature. Essays on other authors and on connected subjects are prepared by all classes."

The statement for 1884-85 is not so much a revision as a rewriting which stresses the study of literature, including American literature, rather than that of rhetoric:

The required course in English includes one term in the Freshman year [as in 1881], one in the Sophomore year [instead of two], and three [instead of one] in the Senior year.

In the Freshman year, the third term is given to Rhetoric; the third in the Sophomore year to American Literature, with illustrative readings from the leading authors.

In the Senior year, the English classics in prose and poetry are studied critically, with the application of the results of all previous studies so far as they can be made to explain the thought or to enhance the beauty of our own literature [follows here the list of classics of preceding catalogues and
the statement on preparation of papers].

Various studies in English Literature, in Philology of the English Tongue, in Anglo-Saxon, in the Philosophy of English Literature are offered as electives in the Junior and Senior years.

This emphasis on literature may be explained by the announcement in 1882-83 of a department of elocution, with Miss Maria P. Brace, A.B., in charge. The same announcement appears in 1883-84 with the note, "The Chair of Elocution has been unoccupied the past year, the Professor being absent on leave, at her request." Catalogues of the next two years make no mention of the new department. That of 1886-87 announces a "Department of Rhetoric and Elocution" and adds, "At the end of the present year, a separate department of Rhetoric and Elocution will be established, and a competent professor placed at its head." It was not until 1888, however, that the department became active, with Professor Henry B. Miter in charge. He must have had little encouragement, as David Starr Jordan, who had assumed the presidency of the University in 1885, was contemptuous of elocution. In 1889 Miter was succeeded by George W. Saunderson and the title changed to the more reputable "Rhetoric and Oratory." A detailed course of study was ready for 1889-90 and continued to 1893.

Clark was on leave during Jordan's first full year as president (1885-86), presumably to travel, though he managed to earn an A.M. at Harvard as well as journey to "England, Scotland, France, and other parts of Europe" (Indiana Student, May 15, 1894). This leave may have been suggested by the new president, who, very early, began pressuring his faculty to attain high rank in their respective fields. He promised Horace Hoffman a professorship in Greek if he would complete special studies at Harvard and at Athens, Greece; he told Joseph Swain, when Daniel Kirkwood was preparing to retire, "that if he would go to Europe and prepare himself as thoroughly as possible, the chair of Mathematics would be held for him"; he said of William Lowe Bryan, "On his return from the University of Berlin I appointed him professor of philosophy"; and, according to
Woodburn and Clark, Professor Newkirk's resignation in 1886 of the chair of history perhaps came of pressure from Jordan, who sought to secure for that chair Woodrow Wilson, just graduated from Johns Hopkins with a Ph.D. degree (Woodburn, 376-78; Clark, I, 216-17). It was at the time of Orrin B. Clark's leave that Jordan invited Bliss Perry to come to Indiana University to be, without doubt, a part of the English department. During Clark's absence William Lowe Bryan, an assistant professor of philosophy and acting instructor of English, must have had charge of the department. Whether he or Clark or the two of them drew up the program for 1885-86, one cannot be sure, but it elevated English to equal standing with seven other courses and seventeen other specialties. This chart appears in the 1885-86 Catalogue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Specialty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Language courses leading to degree A.B.</td>
<td>1. Ancient Classics</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Modern Classics</td>
<td>Germanic Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Romance Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Literary, Historical and Philosophical courses leading to Ph.B.</td>
<td>3. English Literature</td>
<td>English Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rhetoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. History and Political Science</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Philosophy</td>
<td>Metaphysics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Scientific Courses leading to B.S.</td>
<td>6. Mathematics and Physics</td>
<td>Pure Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Biology and Geology</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Botany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Chemistry</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below the chart five divisions of English are arranged in sequence for sophomores, juniors, and seniors:

To Sophomores: A course in Composition and Rhetoric, combining Practice with Theory (Spring term) Professor Bryan.
Course 1, Anglo-Saxon, Grammar, and Reading (Spring)
To Juniors and Seniors: Course 1 continued, including Anglo-Saxon Prose and Poetry (Fall), Philology of English (Winter), and Study of Words (Spring)

Course 2, leading authors from Chaucer to Hooker (Fall), Dryden to Johnson (Winter), and Cowper to Macaulay (Spring)

Course 3, embracing Shakespeare (Fall), Bacon (Winter), Milton (Spring)

Course 4, comprising Burke and Webster (Fall), Emerson and Carlyle (Winter), and Longfellow and Tennyson (Spring)

Course 5, consisting of Philosophy of English Literature (Fall), Philosophy of American Literature (Winter), Philosophy of Rhetoric (Spring)

Students in literature were required to study Greek and Latin as well as English philology. Juniors and seniors met five hours weekly to complete the requirements of their specialties.

Though specialization was developing in other American colleges and universities about this time, it was certainly speeded up at Indiana by Jordan. He later wrote in his autobiography that he had been aware as early as 1880 that “under pressure of student demands, the classical curriculum had already begun to break, yielding little by little to courses regarded by the classicists as ‘inferior,’ with modern languages in place of Greek, and sometimes fragmentary science as a partial substitute. The new courses, composed of odds and ends, were known as ‘Literature,’ ‘Science,’ or ‘Philosophy,’ and led to the Bachelor’s Degrees of B.L., or Ph.B., or B.S., according to their nominal make-up” (David Starr Jordan, The Days of a Man [New York, 1922], I, 235). Using a committee which consisted of himself, Dr. Hans C. G. von Jagemann, and Dr. Bryan:

... In 1886 [he says], I made some sweeping changes, doing away with the fixed curriculum and adjusting the work so that practically all the subjects hitherto taught in the University, being elementary in their nature, were relegated to
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the first two years. Further than this, we instituted a "major subject" system, by which each junior or third-year student was required to choose a specialty or "major," and to work under the immediate advice of his "major professor," whose counsel in details he was obliged to secure. An individual course of study was thus framed for each one. The natural extension of this emergence of specialized undergraduate study was the introduction of graduate work.

Indiana University granted its first Ph.D. degree in 1883, a degree in science. Charles H. Gilbert, B.S., M.S., and "Assistant in this University," was the recipient. In 1887 the first M.A. degree in English was conferred on Addie Wilson; her thesis subject, "In Memoriam." In 1888-89 there were three M.A.'s in English and six degrees in course with theses; in 1891-92, of twenty-eight graduate students, there were seven resident graduates in English and four nonresident. Following his or her baccalaureate degree, a student spent an extra year on an M.A., three years on a Ph.D.

For 1886-87 and the year following, Clark set up a plan of study for the English major. It consisted of a "general" group of courses required of all candidates for a degree in any field: a year of mathematics; a year of science, with a choice among biology or geology, physics, and chemistry (this revised in 1887-88 to "Physical Science, three terms daily"); two years of foreign language—Greek, Latin, French, or German—from which one might select one language for two years or two languages for one year each (revised the following year to one language for two years); and English composition (once a week for a year) and a year-long course of daily lectures in English literature. In addition to the courses required for all students, the English major would carry twelve courses in his own field, a course which met daily in each term of his four years. In the first year he studied minor British poetry and prose and American prose and poetry. The subjects of the sophomore year were "Anglo-Saxon Prose and Poetry, including part of Beowulf, the habits of thought and life, the laws and the antiquities of the Anglo-Saxons, as illustrating and influencing modern English civiliza-
tion;" "English philology, including the origin and development of the language, its relations to foreign tongues, especially Latin, French, Greek, and German," and the study of words; then Chaucer, Spenser, Hooker, Bacon, and Milton in the third year, and a term of Shakespeare, a term of Burke and Daniel Webster, and one of Victorian literature in the fourth year. Students who were not majoring in English were required to enroll in one year of study in English, to be selected from the freshman and sophomore work. The course in American literature seems to have been popular; over fifty students were enrolled in it in 1887 (Clark, I, 224).

In the next few years the courses in British poetry and prose were restricted by dates (1550 to 1750; 1750 to 1875); these, with the term in American literature, constituted a literary survey for freshmen, a foundation for the more detailed work to follow. The sophomore work, formerly Anglo-Saxon, English philology, and Study of Words, was reduced to "Anglo-Saxon Grammar and Prose" and "Anglo-Saxon Poetry, including Beowulf." For the junior year the name of Sidney was added to those of Spenser, Hooker, and Milton. First-term work in Shakespeare was now listed as "Shakespeare's Plays and Poems. In alternate years: Tragedies, 1890-91, Comedies and Sonnets, 1891-92." There was a similar change in third-term senior study: American orators, Webster and others, would alternate with Burke and others, the former listed for 1890-91, the latter for 1891-92. For the third term, "Browning and Lowell" was substituted for the broader "Victorian Age." Clark's idea, it would seem, was to intensify the work.

In other ways, too, the University was beginning to look something like a modern university. It was growing as well as becoming more complex in its mixture of specialisms and graduate and undergraduate study. Clark quotes a story from the Bloomington Telephone of January 18, 1887, boasting that the faculty now numbered eleven professors, four associates, and two tutors. "The faculty is composed of young men, the average age being only thirty-two. They are chosen without regard to political or denominational relations. Among them are grad-

Lectures on campus increased rapidly from the middle eighties to 1890. In 1884-85, under the auspices of the Lecture Association, eight lecturers came, among them Albion W. Tourgee, novelist and social critic, who had been an officer with the northern forces during the war and, following the conflict, a court judge in North Carolina, where he was not appreciated. In 1885-86, as noticed earlier, three lecture courses were scheduled that would continue for the next four years: one for Sunday afternoons, one for Tuesday evenings, and a third, at a time not specified, sponsored by students. Originally reserved for faculty lectures, the Sunday afternoon course had, by 1885-86, been opened to outside speakers and for the year introduced thirty-five lecturers. One of these, James A. Woodburn, of the faculty, spoke on "The Race Question in the South"; Professor James Baldwin on "Books and Their Readers"; and Mrs. Mary Wright Sewall, founder of a girl's classical school in Indianapolis, on "Margaret Fuller." In the same year the "Students' Lecture Course" brought George W. Cable, regional novelist and short-story writer of New Orleans, who had gained phenomenal popularity in the seventies and eighties with his accounts of Creole life. He came again in 1888-89 for a lecture on one of his novels, Dr. Sevier. Of the many who came during the last half of the decade, mention may be made of Henry Ward Beecher, who spoke on "The Reign of the Common People"; Elmer Griffith on "The Jew in English Literature"; General Lew Wallace on "Turkey and the Turks"; The Reverend James McLeod on "John Wy-cliff"; Professor Stanley Coulter, a home product, on "Thomas Carlyle"; Thomas A. Alford on "Hawthorne's Philosophy"; and Samuel Harwood on "Whittier." In 1887-88 the Students' Course brought James Whitcomb Riley to entertain with "Recitals in Dialect." In 1888-89, among thirty-two Sunday afternoon speakers were Dr. Zaccheus Test, who spoke on "The
Philosophy of Tennyson" and Theodore Sewall on "The Growth of Literature." Theodore Roosevelt came in 1889-90 for an address on "Civil Service Reform." A Civil Service Club, with Clark's aid, had been established on campus the preceding year.

With the structural change in the eighties involving the shift from three standard courses of instruction to a departmental organization, clubs began to capture student interest from the literary societies, though the latter, on into the nineties, drew praise at times from The Indiana Student for their public performances in oratory, debate, and essay contests. The catalogue of 1885-86 lists some of the clubs called into being through departmental interest: the Classic, for professors and advanced students of Latin and Greek; the "Specialists," founded by Jordan with a hand-picked membership of faculty members engaged in specialized study of their subjects; and the Economics Club. In 1886-87 additional ones appeared: the Social Science Club, the Language Teachers' Club, the Mathematics and Physics Club; and a year later the Philosophical Club and the Civil Service Club. Orrin Clark, rather early, had organized the Shakespeare Club which was announced in the annual catalogues of the University as a part of the English program. The statement of 1892-93, Clark's last year at Indiana, is like those that had preceded; except that it gives the year of organization: "The Shakespeare Club, dating from 1884, and meeting weekly at the home of the Director, Prof. Clark, is one of the agencies of the department." The Indiana Student heralded its meetings; in December, 1886, it reported, "Instead of looking up references on Thursday evening, the Shakespeare class will meet at the residence of Prof. Clark and spend an hour listening to the Professor read Henry IV in his matchless style," and a week later, "Prof. Clark is reading Julius Caesar to the Shakespeare Club. The Club is composed of the members of the Shakespeare class and a few others who are interested in Shakespearean readings."

The catalogue of 1891-92 announced a new department closely related to that of English, a "Department of General
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Literature," under the direction of Professor Edward Howard Griggs. Griggs, who was on leave in 1891-92, was one of the Indiana men whom Jordan claimed to have helped “start on the road to professorships in their Alma Mater” (Woodburn, I, 376-77). He was born in Minnesota in 1868 to a Connecticut father and an Indiana mother, both of clerical ancestry. When he was five years old the family moved to Madison, Indiana, the home of his maternal grandparents, and later to Indianapolis. He completed grammar school at the age of thirteen, worked at odd jobs in Indianapolis, and, during his spare time, read Emerson, Plato, Marcus Aurelius, Carlyle, and Shakespeare. At seventeen he entered an evening class in literature conducted on an experimental basis for adults by the Plymouth Institute, a group of the liberal churches of Indianapolis. He attended at least two summer sessions of John Davidson’s school at Orange Mountain, New Jersey. Short on college entrance requirements, he was urged by a close friend, Charity Dye, of Indianapolis, to enter Indiana University as a special student. Here, at the end of two years, he had assembled enough credits to graduate. He stayed on for a master’s degree and, while engaged in this, served as an instructor in English through 1889-90 and 1890-91.

Disturbed by the thought that natural sciences were growing at the expense of humanism, Griggs decided in 1891 to strike a blow for humanism. His story runs as follows:

At the close of my second year of teaching, at President Jordan’s suggestion, I sent a memorial to the Board of Trustees, developing at length these views and urging the need of a department for the study of world literature in English. Greatly to my surprise, the trustees acceded, established the department and gave me the headship of General Literature, at the same time granting me a year’s leave of absence for graduate study (Edward H. Griggs, The Story of an Itinerant Preacher [Indianapolis, 1934], p. 60).

While on his way to Harvard, where he had a fellowship, he stopped off at the John Davidson school and gave a three weeks’ course of lectures on The Faerie Queene. In the meantime Jordan departed for Leland Stanford as president. A telegram from
Jordan urged Griggs to come to Stanford. He resigned his fellowship at Harvard and went. He was obligated, however, to return to Indiana for the year 1892-93 to give the work in General Literature.

The announcement of the Department of General Literature in the 1891-92 catalogue gave this description of its program:

Four-years' work will be offered. The first year's work will be required of all students. It will be based on the study of a few 19th century English authors. These are chosen with the thought that literature of our own time and race, written in our own language, can be most sympathetically studied and most readily appreciated.

With this year's work as a basis, the student will then turn to the world of Greece and study the literature of that marvelous people who have given much that is noblest in the culture of Europe. Through Homer, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Plato, his life should be deepened and ennobled.

Using Greek as a basis of comparison the student can now turn to a still more remote world, the Orient. In the Divine Lay of the Hindoos, the Dahmnpada of the Buddhists, the Zend Avesta of the Persians, he will read stranger stories than he has yet known, and meet ideals of civilization almost antithetical to that by which he is surrounded. The Bible will be more familiar to the student, but perhaps taken up as literature will offer an equally fertile field. Certain books of both the Old and New Testaments will be studied, and the student will then be prepared to pass to the Mediæval Christian world which will be studied through its most complete expression, Dante, certainly one of the greatest masters of all time. Next the Renaissance period with its reaction against Mediæval life and its re-emphasis of the life of Nature and its senses will be studied through some of the great authors of the epoch; and the new mingling of Greek and Christian ideals will be studied in Spenser's The Faerie Queene.

The last year's work will be in the main devoted to the study of the deeper modern literature, through Goethe, Browning and others. During the last term a course of lec-
tures will be offered, giving a philosophical view of the development of world-literature.

The Indiana Student expresses the student response to Griggs' course: "The work of Prof. Griggs' department of General Literature is proving a decided success. I.U. is the only college outside Harvard that has such a chair, and Prof. Griggs conceived the idea of this chair before it was announced at Cambridge" (Nov. 20, 1892). In January, 1893, in a further word from the same source: "Prof. Griggs' work is very popular. His classes are among the largest at I.U." In May of the same year, the final year of the course, "Prof. Griggs' bi-weekly lectures . . . are proving very comprehensive and make a good ending in the work of his department. A general review is given of all the world literature and arts." For this final term Griggs brought in some artists to speak on architecture and painting of the periods covered.

It is difficult to assess the effect of the announcement of the new chair on Clark and his English department. He took note of General Literature in his reorganization of the English curriculum for 1891-92, which, he says, "presupposes the year of preparatory study of literature required for admission to the University; also the year of English and American literature required for graduation, indicated as Course 1 in the department of General Literature, or a fair equivalent thereof." The last two descriptions of English department offerings by Clark (1891-92 and 1892-93) are briefer and less enthusiastic than those of the early and the middle eighties. Clark states in his catalogue announcement of 1891:

The aim of this department will be to acquaint students with the great works of the great writers of the most important periods throughout the history of the language and literature, and to trace certain lines of development from their starting point to the present. The course includes Bede and Browning, and extends through twelve centuries.

The course, as outlined, moved from Old English grammar, prose, and poetry, and Middle and Modern English in the soph-
omore year, to courses in Chaucer and his contemporaries, the Elizabethan Age, and Shakespeare in the junior year; to courses in Milton and Dryden and the history of English drama and novel in the senior year. The course for 1892-93 is a duplication but is followed by a note to correct a difficulty that had developed from a change in University entrance requirements:

It will be observed, that pursuant to previous announcement what was formerly Course I in this department, a year's general study of English and American literature, is now required for admission to the University. To remedy any deficiencies in preparation caused by this change a special class will be formed if justified by the number needing the Instruction.

In January, 1891, extension work began for the University without preceding announcement. Jeremiah W. Jenks, Professor of Economics at Indiana since 1889, was invited by the Indianapolis Association of Collegiate Alumnae to give a series of twelve lectures in its city, and, after a few of the many who had attended did the prescribed reading and passed an examination, they were granted by the University two term hours of credit. Before Jenks had completed his course, Jordan was exasperating to the University Trustees that work similar to that of Jenks was being done by eastern schools and was spoken of as "Extension." The Trustees appointed a committee consisting of James A. Woodburn, E.W. Huffcut, Orrin B. Clark, and Edward A. Ross to study the matter. During 1891-92 four professors from I.U. gave nine extension courses in a few cities of Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky. Clark, according to the catalogue of 1891-92, gave six lectures on "The Development of Shakespeare's Mind and Art" at Rochester, Indiana; six on "James Russell Lowell, Poet" at Jeffersonville; and twelve on "The History of English Dramatic Literature" at New Albany. From The Indiana Student we know that in 1892-93 he gave extension lectures at Jeffersonville, New Albany, and Chicago (March 10, 1893). On January 20, 1893, the Student quoted from the Jeffersonville News:
The high school rooms were crowded last night with one of the most intelligent audiences ever gathered in this city, to listen to Prof. O.B. Clark's third lecture in the University Extension Course. Like the two preceding ones it was on the poet Lowell, and from the very start commanded close attention. The lecturer spoke of Lowell as the poet of democracy, brotherhood, patriotism and war. He commenced entertainingly upon the socialism of the poet's time, his political beliefs, and pointed out the poems of agitation, protests and ridicule, and of commiseration too. The only fault to find with the lecture is, that it was by far too short. It is intellectually the finest treat that this city has ever enjoyed.

In November of 1892 the Student noted that "the New Albany Ledger had spoken in the highest terms of Clark's University lecture on the 'Miracle Play'" (a part of his series on the History of English Dramatic Literature) and, in the same issue had stated that "Clark has three courses, one at Jeffersonville, and one each at New Albany and Louisville." A note in the issue of March 20, 1893, observed that "Professor Clark began his Extension course at Woodlawn Park, Chicago, Feb. 17." In the Chicago series Clark used two lectures from each of his three courses. Griggs, too, participated in extension work. Teaching outside the halls of an institution was the kind he preferred and to which he soon turned, becoming a celebrated lecturer. Saunderson prepared six lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory.

Griggs' departure at the end of 1892-93 academic year was accompanied by other resignations which effectively ended this first period of the existence of English as a distinct academic department in the University. Clark and Saunderson also left the University in 1893. Woodburn speaks of Clark and Saunderson, and with them two faculty members in other departments, not as having resigned, but as having been "rather peremptorily dropped" from the faculty with "no explanation . . . given for the action, although the trustees' minutes for March 29 mention 'reorganizing' these departments . . . and the advisability of notifying the men concerned. The surmise was that it would make
the path easier for the incoming president [Swain]” (Woodburn, I, 416). In Clark’s case, at least, it is possible that his health may have been noticeably failing at this time. Eleven months after his time was up at Indiana University, according to an obituary in the Student, he “died at his home in Ripon, Wisconsin, on the afternoon of May 14,” where he had “been ill for some time and death ... not unexpected.” He was forty-four years old. “A man of broad and liberal ideas and ... well liked by all his students in the English Department. Member of Phi Delta Theta fraternity and popular with its members” (Indiana Student, May 15, 1894).

During his thirteen years at Indiana, Clark had worked hard under three presidents—Moss, Jordan, and Coulter—at building a course in English that would train students in public speaking and writing, acquaint them with Anglo-Saxon, Middle English and the history of the English language, and give them an appreciation of the poetry and prose of English and American literature. He had quickly adjusted his courses to meet the demands of specialization, founded the Shakespeare Club and kept it active for nine years, served during his last four years as secretary of the faculty, been active and successful in extension work, and been chosen to give the main address at the dedication of the new library (later Maxwell Hall) on January 20, 1891. He served as chairman when the department of English became a department, and he led the way in determining that a principal purpose of the department was to be the study of the history of English and American literature and the history of the language. In the years immediately after his resignation, this purpose was somewhat obscured as the course of study Clark and his colleagues devised was altered. But the purpose he stated for the department was soon to return to prominence in the curriculum, and eventually it was to become dominant.
In the period between 1893 and 1920, the Department of English grew into something which, in its courses, purposes, direction, and even its relative size, looks very much like the Department of English in the decade of its centenary. During these years the Department relinquished some purposes. In particular, its members surrendered the teaching of philology, and they stopped giving direct attention to the teaching of secondary school teachers. The dominating emphasis of the undergraduate curriculum came again to be, as it had been during the 1880's, the teaching of literature and literary history. At least in the University catalogues, the graduate program began to be distinctly set off from the undergraduate curriculum. The number of students in both programs increased, along with the enrollment of the University. In 1893, there were 450-550 students enrolled in the University, and the Department awarded four bachelor’s degrees and two master’s degrees in English; in 1919-20, the University’s enrollment was 3783, and the Department awarded sixty-seven bachelor’s degrees and five master’s degrees in English (1920 Catalogue, p. 347; 1920 Arbutus).* The traditional responsibility for teaching entering students how to

*See also James Albert Woodburn, History of Indiana University, Volume I, 1820-1902 (Bloomington, Indiana, 1940), I, 412; and Burton Dorr Myers, Trustees and Officers of Indiana University 1820-1950 (Bloomington, Indiana, 1951), p. 431. Other sources are Myers’ History of Indiana University, Volume II, 1902-1937 (Bloomington, Indiana, 1952), and Thomas D. Clark, Indiana University, Midwestern Pioneer, Volume I, The Early Years (Bloomington, Indiana, 1970).
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write was by 1920 being exercised principally in a one-year course in freshman composition required of all students and taught by graduate students as well as by members of the faculty. Throughout the period most of the Department's courses continued through the entire academic year, but in 1915 the University had changed from a three-term to a semester calendar, and one-semester courses began to be common. Not all of these changes were gradual. In some ways, the history of the Department in these years reads as if for a time the members of its faculty first investigated the boundaries of what a Department of English is and can do, and then, about 1907, settled in to concentrate on a few of the purposes which had been defined and a few of the means which had been tried.

The idea of an academic department commissioned to decide for itself the sequence and content of a large part of an undergraduate's education was still new in 1893. Undergraduates had been permitted to choose a "major" for the first time in 1886. Before then, as Professor Davidson notes in the essay which precedes this one, undergraduates could choose only to enter one of three relatively fixed curricula in science, ancient classics, or modern languages. By 1893 the number of departments which offered the three- or four-year sequence constituting a major had increased from the original eight—English was one of them—to nineteen. The author of a proud description of the new system in the University catalogue for 1892-93 notes not only that "work has been abundantly enriched . . ., the departments multiplied and options allowed," but that contrary to fearful expectation, students had chosen to concentrate their elections in the languages and humanities rather than in sciences and mathematics. A survey of 160 recent graduates of the University showed that fifty had majored in humanities (history, sociology, philosophy, and pedagogy) and seventy-six in languages: twenty-nine in Greek, twenty-three in German, and fifteen in English (1892-93 Catalogue, pp. 15-16).

The description of the program in English in the early 1890's does not suggest what students were learning when they chose to concentrate or to enroll in courses in English. That question was asked by Martin Wright Sampson shortly after he
assumed the chairmanship of the Department in 1893. Sampson had been born in Cincinnati, received a bachelor's and a master's degree from the University of Cincinnati, studied in Munich and Paris, and taught at the University of Iowa and at Stanford before he came to Bloomington. During his years in the Department—he left for Cornell in 1906—he displayed some remarkably versatile energies. He was very interested in the teaching of English in the state's secondary schools and helped to organize the English teachers' section of the State Teachers' Association. He directed Shakespearean plays presented by the members of the English Club and helped to found and to write plays for Strut and Fret, the University's first dramatic society. He served as the University's faculty representative to the Big Nine athletic conference. He collaborated in a textbook for *Written and Oral Composition* and published editions of Milton's lyric and dramatic poems and two of Webster's plays.

When Sampson came to the Department, it was uncommonly clear of the structures and even the personages of the recent past. The largely historical sequence of courses carefully built up by Sampson's predecessor as chairman, Orrin B. Clark, had by 1892-93 dwindled to three year-long courses. The required first-year course in literature was being taught in the new Department of General Literature and required courses in rhetoric and composition in a new Department of Rhetoric and Oratory. But the Department of General Literature evaporated when Edward H. Griggs left for Stanford in 1893, and the Department of Rhetoric and Oratory also disappeared after the academic year 1892-93. William E. Henry, Griggs' colleague in the Department of General Literature, left when he did, and Clark and George W. Saunderson also left the University in 1893. That left only Charles J. Sembower, who had joined the faculty as an instructor in English after receiving his degree from Indiana in 1892. He was to earn a doctorate at Pennsylvania with a biography of Charles Cotton in 1910 and to serve as Dean of Men from 1921 to 1941, the year in which he retired from the faculty.

In 1893 Sampson added two faculty members to his faculty
of one: Lancelot M. Harris, who had taught Latin at Washington and Lee and then done graduate study at Johns Hopkins; and in the second semester, Charles Davidson, who had studied philology and Sanskrit at Yale and then earned a doctorate in English from Yale in 1892. Sampson also absorbed into the Department of English some of the courses of the Department of Rhetoric and Oratory and some of the ambitions of the Department of General Literature. He added a few other courses in English language and English poetry. Then, in an essay published in *The Dial* in the summer of 1894, which is worthy of being reproduced nearly whole, he looked around at where he was and what he and his colleagues wanted to do.

A year ago the English department of the University of Indiana was completely reorganized, and four men—a professor, an associate professor, and two instructors—were appointed to carry on the work. The present course is our attempt to meet existing conditions. Each department must offer a full course of study leading to the bachelor's degree. Our students graduate in Greek, in Mathematics, in Sociology, in English, or in any one of the dozen other departments, with the uniform degree of A.B. About a third of the student's time is given to required studies, a third to the special work of the chosen department, and a third to elective studies. The department of English, then, is required to offer a four years' course of five hours a week; as a matter of fact, it offers considerably more.

The English courses fall into three distinct natural groups—language, composition, and literature—in each of which work may be pursued for four or more years. One year of this work is required of all students; the rest is elective. With two exceptions, all our courses run throughout the year.

The linguistic work is under the charge of Associate Professor Davidson. The elementary courses are a beginning class in Old English prose, and one in the history of the language. Then follow a course in Chaucer, the Mystery Plays, and Middle English romances and lyrics; an advanced course in Old English poetry, including a seminary study of Beo-
wulf; the history of Old and Middle English literature; and a course in historical English grammar, which makes a special examination of forms and construction in modern prose. In these classes the intention is to lead the student into independent investigation as soon as he is prepared for it.

In composition, the work is as completely practical as we can make it. Writing is learned by writing papers, each one of which is corrected and rewritten. There are no recitations in "rhetoric." The bugbear known generally in our colleges as Freshman English is now a part of our entrance requirement, and university instruction in composition begins with those fortunate students who have some little control of their native language when a pen is between their fingers. We are still obliged, however, to supply instruction to students conditioned in entrance English, and the conditioned classes make the heaviest drain upon the instructors' time. The first regular class receives students who write clearly and can compose good paragraphs. The subjects of the year's work are narration, description, exposition. In the next year's class, an attempt is made to stimulate original production in prose and verse. A certain amount of criticism upon contemporary writing enters into this course—the object being to point out what is good in (for example) current magazines and reviews, and thus to hold before the student an ideal not altogether impossible of attainment. A young writer confronted with the virtues and defects of Macaulay and De Quincey is likelier to be discouraged or made indifferent, than inspired, as far as his own style is concerned. If he is shown wherein a "Brief" in The Dial is better than his own review of the book, he is in a fair way to improve. And so with sketches, stories, and even poems. Of course current magazine writing is not held up as ideal literature; nor, on the other hand, is the production of literature deemed a possible part of college study. The work in this branch of English is rounded off by a class for students who intend to teach composition: The theory of rhetoric is studied, and something of its history; school texts in rhetoric are examined; and finally the class learns the first steps in teaching by taking charge of elementary classes.

In the literary courses the required work comes first.
Many students take no more English than these prescribed three terms of five hours a week; many others continue the study; and the problem has been to arrange the course so as to create in the former class the habit of careful and sympathetic reading, and at the same time to give the latter class a safe foundation for future work. The plan is to read in the class, with the greatest attention to detail, one or more characteristic works of the authors chosen (Scott, Shakespeare, Thackeray, George Eliot), and to require as outside work a good deal of rapid collateral reading.

The course in English prose style begins in the second year, and follows the method of the late Professor Minto. Macaulay, De Quincey, Carlyle, Ruskin, and Arnold are the writers taken up. A course in American authors finds here a place. Then comes a course in poetry: Coleridge, Wordsworth, Byron, Shelley, Keats, Tennyson, Browning. Complete editions of all the poets, except the last, are used, and the year's work is meant to serve as an introduction to the critical reading of poetry. A separate course of one term in metrics accompanies the poetry course. In the drama there is a full course in Shakespeare and other Elizabethans (which presupposes the first year's work in Shakespeare), and also a course in classical drama, Greek and French, studied in translation. The dramatic courses begin with a discussion of Professor Moulton's books on Shakespeare, and on the Greek drama, and then take up independent study of as many plays as possible. The last regular course is the literary seminary, which during the coming year will investigate, as far as the library will allow, the rise of romantic poetry in England. Special research courses are arranged for students who wish to pursue their English studies. It may be added that in order to graduate in English, work must be taken in each of the three groups of the department.

And now, as to that vexed question: How shall literature be taught? Class-room methods vary in the department, but our ultimate object is the same. The aim, then, in teaching literature is, I think, to give the student a thorough understanding of what he reads, and the ability to read sympathetically and understandingly in the future. If we use the
phrase "to read intelligently," we name the object of every instructor’s teaching. But in the definition of this ideal we come upon so many differences of opinion that in reality it means not one thing but a thousand. To touch upon a few obsolescent notions—to one teacher it meant to fill the student full of biography and literary history; to another it meant to put the student in possession of what the best critics, or the worst ones, had said about the artist and his work; to another it meant making a pother over numberless petty details of the text (a species of literary parsing); to another it meant harping on the moral purposes of the poet or novelist; anything, in short, except placing the student face to face with the work itself and acting as his spectacles when his eyesight was blurred.

The negations of all these theories have become the commonplaces of today’s truisms among a certain class of teachers. To repeat those principles that have thus become truisms of theory (not yet of practice—the difference is profound), we have first the truth that the study of literature means the study of literature, not of biography nor of literary history (incidentally of vast importance), not of grammar, not of etymology, not of anything except the works themselves, viewed as their creators wrote them, viewed as art, as transcripts of humanity, not as logic, not as psychology, not as ethics.

The second point is that we are concerned with the study of literature. And here is the parting of the ways. Granting we concern ourselves with pure literature only, just how shall we concern ourselves with it? There are many methods, but these methods are of two kinds only: the method of the professor who preaches the beauty of the poet’s utterance, and the method of him who makes his student systematically approach the work as a work of art, find out the laws of its existence as such, the mode of its manifestation, the meaning it has, and the significance of meaning—in brief, to have his students interpret the work of art and ascertain what makes it just that and not some-
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else. Literature, as every reader profoundly feels, is an appeal to all sides of our nature; but I venture to insist that as a study—and this is the point at issue—it must be approached intellectually. And here the purpose of literature, and the purpose of studying literature, must be sharply discriminated. The question is not, Apprehending literature, how shall I let it influence me? The question most definitely is, How shall I learn to apprehend literature, that thereby it may influence me?

As far as class study is concerned, the instructors must draw the line once for all between the liking for reading and the understanding of literature. To all who assert that the study of literature must take into account the emotions, that it must remember questions of taste, I can only answer impatiently, Yes, I agree; but between taking them into account, and making them the prime object of the study, there is the difference between day and night. It is only by recognizing this difference that we professors of English cease to make ourselves ridiculous in the eyes of those who see into the heart of things, that we can at all successfully disprove Freeman’s remark—caustic and four-fifths true—“English Literature is only chatter about Shelley.” As a friend of mine puts it: To understand literature is a matter of study, and may be taught in the classroom; to love literature is a matter of character, and can never be taught in a classroom. The professor who tries chiefly to make his students love literature wastes his energy for the sake of a few students who would love poetry anyway, and sacrifices the majority of his class, who are not yet ripe enough to love it. The professor who tries chiefly to make his students understand literature will give them something to incorporate into their characters. For it is the peculiar grace of literature that whoso understands it loves it. It becomes to him a permanent possession, not a passing thrill.

To revert to our University work in English, we have been confronted with a peculiar local condition. Sometime ago, Professor Hale wrote to The Dial that the students of Iowa University had little feeling for style. That is true of
the Indiana students I have met. But the Iowans, it was my experience, were willing to study style and develop their latent feeling. Widespread in Indiana, however, I find the firm conviction that style is unworthy of serious consideration. A poem is simply so much thought; its "form-side," to use a favorite student expression, ought to be ignored. And of the thought, only the ethical bearing of it is significant. Poetry is merely a question of morals, and beauty has no excuse for being. The plan of procedure is: believe unyieldingly in a certain philosophy of life; take a poem and read that philosophy into it. This is the "thought-side" of literature. Our first year has been largely an attempt to set up other aims than these (Dial, 17 [1894], 5-7).

One of the several striking ideas in Sampson's essay is his concern to define an attention to literature which will be distinct from that of a historian, biographer, rhetorician, philologist, or ethical philosopher. This concern quite naturally follows from, or accompanies, the notion of a relatively independent department of English which itself determines how it will educate students to know or do something, presumably something different from the knowledge and talents in which other departments educate other students. To ask how literature will be studied in a Department of English is not the same as asking what a Department of English is or will be. As Sampson's division of courses into language, rhetoric, and literature acknowledges, students and teachers of English have more to do than to study literature. But Sampson clearly thought that questions about the study of literature were the most important that could be asked in a Department of English. "The design of this department," someone, probably Sampson, wrote in 1894 in the University yearbook Arbutus, "is to teach the student to understand literature." He will understand it only if he is set to analyze the "literary phenomenon" itself. "In this sense, the study of literature becomes a question of science and not of personal likes and dislikes" (1894 Arbutus). The methods of the science of literary study are described in a burlesque, which because it is witless may be taken to reflect actual practice, published in the Arbutus for 1897. A student in an English
course, this writer complains, "must analyze not only the selection, but the writer's mind, his mood, his temperament, his times. Moreover, the student must 'clearly' and 'definitely' set forth the 'effect' the selection has upon himself, and tell how this effect is produced; he must set down what he sees and can prove, and what he feels but can not prove" (1897 Arbutus).

The courses in which this catholic attention to the origins and effects of literary texts was conducted emphasized the study of individual literary texts and the work of individual writers. In the catalogue for 1893-94, the Department of English offered courses described as "a critical study of English prose style" (DeQuincey, Macaulay, and Carlyle; Ruskin and Addison; Arnold and Burke), English poetry, classical drama in translation, metrics, and Shakespeare ("Principles of dramatic construction and interpretation of characters"). The introductory course in literature required of all students devoted one term to a long poem and three novels by Scott, gave the entire second term to Adam Bede, Vanity Fair, and the Pickwick Papers, and ended the year with "the close study of one play and the collateral reading of three others" by Shakespeare (1893-94 Catalogue, pp. 44-45). Students could also elect a similarly arranged course in American writers: Bryan and Whittier in the first term; Longfellow, Lowell, and Emerson's prose in the second; and Emerson's poetry and Hawthorne in the third term.

Soon, however, courses began to appear in the catalogues in which writers and literary texts were either sorted into their several chronological periods, or put into a straightforward historical sequence, or both. Words like "growth" and "development" began to appear in the catalogue course descriptions, and teachers and students seemed to be more likely to be interested in the place of a literary text in a historical pattern than they were in the analysis of discrete literary phenomena. In 1896-97 "English Prose" was altered to begin the year with DeQuincey and end with Stevenson, and a new course, "Development of English Prose," was added in which students moved from More to Johnson. In subsequent years came courses in "The History
of English Literature,” “The History of American Literature,” and “The Development of Religious Drama.” By 1903 there were also courses in eighteenth-century literature, the eighteenth-century novel, and the lyric poetry of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. After Sampson left for Cornell in 1906, the pieces of a now familiar education in literary history moved even more quickly into place. The introductory course in literature was throughout most of the first two decades of the twentieth century—the exception will be noted below—taught as “The History and Development of English Literature.” The old course in American writers became “The Literary History of America”; in most years it was the only undergraduate course taught in American literature. “English Poetry” was divided into courses in Romantic and Victorian poetry, and courses were added in fourteenth-century literature, the Elizabethan age, the age of Milton, the age of Dryden. In 1913, when this pattern was nearly complete, undergraduates who elected to major in English were for the first time required to enroll in certain courses. After several years of settling in, the requirements in 1917 came down where this brief chronicle of a finally dominant attention to the history of British literature would predict. Students majoring in English were required to complete an advanced composition course; the introductory course in the literary history of England; and courses in Chaucer, Shakespeare, eighteenth-century literature, and nineteenth-century British poetry or prose. In an extraordinary exercise of this interest in the chronological identities and relationships of literary works, undergraduate majors were also required to complete a course in the history of England taught in the Department of History.

Undoubtedly, one reason for an emphasis on the study of literature in its history is that members of the faculty were re-enacting their educations in the graduate programs of such universities as Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and Cornell. The Department's own graduate program shared the same emphasis. In the 1893-94 Catalogue the Department announced itself ready to award a doctorate, but this degree is not mentioned again until the 1910 Catalogue. Although during this interval several mas-
ter's degrees were awarded each year, no program was specified for advanced degrees until 1908. The Department simply announced in each year's catalogue that a special course of research was available to students who wanted to earn a master's degree. In 1908 Carl H. Eigenmann became the first dean of the Graduate School, which had been formally organized four years earlier, and the Department for the first time identified certain courses as graduate courses. The more advanced of these courses were each given to a period in the history of British literature, from the Anglo-Saxon period to the nineteenth century. When in 1910 a description of a doctoral program reappears in the catalogue, it heads immediately toward precincts chartered by chronology. "At present, two years [after the master's degree] may be spent with profit in pursuing the work which will lead toward the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The Library is equipped for research in several periods" (1910-11 Catalogue, p. 288). These periods were later (1912) specified as the Elizabethan age, and the seventeenth, eighteenth, and first half of the nineteenth centuries: candidates for a doctorate were to concentrate in one of these subjects, and candidates for a master's degree were required to "pursue a course restricted to three subjects" (1912-13 Catalogue, pp. 221-22). The Department awarded its first doctorate in 1914, to Lilian Brownfield, whose dissertation was a study of the thought of Addison, Johnson, and Burke. The second doctorate was not awarded until 1930. But the number of master's degrees awarded increased markedly from 1908 on, and between 1915 and 1920 the Department awarded almost as many master's degrees (sixty-one) as had been earned between 1893 and 1914 (sixty-seven).

While the Department was finding its center in teaching literature and literary history to undergraduates and graduate students, its faculty and teaching assistants were also consistently engaged with what Sampson had called the "bugbear" of freshman English. Until 1901 all students were required to write two essays as part of an entrance examination. Those who failed to meet standards of "clear and correct English" were required to enroll in a year-long, noncredit course in "Conditioned," or
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later, "Entrance Composition." (In 1892, only twenty percent of the students who sat for this examination passed it; in 1902, seventy percent were successful: Clark, I, 296). In 1893, and for some years before that, all undergraduates were further required to enroll in "one year of English," a phrase that was defined by the Department as consisting of "three terms of five recitations a week" (1895-96 Catalogue, p. 50). Sampson and his colleagues at first stepped around the question of teaching composition to those first-year students who had passed the entrance examination by deciding to use the requirement to teach them how to read literature in the introductory course he described in his essay in The Dial. This course, English 2, met three times a week for a year. Students could complete the other two required weekly recitations in one of two ways. Those who were not intending to major in English could enroll in any other course in the Department which met in two recitations a week—for example, the course in American writers—except certain courses in public speaking. Students who took a major in English were required to complete a year-long course, English 7, in the writing of narration, description, and exposition in which each student wrote "Two themes a week and an essay each fortnight" (1895-96 Catalogue, p. 51).

This pattern held until 1901, when English 2 and 7 were specified as making up the required year in English for all students. Then in 1906 the course in literature was eliminated as a requirement, and all students were required to complete only six hours of composition. In 1915 this requirement was reduced to four hours. A year later "Entrance Composition" disappeared, and students whose syntax or spelling in some unspecified way provoked the disapproval of a Faculty Committee on Written and Spoken English were sometimes merely admonished "to write and speak with constant regard to good usage," and sometimes required to enroll in "a carefully prescribed course of study in English 7 classes, or with tutors at the student's own expense; but in all cases without credit" (1919-20 Catalogue, p. 88). From about 1906 on, then, English 7, or something like it, in which students met twice a week for a year and wrote one
or two weekly themes, became "English" for everyone.

This change in requirements, from a required first-year course in literature to one in composition, engendered a long search for a course in which students would begin their study of literature, whether they intended English as their major or were simply collecting some of the hours in humanities the College of Liberal Arts (as it was then named) required of all its students. English 2 had not changed much by 1906: it was then a year-long course in which students were reading Shakespeare, Milton, and a group of nineteenth-century English and American novels. Probably as a result of its elimination as a required course, English 2 in 1907 was transformed into a survey of British literature, and a new year-long course, "Shakespeare, Milton, Browning, and Tennyson," was introduced. At first one or the other of these courses was a prerequisite for enrollment in any of the Department's other courses in literature. Then the course in British literary history became the sole prerequisite, and its companion course disappeared. In 1909 the faculty of the Department tried again to create an alternative to the introductory survey course with English 2A, an "Introductory Course in Literature and Composition (English 2 and 7 combined)."

During the Fall term the course covers selected nineteenth-century essays, with the purpose of teaching the students to read intelligently, and of giving them a basis for composition work and for the study of English poetry. During the Winter and Spring terms the class studies five poets—Browning, Wordsworth, Pope, Milton, and Shakespeare,—considering them as individuals and tracing the important literary movements back to the sixteenth century. The work includes themes once a week, conferences every two weeks, lectures, recitations, and outside reading (1909-10 Catalogue, p. 144).

Frank Davidson, in a reminiscence which will be quoted below, describes how this course was conducted. It survived only through the academic year 1911-12, when both it and the course in the history of British literature were replaced by "English Masterpieces. A course in the general reading of English
literature” (1912-13 Catalogue, p. 121). “English Masterpieces” lasted two years, to yield once again to “Introduction to English Literature,” whose purpose is described in a later catalogue as “to give the student, at the beginning of his study of English literature, a general survey of the whole field in chronological order. Altho [sic] the emphasis is put upon the more important works and writers during each period, special attention is directed to literature and social movements” (1916-17 Catalogue, pp. 130-31). This course was clearly intended for prospective majors in English; after 1915 other students were no longer required to begin their study in the Department with a required course.

Around the turn of the century, then, and increasingly after 1906, most of the faculty members of the Department of English were teaching freshmen in composition courses and undergraduates and graduate students in courses in British literature and its history. This emphasis was thrown into strong relief in 1906-07, a year of several beginnings and endings, when certain of the other purposes of the Department were subtracted from it. Journalism became a “special program” in that year, under the direction of Fred Bates Johnson, an Indianapolis newspaperman. In 1911 the Department of Journalism was established with Joseph Piercy as its first chairman. The Department of English had offered a few courses in reporting in the 1890’s, and Sampson had taught some of them himself. But it had been a long time since anyone in the Department had taught such courses, nor did anyone seem interested in their revival; when Sampson was asked by President Bryan in 1903 to suggest a program in journalism, he simply put together a synthetic curriculum made up almost entirely of courses already in the catalogue (Myers, II, 27). The new program could apparently take over nothing from the Department of English, except a commission to teach journalists which the Department had allowed to lapse.

The creation in 1906 of a new Department of Comparative Philology, however, required that one member of its faculty and an entire section of its curriculum be moved out of the Depart-
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ment of English. The first chairman of the new department, and for most of this period the sole faculty member, was Guido Stempel. Stempel had joined the faculty at Indiana as an instructor in English in 1894. He taught introductory courses in rhetoric and literature, left to study in Leipzig, and returned in 1897 to begin organizing a string of courses which by 1906 included Old English, Middle English, the histories of the English and Latin languages, English grammar, Gothic, Old Norse, Old and Middle High German, and a course titled "Introduction to the Science of Language." By 1919 Stempel had added Sanskrit and Old Icelandic and was himself teaching a course in "The Teaching of Grammar in the High School." His new department, whose "work...is the scientific study of the English language in its historical development and its relations to the principal cognate languages," left behind in the Department of English only a course in "The literature of Anglo-Saxon and Middle English times," which was later divided into separate courses in Old English literature, fourteenth-century literature, and Chaucer.

After 1906 the Department also relinquished a purpose which Sampson at least had prosecuted vigorously—an attempt to affect how English was taught in the state's secondary schools. One sign of the break during the last half of the nineteenth century from the old classical curriculum toward the various, sometimes practical responsibilities of a university was that members of the University's faculty had often assumed responsibility for how their subjects were taught in the schools. In the Department of English, that interest had been there almost from the beginning, in the faculty title and enterprises of George Washington Hoss, Professor of English Literature and Theory and Practice of Teaching. In the 1880's members of the Department of English were at least urged—and because the urging came from the faculty itself, it can be assumed that some of them answered it—to go out to the schools and present readings of such classics as "Enoch Arden," Nicholas Nickleby, Julius Caesar, Lowell's "The Vision of Sir Launfel," and Irving's Sketch Book (Clark, I, 230). According to another of
The Department of English, 1893-1920

the historians of the University, Sampson quickly joined himself to this tradition, and "wielded a notable influence on the teaching of English in the Indiana high schools" by lecturing around the state, and by working in the state teachers' association (Woodburn, I, 435). On his arrival at Indiana he took over the "Rhetorical Seminar," in which students analyzed textbooks in rhetoric and took a turn in the teaching of composition courses. By 1897 he had transformed this course into a "Teachers' Course: Lectures and discussions upon methods of teaching composition and literature; examination of textbooks in English" (1896-97 Catalogue, p. 53), which he taught until his departure in 1906. It is also likely that Sampson was the author of a section which appeared in each of the University's annual catalogues until 1907 which not only described the examinations and standards which students would be expected to satisfy when they entered the University, but also quite directly advised teachers how to prepare their students to satisfy these standards.

In one early catalogue, for example, a description of the entrance examination in composition, which until 1901 was required of all entering students, becomes a warning: "The proper preparation for this part of the requirement is constant practice in writing. A text-book knowledge of rhetoric, while useful enough in its way, is here of little avail . . . . The time ordinarily devoted in high schools to recitations in rhetoric should therefore chiefly be given to the writing, correcting and rewriting of themes" (1893-94 Catalogue, p. 20). In 1901 graduates of over 100 "commissioned" high schools were no longer required to sit for an entrance examination. Nonetheless, advice about how to teach composition remained in the 1901-02 catalogue, along with some specific injunctions about how to prepare for an examination in literature. "A careful and systematic study of the works themselves is the only preparation for this part of the requirement. A knowledge of literary history, or of literary biography, or of critical comments that other writers have made on the works in question, will not serve the purpose" (p. 20). Then follows a suggested three-year course of study,
“intensive and disciplinary, and therefore confined to a few texts”: The Lady of the Lake, Evangeline, and The Lay of the Minstrel in the first year (“Careful reading, with . . . discussions of plot, character, incidents, and descriptions of scenery, together with analysis of similes and metaphors”); Silas Marner, Lowell’s “The Vision of Sir Launfal,” “L’Allegro,” “Il Penseroso,” “Sohrab and Rustum” in the second year; and in the third year Julius Caesar and The Merchant of Venice (“Attention should be given to quotable expressions, figures, peculiarities of phraseology and syntax, plot, characters, metre”). By 1906 this list of books had greatly enlarged, picking up in one year or another such unexpected titles as Dryden’s Palamon and Arcite, Tennyson’s The Princess, Defoe’s The History of the Plague in London, Southey’s Life of Nelson, and Books i and xxii of Pope’s translation of the Iliad, as well as Irving’s Sketch Book, the first two books of Paradise Lost, Pilgrim’s Progress, The House of the Seven Gables, The Last of the Mohicans, The Vicar of Wakefield, orations by Burke, Washington, and Webster, poems by Lowell, Poe, and Browning, more novels by Scott, more plays by Shakespeare, and essays by Addison, Macaulay, Carlyle, Ruskin, and Emerson.

The relative prominence of American books on this list is interesting in view of the poverty of the Department’s own offerings in American literature. So is the prevalence of fiction, drama, and narrative verse—big texts on which teachers could spend some time. For it is by now certain that the author of these lists and their accompanying advice is principally addressing high school teachers. By 1906 the number of commissioned high schools had more than doubled to over 200, which meant that few students were required to sit for entrance examinations. But under the guise of writing to students about entrance requirements and examinations, someone in the University’s Department of English was still spelling out the content (a year of American literature; a year of English literature; a year given to drama and “more difficult prose”; weekly assignments in writing) and the purposes of high school English courses. “The object of the high school course is to give the student the ability to
speak his native language correctly, to write readily and effectively, and to read with sympathy and insight, and thus to strengthen himself with the best thoughts of others and to communicate his own best thoughts in an unmistakable way” (1906-07 Catalogue, p. 71).

Then after 1906, the year Sampson left, this earnest attempt to advertise a literary taste, a standard of literacy, and the means of teaching their attainment was replaced by a simple statement that an entering student ought to have prepared for three years in a course in English which has given him “accurate knowledge of certain pieces of literature, and proficiency in English composition (1907-08 Catalogue, p. 72). In the same year the “Teachers’ Course” in English disappeared from the catalogue. When it reappeared in 1908, it bore the name of Ernest O. Holland of the then Department of Education, who had collaborated with Sampson on their textbook in composition. After 1909 the course was taught first by Lemuel O. Pittenger and then by Earl Hudelson, who were members of both the Department of English and the now School of Education. Soon there were three courses for teachers, one in which students read and discussed literary texts named in the state approved course of study for secondary-school English, a course in methods, and “Practice Teaching in English.” The first course was listed in the catalogue as a course in English, with the provision, “May not be taken for credit by students majoring in English.” The other two courses were merely cross-listed from the School of Education. Neither Pittenger nor Hudelson ever taught any other courses in English.

It is relatively easy to record the careers of those large purposes whose prosecution or surrender makes a difference in the curriculum of the Department. It is more difficult to recapture the play of other interests, which in the perspective of their moments might have seemed to be sometimes as large, but which have left behind them traces more narrow or more fugitive. Some courses persisted which moved across chronological boundaries. Courses in literary criticism, metrics, textual criticism, and a senior-year “Literary Seminary,” in which the topics
The Department of English at Indiana University, 1868-1970

varied from year to year, were taught through 1920. Still another tradition of literary study survived into the twentieth century in a course called “The Art of Poetry,” described in part as “specific study of poetical answers to some of the problems of life” (1914-15 Catalogue, p. 116); and in another course (taught by the same man, Richard A. Rice) variously titled “Representative Biographies” and “Representative Men.”

Lives of men and women who represent vital interests and problems of human nature. Fall term: Franklin, Lincoln, Nelson, Johnson—the rise from humble circumstances to greatness; Winter term: Scott, Trollope, Stevenson, Shelley—the conditions of literary energy and production; Spring term: George Eliot, Thackeray, and others—the autobiographical novel (1912-13 Catalogue, pp. 121-22).

From 1893, when the Department of Rhetoric and Oratory was eliminated, until the establishment of the Department of Speech in 1945, the Department of English offered a range of courses in public speaking. By 1919 these courses included not only elementary courses in rhetoric and public speaking, but also courses in oral interpretation, the staging of plays, storytelling, and the teaching of public speaking in the high school. After 1907 “Courses in Public Speaking” were sequestered under a heading of their own in the catalogue listing of the Department’s courses. They were usually taught by “instructors” or “tutors” in public speaking and, after 1915, by Edgar F. Frazier, whose title was “Associate Professor of Public Speaking.”

There had always been in the Department an interest in teaching courses in which, as Sampson put it in his essay in The Dial, “an attempt is made to stimulate original production in prose and verse.” The course so described was taught each year from the 1890’s on, and in 1913 courses specifically given to the writing of short stories and the writing of plays—the latter taught by F. Tarkington Baker, a drama critic for Indianapolis newspapers—were added to it. Students majoring in English could meet the Department’s requirement of an advanced composition course, when that requirement was in force, by en-
rolling in the course in short story writing. There were other occasions and encouragements for students to write. The University year book until 1917 included a “Literary” section of poems, fiction, and humor. Alongside this tradition moved a succession of campus literary magazines: Bumble Bee, Junior Annual, Megaphone, Hoosier “Lit,” As She Is, The Hoosier. A Writers’ Club was founded in 1911, and students also met first in the Shakespeare Club (founded 1884) and then in the English Club (founded 1906) to try out their own writing as well as to talk about literature.

Literary and debating societies also continued to play a part in the intellectual and political life of the campus. The historian of one of these societies (William Winifred Livengood, The Independent Literary Society of Indiana University, Bloomington, 1908) writes that it was formed in 1885 because the older societies, principally the Athenian and the Philomathean, were dominated by members of fraternities who used them to stage campaigns for campus honors and political office. The Independent Literary Society had its own political edge; at one time its members had to sign a pledge not to join fraternities or sororities. But it and the several other societies organized between 1890 and 1910 existed largely to present, sometimes weekly, programs of music, declamation, the reading and criticism of original writing, and occasionally plays. In their kind and purpose, these sober diversions must have been like an early program described by Livengood:

The President, without comment of any kind, opens a small Bible which always lies on the table before him, and reads a brief chapter . . . . After the critic is appointed, the program is taken up; Remsberg, Trent, Starbuck, and Perigo lead off with a quartet. Lindley follows with an oration on “Sociability”; Harding reads a paper on “Birds in the Night”; Miss McMahon plays an instrumental solo, which is succeeded by another oration, this time by the silver-tongued Shea who doubtless speaks on “Why I Am a Democrat” . . . ; and if we are fortunate, the program may be closed by the new whistling quartet . . . . Then comes the report of the much-feared critic (p. 26).
Increasingly, such intramural exercises were punctuated by voices and presences from beyond Bloomington. The literary societies and Strut and Fret, the dramatic society which Sampson helped to found in 1900, presented plays by Galsworthy, Shaw, Barrie, Henry Arthur Jones, and Arthur Wing Pinero, as well as a Gilbert and Sullivan opera, student revues, and comedies by Sampson and other members of the faculty. In 1916 Forbes-Robertson's troupe played Hamlet at the Harris Grand (now the Towne Cinema) to mark the tercentenary of Shakespeare's death, and William Lyon Phelps came to lecture on the same occasion. James Whitcomb Riley, George Washington Cable, Eugene Field, Jane Addams, Edward Everett Hale, and William Dean Howells read or lectured on campus between 1893 and 1900. In the next two decades W.B. Yeats, Robert Frost, Alfred Noyes, John Cowper Powys, Bliss Perry, the British critics Sir Walter Raleigh and Sidney Lee came to read or lecture in Bloomington, and so did George Ade and Elbert Hubbard, Josiah Royce, Frederick Jackson Turner, and W.H. Taft.

Most difficult of all to recapture are the perceptible but nearly indefinable changes from year to year in the temper of the Department, especially a new concentration of purpose and direction which seem to mark the years after Will D. Howe assumed the chairmanship in 1906. Howe was born in Charleston, Indiana, and earned his first undergraduate degree at Butler in 1893. He then went to Harvard where he successively took a second bachelor's degree (1895), a master's degree (1897), and a doctorate in English (1899). He was Professor of English at Butler from 1899 to 1906, and came to Indiana as Chairman and "Junior Professor" of English, a curious title which was exchanged for a professorship in 1909. While he was at Indiana he contributed chapters on early American humorists and northern poets of the Civil War to the Cambridge History of American Literature, and he edited several textbooks, among them editions of selections from Hazlitt and Longfellow, and The Howe Readers, a series of texts for the elementary grades. He was also very active in University affairs, suggesting and chairing a committee which became the predecessor of a University Council:
in one of the reminiscences invited by William Riley Parker; Fernandus Payne, Dean of the Graduate School from 1927 to 1947, remembers Howe's reputation for scaring up "more rabbits on the campus for other people to chase than anyone else" (English Department Newsletter, III, v4). Howe left the Department in 1919 to help found the publishing firm Harcourt, Brace, and Howe, and then in 1921 moved again to become an editor and later a director of Charles Scribner's Sons. He was succeeded as chairman by Henry Thew Stephenson, who had been a member of the Department since 1895 and who served as its chairman until 1921.

Howe became chairman of a department large in its day, and during his chairmanship it became yet larger and more complex in its hierarchies of rank and responsibility. In 1899, when it had eight of the University's seventy-one faculty members, the Department of English was the largest in the University. In the year of Howe's departure there were twenty-four teachers in the Department and 134 members of the faculty of the College of Liberal Arts. Since 1910 the faculty had been teaching about forty courses a year, from which about fifty undergraduates, two thirds of them women, graduated each year with a bachelor's degree in English. At least five, and in some years as many as fifteen, graduate students each year earned a master's degree in English. Graduate students, variously titled teaching assistants, teaching fellows, instructors, and tutors, were first appointed to teach introductory courses in literature and composition in 1903; four of the twenty-four teachers named in the 1919-20 Catalogue were "tutors" who presumably were studying for advanced degrees in the Department. In 1878 President Moss in a plea for money had singled out faculty members in English to buttress his argument that a faculty member, especially one burdened by the task of correcting weekly themes, could not be expected to teach more than two recitations a day (ten hours a week) and still do original research (Woodburn, I, 325). But in 1910 members of the Department's faculty were still teaching four classes each semester, and their annual salaries in 1913 ranged from $1,000 for an instructor to $2,400-3,400.
for a professor. The teaching was likely to be varied. Will T. Hale, for example, who later taught courses in Victorian literature, began by teaching Milton and the literature of the Bible as well as Browning; and at least in the catalogues Howe is listed as teaching courses in eighteenth-century and romantic literature, literary criticism, the novel (Balzac, Turgenev, Tolstoy, James, Howells, and Hawthorne as well as Scott and Dickens), and a survey of British literature from Anglo-Saxon times to Wyatt and Surrey.

Some of the faculty members, and some of the teaching assistants, who came to the Department in these years stayed for a long time. Henry Thew Stephenson joined the faculty in 1895 after taking a bachelor's degree at Ohio State. He remained at Indiana until his retirement in 1940, taking some time out to do graduate study and earn a second A.B. at Harvard in 1898, and serving as chairman of the Department from 1919 to 1921. Will T. Hale joined the faculty as an instructor in 1913 and took his doctorate at Yale the next year; he retired as Professor of English at Indiana in 1950. Frank Aydelotte became an instructor after earning a bachelor's degree at Indiana in 1900, left to earn a master's degree at Harvard and a B.Litt (as a Rhodes Scholar) at Oxford, and then taught at Indiana again from 1908 to 1915. Cecilia Hennel Hendricks was a teaching fellow in 1907-08, an instructor from 1908 to 1913, and returned to teach at Indiana from 1931 to 1953. Frank Senour, A.B., Indiana, 1911, A.M., Indiana, 1913, taught in the Department as a teaching assistant and member of the faculty until his death in 1928; and Frank Davidson, who was a teaching fellow in 1917 before he went to France with the University ambulance corps, returned in 1920 to teach in the Department until his retirement in 1958.

In addition to Stephenson and Hale, and of course Sampson and Howe, many of the people who joined the faculty of the Department in these years came from study and teaching at other schools. During Sampson's chairmanship, Edward Payson Morton joined the faculty in 1895 after taking a master's degree at Harvard and teaching at Blackburn University in Carlin...
villé, Illinois. John M. Clapp came in 1899 with bachelor's and master's degrees from Amherst and after serving as Professor of English and Oratory at Illinois College. Later, Lewis Nathaniel Chase came with a doctorate from Columbia; and of the faculty during Howe's chairmanship, Robert Withington and Garland Greever had earned doctorates at Harvard, and George F. Reynolds at Chicago. Richard Rice, who taught the ethically weighted courses in poetry and biography mentioned above, came in 1909 with a master's degree from Harvard. Ralph Rusk, later the biographer of Emerson, and Charles Wilbert Snow, a poet and briefly lieutenant governor of Connecticut while teaching at Wesleyan, came after 1915, both with master's degrees from Columbia.

The entire chronicle of the comings and goings and stayings of the more than forty men and women who joined the faculty of the Department between 1893 and 1920 is most conveniently set out in the annals compiled by William Riley Parker which appear later in this book. Frank Davidson, who came to study at Indiana in 1907, recalls the quality of the life made and lived by the people whose names make up this chronicle.

Nineteen hundred seven was, in its small way, an annus mirabilis. In the spring of that year I matriculated at Indiana University as a special student with a two-year deficiency in high school credits. In the June following, three Filipinos, the first to come to I.U. after the Spanish-American war, graduated with LL.B. degrees. Sixty-one years later the names of these three would identify units of a campus center named for one of my classmates of 1913, Paul V. McNutt, who had, in the interval, been Governor of Indiana and Commissioner to the Philippines. The year, too, was the first for Dr. Will D. Howe as head of the I.U. English Department.

Fortunately, when I came, students paid no tuition. There was a fee of $1.00 per term for the Library and some small fees for science courses. At that time the male student found a rooming place in a Bloomington home, for which he paid weekly $1.75 to $4.00. The cheaper rooms were equipped with a bed, a couple of chairs, a stove but no fuel,
and no bathing facilities except a water pitcher, bowl, and washstand. For a bath one went to a shower room in the basement of the Student Building; for fuel, he made arrangements at the beginning of the fall term with a Brown County farmer for a load of wood. He ate at Tony Coyle’s downtown restaurant or at a boarding club, preferably the latter, where he had food of good quality and quantity for $3.50 per week. He was largely on his own. There was no counselor per se. If one needed advice he ordinarily turned to a fellow student more experienced than himself, for, if seen coming from the dean’s office, he was suspect of some misdemeanor. The presumption was that he could find in the University catalogue what he needed to know. There he could learn about sending his credentials to the Registrar’s office before the beginning of his first term, about matriculating, registering, and enrolling in classes. The enrollment was simple; once the student had his card, he went to the office of the department in which he wished to be a student and had this enrollment card signed, ordinarily by the head of the department. He did, however, have to know about required courses and their sequence.

To enroll in English 7 (composition) on that April morning, I went to the English office, which was in Kirkwood Hall, up the short flight of stairs from near the entrance, and first door to the left. Professor Howe was there, an A.B., Butler College, and an A.B., A.M., and Ph.D., Harvard. He would be troubled for thirteen years with departmental financial problems. His salary at this time was about $2,500 and would be no more than $3,300 in 1913.

Dr. Howe was fortunate in his additions to his staff. In 1908 it was Frank Aydelotte, an alumnus of I.U. and our first Rhodes Scholar, and he remained with us until 1915. Some students thought him severe in the demands he made upon them, but they respected him as did the rest of us. His hand may be traced in revisions of departmental offerings. One course he fathered was a combination of composition and freshman literature. His lecture in this course on a Monday morning supplied the theme subject for the week. Once he talked on the divergent points of view of Wordsworth and Darwin on nature, and left the class to ponder and to
write a paper on which was the more profound view. He was firm in his conviction that a student, instead of being spoon-fed, should be a major factor in educating himself. His young assistant in this course, A.B. Stone [he later taught as an instructor in the Department from 1909-12], was popular with all of us.

Other additions to the staff were Charles Wilbert Snow and George Fullmer Reynolds in 1915. Snow was poet as well as a stimulating teacher and, until he left to join a branch of the armed services for World War I, he kept alive a magazine, *The Hoosier*, his creation and an outlet for students who like to write. Reynolds was, at the time he came, working on a book on drama. He brought to the two-hour sessions of his graduate class many of his yet unsolved problems that called for careful investigation and reflection. His drive and his earnestness, coupled with the live problems, awakened in many of us the satisfactions to be found in research—satisfactions of discovery and satisfactions of developing the ability to communicate what was often almost uncommunicable. At the University of Chicago in later years I learned of the esteem in which he and his work were held by the graduate staff there. He was a robust man of hearty greetings and hearty farewells. His words at the end of a class session were invariably, "That's all! Good-bye!" as he made a quick exit from the small room on the third floor of Biology Hall.

The members of the English staff who were in the Department when Howe took charge endeared themselves to me. Charles Sembower, one of my great teachers, was friendly, sympathetic, imaginative, sensitive. This sensitiveness was sometimes shocked by the indifference of students to the point of giving pain. Once, while trying to clarify the subtleties of a poem and being disturbed by the whispered conversation of two coeds, he picked up his books and, without a word, walked from the room. For a moment we sat stunned and then rose and filed out, voicing our resentment against the coeds. Though Sembower had a great interest in sports, I always felt that he lived to a greater degree inward than he did outward. Henry Thew Stephenson I came to admire for his realistic approach to literature and for his in-
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sistence on accuracy in student work. He had developed a technique for forming small classes of competent students for his graduate courses. If he suspected any one of the group of loafing, he would start on him early in the term with a barrage of questions during successive class meetings and so compel him either to improve or to drop the course.

There were eleven youthful assistants in the English department in 1907, a few of whom I came to know. One of these, A.B. Stonex, I have mentioned. Another, Miss Cecilia Hennel (later Mrs. Hendricks) was my first teacher of English composition at the college level. It was she who discovered the “little foxes,” as Arlo Bates called them, in my writing—the despoilers of communication—and taught me to expel them. She and I remained friends for sixty-one years. The title assistant gave way in 1908 to fellows, and then to instructors.

Four years of spring terms or summer terms or both and two of uninterrupted study brought me an A.B. degree in 1913. After two years as a teacher in the high school at Champaign, Illinois, and the summer of 1914 as a traveler in England, I returned to I.U. for work on a master’s degree. This consisted of courses in the nineteenth-century English novel; literary criticism, and bibliography with Dr. Howe; drama with Professor Reynolds; Elizabethan drama with Professor Stephenson; the poetry of Browning with Professor Sembower; and a special report from my individual study of some social aspects of Piers Plowman before the group of graduate students in English and Professors Snow and Howe. The following year I did some teaching in the Department. Dr. Howe resigned in 1919 to become a member of the publishing firm, Harcourt, Brace, and Howe. For thirteen years he had administered affairs of the Department, enrolled all junior and senior students of English literature, taught large classes, directed the Summer School, and, with the aid of a group appointed by President Bryan, formed a “committee on promotion of University interests” that “remained active until the appointment of the University Council nearly two decades later” [Myers, II, 165]. Dr. Howe was always courteous, urbane, affable, attentive to duties. In 1920, after two years with an Indiana Univer-
sity ambulance unit attached to the French armies, I re-
turned to the English Department on invitation of Professor
Stephenson, Dr. Howe's successor (English Department
Newsletter, III, 1-4).

This account of the Department between 1893 and 1920
can properly close with another reminiscence, this one casting
back to the first of these three decades. William Wellborn, an
Evansville attorney, was ninety-one years old when, in response
to Professor Parker's request for information about the Univer-
sity during his years as a student in Bloomington, he wrote:

It seems the Department of English of Indiana Uni-
versity was just in its twenty-fifth year when I entered the
University in the fall of 1893. The much admired Edward
Howard Griggs departed that year for Leland Stanford and
the personable and (to the ladies) debonair Martin Wright
Sampson became the very active head of the Department
of English. He wasted no time in impressing the student
body with the Department's place in their young lives. The
freshmen of the period stood much in awe of the new pro-
fessor. This feeling was not, however, fully shared by the
class of '94. The senior class of that year gave out with a
class yell that was the most resounding and rousing of class
yells. Its proud author was popularly said to be, of all per-
sons, a co-ed graduating in the Department of English. But
it was very hearty male voices that soared loud and clear
above every other sound with,

Rip roar, blood and gore,
Indiana evermore,
That's us, every 'cuss
Make a fuss for '94.

This beautiful gem was just too successful. Alumni, it was
said, were protesting that this was not a fitting product of
an institution dedicated to the highest cultural attainment.
Dr. Sampson was asked to protest to President Swain, and
there being nobody to prove freedom of speech included
freedom of yells, it was toned down, really down but not
out. For, while college riots were unknown, revolts, break-
ing out in brief roar, did happen to the not too secret de-
light of the underclassmen who marveled at the temerity of that co-ed.

Dr. Sampson soon became head of the Faculty Committee on Athletics. With him on this committee, besides Dr. Robert J. Aley of the Department of Mathematics was the young and popular professor Charles J. Sembower, of the Department of English. He was regarded as a perfectionist and so the subject of much good natured badinage among students. He was known to be much interested in athletics and proud of our championship team in baseball. There was a center fielder on the varsity by the name of Streaker. With a runner on third base, his throw-in of a long fly from center to catch the runner at home plate was considered as near perfection as anything human could be. Spectators were thrilled to see Furgeson, the crack catcher of the home team, step to the plate, hold his gloved hand chest high, to indicate Streaker's throw-in from center would come in above the plate right to that spot, when with one easy downward thrust of the ball the luckless runner from third was certain to be tagged out at the home plate. This play became the most talked of any feat unless it was Claude Malott's fielding of the "hill" or maybe some of the great plays of Frank Dailey at short. It was regarded as simply perfect. Then, to the amazement of poor yokels, it was learned that Prof. Sembower said the throw-in was not perfect. It was about four inches too high.

Mr. Wellborn's account, like some of the other documents upon which this short history is grounded, evokes a time not simple, but clear in its contours and assured in its motions. He recalls a provincialism which was both competent and self-aware ("poor yokels"), surprised but not unstrung by discoveries of the defects of its certainties: Furgeson holding his glove where Streaker's throw, four inches too high, will surely come. If Sampson and Howe and their colleagues had anything to say about it, they might protest this metaphor as too simple a distillation of the ferment of their years. No history is the whole story. What seems to me to command the history of the Department of English between 1893 and 1920 is a confident
readiness to explore and then to choose among the several possibilities of that relatively new thing, a university department of English. The choices finally were more narrow than the possibilities. But the choices were sound: half a century later most of its faculty members will still agree that among the central purposes of the Department are the teaching of composition, the teaching of the elements of literary apprehension, and the teaching and study of literary history. More important, the definition of these purposes did not inhibit the later emergence, sometimes the rediscovery, of other interests proper to a department of English. The faculty members who in the first decades of this century gave the Department's undergraduate and graduate programs a shape and content which they still display seem, in retrospect, to have been enviably sure of what it means to study and teach English. But on their way to that assurance they tried out other means and purposes, and whether they willed it or not, they made a department in which their definitions of the study called English continued to be tested, complemented, and enlarged by other conceptions.
It is fitting, to say nothing of prudent, to tell the history of the Department after 1920 largely in the words of some of those whose history it is. The reminiscences which follow in this chapter, all of them invited by William Riley Parker and published first in the *English Department Newsletter*, are written by members of the faculty whose knowledge of the Department is long and close. In this preface to their recollections I will try only to place them in a context, mostly of names and numbers, of some of the circumstances and events of consequence on the Bloomington campus between 1920 and 1945.

The most important events beyond the campus in these years were, of course, the depression and the Second World War, both of which profoundly affected what happened, and did not happen, on the campus. Their most evident effect was to help create, and certainly to enforce, what now seems a remarkable stability. Some changes slowly evolved from the interests of the relatively large number of faculty members who joined the Department in the 1920’s. Other changes began or picked up a new velocity after 1937 when Herman B. Wells became first Acting President and then President of the University. But all change was slowed by the depression or postponed by the war. Further, whatever change did occur is now dwarfed by the magnitude of the changes which followed the war. It is really only when the events of the quarter century between 1920 and 1945 are put against one another, and measured by the very different clock of the 1920’s and 1930’s, that the development of the Depart-
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ment in these years shows the lines of its movement and alteration.

Certainly the quarter century began with a sense of marked change as the Department filled with new faculty members. Between 1919, when Will D. Howe resigned as chairman and left the University, and 1923, when John Dougan Rea followed the same course, about a dozen faculty members (of a faculty which in 1919 numbered twenty-two) resigned from the Department. Many of those who replaced them came to stay. Stith Thompson joined the Department in 1921; Laurens Mills, John Robert Moore, and Henry Holland Carter in 1922; Alexander Judson in 1923; Arthur Leible in 1924 (he left in 1927, to return in 1930); Josephine Piercy in 1926; Mary Elizabeth Campbell in 1927, Russell Noyes in 1928 (he left in 1929, to return in 1932), and Samuel Yellen in 1929. Leible died in 1955; Professors Campbell and Yellen are still (1973) teaching in the Department; all the others remained until their retirements thirty or forty years later. So did Henry Thew Stephenson (retired 1940), William T. Jenkins (retired 1939), Will T. Hale (retired 1950), and Frank Davidson (retired 1958), who had joined the Department before 1920. Estella Mary Whitted, Mabel Compton, and Christian Knecht, all of whom were appointed as instructors in the 1920's, served in that rank into the 1940's. Lee Norvelle joined the Department in 1925 to teach courses in speech and theater and left in 1945 to chair the University's new Department of Speech and Theater: he remained in the University until his retirement in 1963. (Robert Milisen, who joined the Department in 1937, and Richard Moody, who came in 1942, also moved to the new department in 1945; both are still teaching in the University.) Chauncey Sanders came in 1926 and left in 1946, although he was not in residence during the war. Donald Smalley taught in the Department, as tutor and a member of the faculty, from 1929 to 1959; Cecilia Hendricks from 1931 to 1953; and Harold Whitehall from 1941 to 1966. Ralph Collins came as an instructor in 1935, and was Dean of Faculties of the University when he died in 1963. David Dickason and Rudolf Gottfried, who came in 1939, remain members
of the Department’s faculty, along with Horst Frenz (1940) and George Barnett (1944). And Agnes Elpers became the Department’s secretary in 1927 and served in that difficult and indispensable post until her retirement in 1972.

Others did not stay so long, among them Ralph Rusk, Myron Brightfield, Roy Tower, Richmond Bond, and James Pitman in the 1920’s; and Norman Eliason, Tom White (later of the University’s News Bureau), William Jansen, Robert Gorrell, Marshall Stearns, and William Strain (later the University’s Director of Admissions) in the 1930’s and early 1940’s. But there were other marks of stability. After the two brief chairmanships of Henry Thew Stephenson (1919-21) and John Dougan Rea (1921-23), Henry Holland Carter assumed the chairmanship in 1923 and continued in it until 1941 when Russell Noyes succeeded him to serve as chairman until 1951. Selatic Edgar Stout, once chairman of the Department of Latin, served as Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences from 1920 to 1942. Fernandus Payne was Dean of the Graduate School from 1927 to 1947; and William Lowe Bryan, named president in 1902, continued in his presidency until 1937. Even the fluctuations in the numbers of faculty members in the Department are relatively modest. According to the University catalogues, in 1923-24 there were twenty-six faculty members in the Department, thirteen in the professorial ranks (nine of these were to remain on the faculty until their retirements or deaths), and thirteen instructors. By 1931-32, the number of faculty members had increased to thirty-one, fifteen in the professorial ranks and sixteen instructors, plus three tutors. In 1937-38 the number had increased only by one, to thirty-two. It increased more sharply after 1939, but in 1944-45 the Department’s faculty had enlarged only to forty members, including five who were on leave for government service, which meant that the curriculum was being taught by only four more faculty members than had been teaching in 1931-32.

The curriculum itself was also relatively stable. Courses in public speaking and theater continued to be taught in the Department of English until 1945, and courses in the English lan-
language continued to be taught outside it, in the Department of Comparative Philology, until the early 1940's. Except for a course in children's literature, instituted in the Department in 1926, courses explicitly intended to educate prospective teachers were taught in the School of Education: Blanche Wellons, A.B., A.M., Indiana 1911, 1921, taught the course in the teaching of English from 1929 to 1940. As Samuel Yellen remarks in his recollections, in an era when a faculty member was strongly, even exclusively identified with a particular course, the graduate program did not change much from the 1920's when the men who taught the graduate program joined the faculty. Carter offered seminars in Literary Criticism, Sanders in the methods of literary research, and Thompson in the origins of literature, the ballad, and folklore. The rest of the graduate curriculum was organized by the conventional divisions of literary chronology: Judson on Spenser, Mills on Elizabethan drama, Moore on the literature of the ages of Queen Anne and Johnson, Pitman and then Noyes on the literature of romanticism, Hale on Victorian literature, Davidson (after 1934) on American literature. In 1929 candidates for the master's degree were required to sit for a comprehensive written or oral examination on "the History of English Literature" (1929 Catalogue, p. 239); in 1942, this examination was specified as an oral examination over five (later four) periods of British and American literature. In 1932 the long-standing requirement of a comprehensive oral examination for doctoral candidates, "over the field of English literature" as well as the subject-matter of the candidate's thesis, was joined by a requirement of a preliminary oral examination, which also tested a knowledge of (principally) British literature.

There were not many graduate students, in part by design. In the University catalogue for 1929, a description of the Department's graduate program is prefaced by the warning, "students will be discouraged from entering upon candidacy for the PhD degree unless they can supplement their work in larger universities and larger libraries" (p. 237). In 1942 Dean Fernando Payne reported that there were 257 students then-en-
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rolled in the entire Graduate School. "The number may seem small," he wrote, "but it is about all we can care for and do the job well." Further, he doubted that a larger number of graduates could find appropriate employment: "... the universities have been training more people than needed in certain fields" (President's Report, 1937-42; 1943 Catalogue, pp. 19-20). For all this temper of discouragement, the Department did award twelve doctorates between 1929, when Sister Gertrude Smith earned the second Ph.D. given by the Department, and 1945. Stith Thompson in his recollections writes that in this period the Department emphasized the master's degree, and the number of degrees awarded reflect this emphasis. During the 1920's about five or six masters' degrees were awarded annually, when over 100 A.M.'s were awarded annually in the University. In the 1930's the Department awarded eight or nine master's degrees each year, when only eighty or ninety were awarded each year in the University.

Undergraduates who majored in English in these years enrolled in a program which also continued to be dominated by the study of the history of British literature. For a year or so in the late 1920's, there was a first-year course in American literature, taught by Frank Senour, who died in 1928. Thereafter, usually only a single, year-long, multisectioned course in American literature was offered, until Samuel Yellen introduced his course in contemporary American literature in 1940. In the 1920's students majoring in English were required to enroll in year-long, historically organized courses in English literature in their first as well as in their second years, and they were also required to take a minor, or later a course, in British history. In the 1930's this latter requirement was abandoned, and a comprehensive examination was instituted in the senior year. As its purpose and content were eventually elaborated, in this examination students were "expected to show a grasp of the spirit of the successive periods and to be able to place the more significant writers in their literary environment. The examination is intended as an incentive to the student to acquire and retain an intelligent conception of the progress of English literature, and to
fit into his view of the whole such courses as he shall take after the Freshman survey" (1942 Catalogue, p. 190). Mary Elizabeth Campbell in her recollections blames the requirement of a comprehensive examination for a decline in the numbers of students majoring in English. Whatever the cause, the decline was pronounced. According to compilations in the University catalogues, in 1922 eighty-two baccalaureates in English were awarded (of 328 degrees in Arts and Sciences); in 1929, ninety-five (of 353). But in 1931 only sixty-nine undergraduate degrees in English were awarded (of 307); thirty-six in 1938 (of 348), and only twenty-six in 1941 (of 326).

One effect of this diminishment was that members of the faculty were likely to teach as many or more first-year courses in composition and literature as they did undergraduate or graduate courses in literature. The elementary composition program, directed by Stith Thompson from 1923 to 1936 and by Frank Davidson from 1936 to 1950, remained a sequence of semester-long courses meeting twice a week in sections enrolling twenty or twenty-five students who wrote weekly or bi-weekly themes. Throughout the 1920's all students were required to complete two semesters of composition. In 1932 a third semester was required of students in the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Business. This latter requirement, reinforced by the necessity of passing examinations in composition at the end of the sophomore or junior year, remained in place through the 1940's and into the 1960's.

In the 1920's students in the College of Arts and Sciences could also enroll in year-long, six-credit courses in Freshman English Literature (English 102) and Sophomore English Literature (English 121) as a way of fulfilling a requirement in humanities. John Robert Moore administered English 102 from 1924 to 1942; Laurens Mills became the director of the course in that year. Both courses were surveys of British literature, the first of its literary types, and the second of its history. Until 1932 both courses were prerequisites for enrollment in any other course in the Department except those in public speaking, and until 1944 both were required of students majoring in English. In 1925,
however, at the request of the dean of what was to become the School of Business, the Department instituted another two-semester, first-year course in literature—English 103, “Freshman English Literature (Commerce)”—which was required of students enrolled in that school. Arthur Leible was “in charge of,” in the words of the catalogue, English 103 from 1927 through the 1940’s. Despite its name, which it retained all through the 1930’s, English 103 evolved into a course in world literature whose texts were arranged chronologically (Homer through the 19th century). The dominant intention of the course, according to an account of its development by Philip Daghlian and Horst Frenz, was to provide some information about the cultures in which certain classic Western literary works were written and, more important, to teach students how to understand the texts themselves. Professors Daghlian and Frenz also describe how other schools in the University came to accept English 103 as fulfilling requirements in literature or humanities, and in consequence, by the mid-1930’s enrollments in English 102 and 103 “were just about equal, and since that time world literature (English 103) has gradually pulled into the lead” (“Evolution of a World Literature Course,” College English, 12 [1950], 150). The older course in freshman English literature was still being offered in 1945 (the sophomore English course was dropped from the catalogue in 1944, the same year in which the title of English 103 was changed to “Freshman World Literature”). The content of the English 102 was now described as “Readings from English literature from Anglo-Saxon times to the present with emphases on the significant literary figures” (1945 Catalogue, p. 73).

All during this quarter century, members of the faculty taught four courses each semester, sometimes adding an additional course or, more often, teaching a course at an extension center to supplement salaries which were distressingly stable. Graduate students often taught as tutors or graduate assistants. Joseph Friend, now Professor of English and Director of the Center for English as a Second Language at Southern Illinois University, recalls that he came to Bloomington in the fall of
1931 as a graduate assistant earning $900 "for nothing more onerous than teaching three sections of Freshman Comp two semesters running! . . . When an elderly lady among the Department's instructors fell ill shortly before superannuation, by a stroke of marvelous good luck I was given the privilege of collecting a further stipend by marking two more sets of themes a week." Professor Friend moved to Indianapolis in 1933 to become a full-time member of the faculty at the Indianapolis Extension Center. "That was then a small operation, English classes under Mary Orvis' supervision; one commuted by interurban electric car to Fort Wayne weekly to bring Light to that town in small classes that met under dim bulbs in an old high-school building" (English Department Newsletter, \textit{IV}, 14-15).

Many other members of the faculty in Bloomington also commuted to teach in other cities. In 1925-26, for example, courses in twentieth-century poetry were taught by Arthur Leible in Brownstown, Charles Sembower in Danville and Greensburg, Richmond Bond in Seymour, Arthur Stonex in South Bend, and Roy Tower in Spencer. Professors Moore, Thompson, Hale, Stephenson, Carter, Jenkins, Karr, and Frazier (the latter two taught public speaking) were teaching in Indianapolis in that year; Jenkins was also teaching a course in contemporary drama in Gary, Fort Wayne, and Wabash. In 1934-35 Jenkins taught twentieth-century drama and the English novel in South Bend and East Chicago, Norvelle taught public speaking in Fort Wayne, Norman Eliason and Samuel Yellen were teaching in New Albany, and Donald Smalley, Russell Noyes, Davidson, Thompson, Frazier, and Jenkins were all teaching in Indianapolis as well as in Bloomington. As the centers grew and began to recruit part-time faculty members from nearby high schools and colleges, faculty members in Bloomington stayed nearer home. But until the end of the 1940's (the practice was not entirely discontinued until 1955), members of the Department in Bloomington frequently taught in Indianapolis as well.

The enrollment of the Bloomington campus was steadily increasing all through this period. In 1925 a writer in the year-
book *Arbutus* invoked the principle of "standarized service to the greatest number" rather than "specialized stimulation for the few" in a defense against the "great hue and cry about the growth of the University. 'The University is becoming too large! It is nothing but an educational factory! They're trying to sell learning by the yard!'" (*Arbutus*, 1925). Enrollment was not really rising rapidly in the 1920's and early 1930's—according to the University catalogues, it increased from 4,268 students in Bloomington in 1921-22, to 5,344 in 1928-29, to 5,842 in 1934-35. But then it did quicken, and by 1940-41 there were twice as many students enrolled (8,108) as there had been twenty years earlier.

Most of these students had graduated from high schools in Indiana. In 1921-22 only 150 of 4,258 students were out-of-state students; in 1934-35 there were about 500 such students (of 6,353 students enrolled); in 1939-40, for the first time, over ten percent (about 900 of 8,168 students). Until 1930 any graduate of a commissioned high school in Indiana was admitted as an undergraduate to the University. In that year a College Aptitude Score was computed on the basis of class standing and performance on a standard psychological test. There is no suggestion in the catalogues that the score was used to deny admission. Residents of Indiana paid tuition of $30 a semester in 1924 ($47.50 for out-of-state students); $38.50 ($56 for out-of-state students) in 1931; and $44.75 (and $62.75) in 1938.

Undergraduates in English could join the English Club, which survived all through this period and in 1945 even attained its own clubroom on the second floor of what is now Lindeley Hall, "a comfortable place of nonacademic atmosphere, with lamps, easy chairs, shelves of light reading matter and magazines" (*Arbutus*, 1945). The tradition in which debate and public speaking were an important part of a literary education continued to flourish through the 1920's: in 1926 the largest crowd ever to witness a debate on campus voted 445 to 165 that the Indiana debaters had defeated the Cambridge University team, which had argued against the prohibition of alcohol. Various named theatrical groups—the Garrick Club, the
Studio Players, the University Players—presented plays in the old Assembly Hall or the gymnasium. The Writers’ Club produced a campus literary magazine, *The Hoosier*, in 1922, and another, *The Crimson Quill*, in 1927. Another literary magazine, *The Vagabond*, appeared from 1924 through 1931 (its articles “have been reprinted or quoted in everything from the *Saturday Review* to the *Haldeman-Julius Weekly*”; *Arbutus*, 1925). *The Bored Walk*, one of several campus humor magazines, was published monthly from 1930 to the end of that decade. In 1935 *Folio* was founded to supplement the text in elementary composition, retained that purpose while growing to become a quarterly literary magazine, and continued publication all through this period and into the 1950’s.

An undergraduate honors program was established in the College of Arts and Sciences in 1929 “based on the Swarthmore plan.” Essentially, the program was a two-year course in independent reading, “without the formality of required class attendance, semester tests, and examinations,” and it culminated in an oral examination, graced by an external examiner (1929 Catalogue, p. 129). June (Hiatt) Keisler, who graduated with honors in English in 1940, describes the program, and along the way describes too something of the character of undergraduate study at Indiana in the 1930’s, in a recollection invited by Merritt E. Lawlis.

Each registration day we signed up for enough hours of “Honors English” so that we would be carrying along with our minor requirements and those in other fields a total of 15 hours. Our plan of study was, roughly, a chronological one. We started off with Dr. Carter, then head of the Department, and Old English and ended with Professor Davidson and Walt Whitman and Dr. Thompson and 20th-Century poetry. (I still treasure the Tinker *Beowulf* Dr. Carter gave me from his own library. In those days of the “depression” many books were out of print or to be had only by special order; we used the library a great deal, sometimes borrowed books from our professors; we bought those which were readily available, when we could afford them.
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and if we wanted to add them to our own libraries.) We
skipped lightly past The Canterbury Tales, The Faerie
Queene, Paradise Lost, Gulliver’s Travels, and such other
classics as had been covered by the standard freshman and
sophomore courses and read instead The Book of the Duchi-
ess, Troilus and Criseyde, The Amoretti, Boethius’ Conso-
lation of Philosophy, Areopagitica, and Paradise Regained.

Once or twice a week we met with the professors in
their offices, in the library, or on occasion in their homes
and talked about what we had read and received suggestions
about what we might read next and where we might get
copies. Always there was a paper or two. Whenever he felt
that we had done sufficient work in his “period”—or, I sus-
pect, whenever he tired of us—each professor would send us
back to Dr. Carter, who would then make arrangements for
passing us on . . . . I knew vaguely that I was doing satisfac-
tory work or I would have been sent back to regular course
work; still, as Commencement approached I began to worry.
I had passed the proficiency tests in German and in French.
The test in English composition was long behind me. I had
written, successfully I was sure, until my tired handwriting
must have been quite illegible, on the English Comprehen-
sive then required of all English majors, and I had finally
finished and turned in the thesis in the field I had chosen as
my “major,” Pre-Elizabethan Drama. But I had still to face
my orals, and there were so many things that I didn’t know.
Like the Victorian Novel. I’d been reading like mad all the
previous summer (whoever had time to read novels in the
school year?) and hadn’t even got well into Dickens. And
American literature: except for Hawthorne and Twain and
Whitman and Poe what did I know of American writers? Or
modern world literature, aside from a little Tolstoy and
Mann?

By the Saturday morning set for the orals I had worked
myself almost into a state of petrification. I remember that
the circle of questioners included Deans Payne and Stout and
I think three visiting professors from neighboring colleges
(one of whom I remember was introduced as Head of the
English Department at Wabash College and who was, I be-
lieve, himself a product of “The Oxford System”), as well as
what appeared to be the entire English Department of Indiana University. I remember that it was the gentleman from Wabash who offered the first question. It was something about Sir Francis Bacon; and after I had answered it, he asked me whether I liked Bacon. "Bacon's all right in its place," I said without thinking, "but, on the whole, I really prefer Lamb." The whole circle roared with laughter. I blushed. My pun was unwitting and quite unintentional, but it put us all at ease and the occasion became rather pleasant. By the time we got around to the Victorian Age I had entirely forgotten my years about the novelists. Dr. Hale asked me two quick questions about minor details of a couple of Browning poems, questions which sounded very difficult but which he had so reiterated in class that even the dullest of his students could not have failed to answer them. Then, turning from me toward the other questioners, he said, "I can assure you, gentlemen, that this student could answer any other question about the Victorian period that I might put to her quite as readily as she did these. Have any of the rest of you any questions?" And, of course, nobody did.

The topics on which Mrs. Keisler was examined, the tone of the examination, even the people who conducted the examination were in 1940 what they would have been ten or fifteen years earlier.

In some ways, the character and enterprises of the Department did not change much between 1920 and 1945; in some ways, they had not changed much since the early years of Howe's chairmanship in the first decade of the century. But in other ways, changes large in immediate or future consequences were instituted. It is when writing about this period, for example, that it is necessary to specify that this chronicle is of the Department of English in Bloomington. Extension centers, the predecessors of regional campuses, were established in Indianapolis in 1916, Fort Wayne in 1917, Gary in 1922, East Chicago (later Calumet) and South Bend in 1932, and Jeffersonville (the Falls City Center, now Southeast) in 1941. The growth of the faculties and departments on these campuses requires its own historian. I will note only that by 1945 there were full-
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time faculty members in English at least in Indianapolis (Mary Orvis was the first appointed, in 1920), South Bend (Floyd H. Deen was the first appointed, in 1933), and Jeffersonville (A.J. Beeler, in 1943).

The University in Bloomington grew too, and not just in enrollment. The School of Commerce and Finance (then Business Administration, then Business) was established in 1920; the School of Music in 1921, and the School of Education was reorganized to be comparable to the other schools in 1923. The Junior (now University) Division, in which all freshmen were to be enrolled until they were admitted to one of the schools of the University in their third or fourth semester, was created in 1942. At the same time an interesting experiment, the Two-Year Elective Course of the College of Arts and Sciences, was abandoned. The course had enrolled students who for one reason or another chose not to complete a conventional baccalaureate and who were exempt from all requirements except that of freshman composition. There were 268 students enrolled in the program in 1941; it was then administered by Arthur Leible, of the Department of English.

The central physical campus of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—the old Library, the Student Building, Maxwell, Owen, Wylie, Kirkwood, Lindley Halls, Swain East (then named Biology: I use the present names of all these buildings)—was gradually surrounded by a ring of new buildings. Rawles and Memorial Halls, the old Fieldhouse and the old Stadium, and the President's house were built in the 1920's; then the Union, Chemistry, Woodburn, the Auditorium, Education, Music, Goodbody and Sycamore Halls, and Myers, Swain, and Bryan Halls in the 1930's and early 1940's. The University's libraries held 144,000 volumes in 1922, a number which nearly doubled by 1935, and doubled again (to 600,000 volumes) by 1946. An addition to the library in Bloomington had been built in 1926, and a rare book room was established in 1943, by which time the University Librarian was singling out the Watkins collection in Wordsworth and 2,300 titles in eighteenth-century British literature as among the notable holdings of the
Among the first acts of Herman Wells' presidency were the creation of a faculty retirement plan in 1937 and the institution of sabbatical leaves in 1939. A series of publications in Humanities (and another in Folklore) was inaugurated in 1939, a portent of the University Press to be established in 1950. Faculty research grants were first awarded in 1941: Horst Frenz and Malcolm Ross of the Department of English each received one of the first eight awarded, $300 each to visit the libraries of other universities. In his report published in 1943, President Wells explained why the University administrators and the Board of Trustees had recently adopted a statement on academic freedom and tenure. "In World War I, wartime hysteria caused an unfortunate restriction of academic freedom on many campuses. In order to protect members of the faculty and the reputation of the University, should such folly again appear, a clear statement of our consistent but unannounced policy on academic freedom was prepared" (President's Report, 1942-43, 1945 Catalogue, p. 13).

Changes within the Department of English follow a pattern which can be traced in the changes noted above, a steady accumulation and then a quickened pace after the mid-1930's. Russell Noyes was named acting chairman and then chairman of the Department in 1941, one of sixteen new chairmen appointed between 1937 and 1942. Stith Thompson had taught courses in folklore in the Department since his arrival in Bloomington. But a decisive step was taken in 1942 toward the creation of first a program (a graduate program first, in 1949, and then an undergraduate program, in 1955) and eventually a department of folklore when the summer Folklore Institutes were begun. The chairman of the Department of Comparative Philology, Guido Stempel, retired in 1938, and the Department itself dissolved after 1942. In that year a program in linguistics was created, and Harold Whitehall, whose courses in Old and Middle English had been offered as courses in Comparative Philology, began in the Department of English a series of undergraduate and graduate courses in English language. All through
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The period 1920-45 a string of writers and literary critics had read or lectured on campus: J.C. Powys, Harriet Monroe, Padraic Colum, Hamlin Garland, Vachel Lindsay, and Carl Sandburg in the 1920's; Alfred Noyes, Langston Hughes, Robert Frost, Thomas Mann (speaking on "The War and Its Future"), Bernard De Voto, Stephen Spender, and André Maurois in the 1930's and 1940's. The utilities of such appearances were consolidated and enlarged by two innovations of the early 1940's. The Indiana University Writers' Conference was created in 1940, directed first by Cecilia Hendricks and then successively by Ralph Collins, Philip Daghlian, and Robert Mitchner. In its first five years the Conference enlisted among its teachers John Gould Fletcher, Jesse Stuart, John Crowe Ransom, Irwin Shaw, David Daiches, Katherine Anne Porter, James T. Farrell, Horace Gregory, and the writer of children's books, Jeanette Covert Nolan. The second innovation was to invite distinguished writers and teachers to serve in the Department as visiting professors. Marguerite Young taught in Bloomington in the first semester of 1941-42, Robert P. Tristam Coffin in the spring of 1942; Robert Frost spent four weeks on the campus in the spring of 1943; and Robert Nichol Smith and Robert Penn Warren followed in the spring of 1947.

The war brought changes of its own. Some members of the faculty—Mary Elizabeth Campbell, for example—left the campus to serve in the war. Others remained to teach in an accelerated three-semester calendar and in the Army Specialized Training Program, in which members of the Department's faculty taught composition to students who were in military service, most of them studying foreign languages. But for the most part, the war did not institute changes so much as it delayed the effects of some changes already begun and prepared yet others. After 1945, in the greatest expansion the University had yet undergone, the Department was again to be filled with new faculty members, as it had been when Martin Wright Sampson came in the 1890's, and again in the early 1920's. But now the numbers, and their consequences, would have no precedents. Nonetheless, many of the changes which were to be worked after 1945—
the development of a first-year course in literature, the invitation each year to a distinguished critic to serve as a visiting professor in the Department, the consolidation of a program in creative writing, the growth of courses and programs in American literature and English language, the creation of programs and then departments in folklore, comparative literature, and linguistics, the palpable facts of faculty benefits and status which helped Russell Noyes and his successors as chairmen to add to the faculty people of promise or achieved distinction: all had their ground in events before 1945 and took their first energy from members of the Department's faculty and University administration during the 1920's and 1930's. From the perspective of the present, the Department of English in 1945 resembles that of twenty years earlier more closely than it does that of ten or five years later. But there are central continuities between the character and responsibilities of the Department in all of these years. In many of the ways which matter, what was achieved in the Department after 1945 amplifies what had been achieved or begun by faculty members who in decades of more deliberate change were, and with colleagues who have since joined them, still are the worthy stewards of the Department's identity, quality, and growing purposes.
Before I came to Indiana University in 1921 I had never been in Bloomington, though of course I knew something of the University. My teen-years were spent in Indianapolis, and I well recall reading of the appointment of Dr. William Lowe Bryan as president of the state university. It is interesting that on my graduation from high school in 1903, though I was urged to go to various colleges, it never occurred to me or my family to consider Bloomington. Perhaps it is just as well, for at Butler I was under Professor Will D. Howe, an excellent teacher who came immediately afterward to be Professor of English here. During this regime (1906-1919) two of my doctorate classmates taught here and with one of them, Garland Greever, I exchanged frequent letters. In 1919 Howe left to go into the publishing world in New York. For the last part of his life he was one of the chief editors of Charles Scribner's Sons. His departure left a difficult vacancy to fill, and for two years or so there was in effect an interregnum. Because of the war or for other reasons, there was something of an exodus from the English faculty. Greever retired on the strength of a very successful textbook. Reynolds went to Boulder; Snow and Woodbridge to Wesleyan in Connecticut.

The interregnum ended with the appointment in 1920 of John D. Rea of Earlham College as chairman of the Department. [Rea was appointed as chairman in 1921; H.T. Stephenson served as chairman from 1919 to 1921.] He found much work to do. Some of his best men had just left, and the University was still disorganized after the First World War. The inter-
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ten years had developed some unfortunate personal antipathies and all this made Rea's problems difficult. I had met Rea sever-
also earlier, but had a good talk with him at an MLA meeting at Ohio State in March of 1920. The next year I agreed to come here, primarily to reorganize freshman composition. I had already taught in a highly organized department at the University of Texas and had written textbooks in the field.

An amusing article might be written about our attempts to find a place to live in Bloomington. Eventually we did settle down in what I am sure was the last possibility. The English Department was then located on the second floor of Biology Hall (Swain Hall East) between Botany and Zoology—and as a buffer department probably served a purpose in promoting amity on the campus. No new buildings had gone up lately, so that it was almost impossible to schedule all the thirty-odd sections of composition. But we managed. The first of the new crop of buildings was Commerce Hall (Rawles).

As Director of Freshman Composition, it was my task to improve the haphazard arrangements that had been handed down from the small college days. Toward making this change, President Bryan was especially helpful. On his own initiative he attended my first meeting with the staff and made a very helpful talk urging cooperation. The first problem was the evening up of sections. Until that time a student went to the professor to enroll. Some sections had sixty or seventy students (snap courses) and others only eight or ten. The central registration broke this up but caused some heart-burning, not only among certain athletes but within the teaching staff itself. I am sure that the regimentation soon became too strict, but it was easier to relax later than to impose uniformity. In the course of five or six years a certain equilibrium was reached which has been maintained in its general form ever since.

No comparable changes were made in the English literature courses. In addition to the general survey of English literature there were specialized courses—Old English, Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, and the like—and some based on the professors' research interests. About 1923 or 1924 a definite attempt was
made to strengthen the graduate offerings. I recall that I was permitted to offer seminars in the folktale and in the medieval romances—the actual beginnings of work that have led to the present Folklore Institute.

The School of Business was then new and had not acquired its present autonomy. Students had certain language requirements which did not seem to that school to be germane to their actual needs. That they needed some training in the humanities was clear to the Dean. He asked the English Department to design a course in World Literature which would be required of business students. This was a real challenge and was to engage the energies of a number of us in the Department for twenty years or more.

In 1923 H.H. Carter became Head and conducted the affairs of the Department for nearly twenty years. Rusk, Hale, and Jenkins were already attracting students when I came in 1921 and we were soon joined by Moore and Judson, and, on their return from graduate work, by Frank Davidson and Laurens Mills. As the postgraduate offerings grew and we had more and more students, a policy was agreed on that at least for some time we should strive to give a first-rate master's degree, but not normally train for a Ph.D. As a result a number of the M.A. theses from that period were comparable to later doctor's dissertations, and the oral examinations were formidable. Seminars were held in Indianapolis on Saturday mornings and a number of Indianapolis teachers eventually earned degrees. This arrangement lasted until the late 1930's.

The growth of the English Department over the last half century has been steady, and the period of the 1920's was a necessary part of this evolution. By 1930 we were ready to move from Biology Hall to the east wing of the Chemistry Building and exchange the occasional whiff of fishes in alcohol for the continual presence of chlorine and other laboratory smells (English Department Newsletter, III, 34-35).
1922! That was the year when Bloomington had its worst water shortage. In July the campus in the horseshoe curve was cracked as if by miniature earthquakes. On September 4 the temperature reached 104, and by the time the University opened one had to drive to Greencastle to get his car washed. Male students paraded toward the Gymnasium with towels and soap for baths from the water which trickled in from the University's own little reservoir south of Griffey Creek. A young assistant in English endangered the operation of the University by lingering for forty minutes in the luxury of a shower bath. Rumor told us that the University was to be moved farther northward, to be replaced in Bloomington by an insane asylum.

Housing was in almost as short supply as water. The University had no dormitory. A bachelor newcomer in the faculty lost his expected room when the landlord moved to Ohio just before enrollment day, and he secured the last room on the list from a junior in charge of the YMCA's housing program—an energetic young man named Herman B. Wells. When the Theta House on Forest Place burned to the ground after Christmas, almost uninhabitable houses far apart were requisitioned for use; a dead mouse was found in a bed one morning.

1922 was the year when the saxophone was to be heard blaring out on Third Street, and when the old Book Nook on Indiana Avenue stayed open until far into Sunday morning. The tenant of an upstairs room nearby completed reading the eight volumes of Pepys' *Diary* and a sixteen-volume edition of Dr.
Samuel Johnson's works on Saturday nights alone. Through the doorway of the Book Nook one caught glimpses of a yellow raincoat and a tarpaulin hat, draped around a slender figure which banged away at a piano. A musically gifted freshman assured his English teacher that Hoagy, the man in the raincoat, had something special in his flair for jazz. (That must have been late in the academic year; until February there was no conceivable reason for the raincoat.)

But 1922 was also the year when there was talk of developing a strong English Department at Indiana University. Among the newcomers were Carter from Miami, Mills from Baylor, and Brightfield and Meeks fresh from graduate school. In the years before, Rea had come from Miami and Thompson from Maine; in the next year Judson would come from Texas. It is true that our sights were not yet raised very high. The departmental chairman pointed to the niches in the upper walls of the one library building, which showed where the upper floors of the stacks would later be erected; and he explained to a newcomer that this provided room for future expansion. Those spaces have been crowded since then. The Library Building has been extended several times; the library services have overflowed into the Student Building and many departmental libraries and the Lilly Library, and more recently into the eyeless mass of stone on Tenth Street.

In 1922 three departments had their headquarters in Biology Hall (now shrunken into a wing of Swain). Because of friction between the heads of two science departments, English was sandwiched in on the second floor as a buffer state. Room 30, to the north of the head of the stairway, quartered six men; the chairman was next door; our colleagues were provided for in wherever cubby holes could be found. A few lucky teachers had classes in Biology; the rest were scattered in almost every building on the campus but the Power House.

The Correspondence Study Bureau offered a few extracurricular courses to students who could not come to Bloomington; and a small Extension Center functioned at odd intervals in the old Shortridge High School building in Indianapolis.
Beyond that, in the recesses of the state, occasional lectures were arranged for and some local gatherings regarding which the deponent cannot certify. The development of extension universities (opprobriously known in Fort Wayne as "Stench") was unachieved—and almost undreamed of.

Most of our students were natives of Indiana. An informal check in freshman classes for several years verified that beyond doubt. Many students had never been outside of the state. The president of the University and a majority of the deans were originally from southern Indiana. There were no sabbatical leaves for the faculty until September 1939. The one opportunity to earn leave with salary came through teaching in the summer school, transforming the basic stipend of 17% to 25% by claiming it later for travel and study.

But in our Department in 1922, we taught English—and most of us liked it. Our regular schedule called for twelve hours in the classroom (with untold hours in private conference). During the worst of the depression years many of us gladly accepted fifteen hours with a slight increase in salary. Campus demonstrations happened before holidays or after an unexpected victory in athletics. We were willing—then, as now—to be judged by the achievements of our former students. And we have had some cause for pride in hearing what is reported about Indiana University in remote corners of the earth. We could say of our relation with Indiana University, as Will Rogers said of his aboriginal ancestors: "We did not come over on the Mayflower; we were there to meet the boat!" (English Department Newsletter, III, 8-9).
able place in which to teach, the faculty was in general congenial, and there was no particularly noticeable publish-or-perish atmosphere. Except for some Extension teaching the faculty was sedentary; there was no flying to Washington or the ends of the earth on one mission or another. We were not paid at a very generous rate; the present salary scale seems astronomical by comparison. But we managed to live—or go elsewhere (English Department Newsletter, III, 11-13).
If you will accept some haphazard notes, I shall give you what I remember of our English Department since the Dark Ages when I was an undergraduate for two years [1916-18], a graduate for another, and a teacher after that. I lived where I live now and cut diagonally across meadows to the campus and Biology Hall. The chairman of the Department was Will D. Howe, editor of many tests and subsequently a member of the publishing firm of Harcourt, Brace, and Howe. He lived on Forest Place, nicknamed “Faculty Row,” in the brick house that became the I.U. infirmary. Another English faculty member was the vivacious and stimulating Shakespearean scholar, George F. Reynolds, who later became chairman of the English department at the University of Colorado, where he and his charming and talented wife established a fine university theatre. Frank Senour was another. His sarcastic tongue scared the wits out of some students, as did his witty and sometimes brutal colleague, Dr. Will T. Hale. Both men were intolerant of lazy students; both were infinitely kind to the conscientious. It was Frank Senour’s wife who gave an annual sum in his memory to the Men’s Faculty Club for their library.

All of these men were my professors, whose careers I knew afterwards. What became of H.W. O’Connor, who taught creative writing, I do not know. During that time we had a Writers’ Club and we published The Hoosier literary magazine. I had fun in and on both. Of course the magazine did not pay for itself and we fell in debt. How we got out is an amusing story
not appropriate to this report, but it is a coincidence that both *The Hoosier* and *The Folio* fell into my lap to get them out of debt.

When I came back to Indiana University [in 1926] (after a year of teaching high school in the God-forsaken town of Carlyle, down in "Egypt," Illinois, and one year at Columbia, and four years as a graduate assistant at the University of Illinois), Dr. Carter was chairman (there were three people we always addressed by title—Carter, Hale, and Judson), and the English Department was still in Biology Hall. I do not remember the size of the Department or of the University then or before. [The English faculty totalled twenty-six in 1926-27.] Of course, during the World War I years, attendance was cut sharply and I.U. became almost a girls' school. I do remember that there were several of us with the simplest of desks all in one room. Mary Elizabeth Campbell was there (she always had a box of chocolates in her desk) and Cornelia Vos (Christenson).

Like Methodist preachers, the Department was moved from one place to another: from Biology Hall, where Zoology did not want us, to Chemistry, where the smells were worse than the last, to—for some of us—the old Howe House for offices, to Science Hall (Lindley), and finally into the incredible English Building. In Science Hall, some classrooms were divided into two offices and in order to have two entrances, the two doors were put back about five feet from the original door leaving an entrance hallway. Mary Elizabeth Campbell and I, who had two such offices, turned our extra outer space into a reception room with magazines and comfortable chairs for victims waiting for conferences.

Among my colleagues during this long stretch were Dr. Hale, who always made fun of my hats, Dr. Alexander Judson, Spenserian scholar, John Robert Moore, Russell Noyes, Laurens Mills, Sam Yellen (later), Stith Thompson, and Frank Davidson . . . . Did you know he used to write excellent poetry? He contributed to *The Hoosier* magazine. There must be some others I have forgotten for the moment. And our beloved chairman, Dr. Carter. I do not remember the sizes of the Department
over the years. I do remember low salaries and slow promotions all over the University . . . .

I mention my own case as a typical example: I came here in 1926 as an instructor at $1,800. In 1930, when I published Modern Writers at Work, it went up to $1,900. I do not remember the in-between salaries, but in 1943, after three years as assistant professor, mine was increased to $2,700 . . . . As you know, promotions were few and far between. Mine was even better than others: fourteen years as instructor, ten as assistant professor, fourteen as associate, and two as full professor. Sometimes I wonder whether our young people have any idea of how lucky they are (English Department Newsletter, III, 5-6).
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Mary Elizabeth Campbell

In September 1927, the time of my arrival in the Department, we were housed in Biology Hall, later re-named Swain Hall East, which looks to the south onto Third Street and to the north onto the old campus. Henry Holland Carter, our good, loved chairman, had a cubicle-like office on the second floor; beside it was a considerably larger office, where several professors had their desks and where a young, auburn-haired undergraduate, name of Agnes Elpers, dealt  with Mr. Carter's and the Department's secretarial needs. To the west of this office was a nice, big, high-ceilinged room with great north windows that looked out on the beeches and the campus and in the winter-time, a good way off, the faint lines of Maxwell and the Student Building. Here the women of the Department had their desks. (Over mine hung a large engraving of a Shakespearean figure, whose tragic countenance, which wore on me after a time, I replaced one day with a red, blue, and gold map of London.) Across the corridor was another good big room with the desks of the rest of the Department. It being a fully southern room, the lighting had to be glare, darkness, or electricity, and the heat in warm weather was doubtless dreadful. From my own point of view, the general arrangements were sufficient, comfortable, and sociable. The heating apparatus in those days, it is true, provided about as much dirt as heat, dinginess continually assaulted ceilings and walls, and a person's dry-cleaning bills were something of an item. Still, there was the great sweeping view over the heart of the campus, with the branches and great smooth
trunks of the beeches whitening from winter into spring.

It was a hilly, woodsy campus, some happy offshoot of Wordsworthian romanticism, preserved tooth-and-nail to this day against all but fringe encroachments. Where Myers Hall now stands were four good fast tennis courts—about the only courts then—surrounded by solid greenery. From the high westerly front steps of the Student Building, a limber young faculty member, coming out from late afternoon basketball, could see, not the Administration Building, but a glade where flourished redbud and forsythia. In those days both the University administration and the Law School abode in Maxwell Hall. A person went over there himself to receive his monthly check.

In a curious little room and anteroom, on the ground floor to the east, Mr. [Clarence Edmund] Edmondson, one of the two Deans of Men, had his office. I remarked once sympathetically on the revolting paint job that had just been done on his anteroom walls, a heavy dark green and heavy dark brown done in blobs. “True indeed,” said Mr. Edmondson equably. “But by the time a man has waited here a few minutes, he has pretty powerfully the feeling that he has happened into a lair.”

On a long oblique across Indiana Avenue from the present Administration Building, stood, where the much larger Gables is now, the Book Nook—no truck with books, I assure you—a special and flavorsome aspect of university life, a Bill Monkhouse-Hoagy Carmichael kind of a world, figures gone their way by the time I arrived. Every spring, however, there was the Book Nook Commencement, with a good, big, uproarious nonacademic procession down Third Street and suitable honors and degrees for those who had managed to spend their college days mainly at the Book Nook. An egregiously untroubled world, the Book Nook? Well, I’d say so. Still, there were perhaps other moments. The great “pipe course” in those days was Greek Life and Literature. When the news went up one night on the Book Nook bulletin board that the professor of the course, who had long been satisfied with the final examination he had evolved years before, had suddenly, for no reason known, formed a new final, within five minutes of that news the Book Nook clientele
had vanished toward an even more sudden scholarship, almost to a man.

In 1927 Indiana was a very small state university and, even allowing for the worth of the dollar then, rather poor. When I run across it now and then, I smile at the Red Book for 1927—scarcely bigger than a lady’s memorandum book. Though World War I had hit Bloomington, and [Amos Shartle] Hershey (of the Department of Government) had been with Wilson in Paris, the postwar world of the Twenties that I had lived in never came near the life of the campus. The campus was incredibly insular, and national and international concerns were all but nonexistent. (It was a proud day for us few young kids when Sam Yellen’s “A Socialist Boyhood” came out in the American Mercury.) The main thing was the fraternities and sororities. For a person like me one’s college class was part of one’s name. Not so here. It was one’s fraternity that mattered. In so small a place, to have organizations so numerous and important left a non-fraternity person many a time painfully on the fringe. The stone building [Alpha Hall] that once stood in the open space in front of Jordan Hall was built with private funds for profit, and the University rented it as a dormitory for girls. Shortly before I came, Memorial Hall had been erected by alumni donations as a war memorial, and this also housed girls, grew rather a lovely tradition, and was a great stride forward. But, in general, non-organization students lived in private houses, where indeed they were open to considerable deprivation and exploitation. Once, in World War II, in the 33rd General Hospital near Leghorn, I received a letter from an Army man in the Pacific; he’d got a copy of Scandal Has Two Faces [a mystery novel by Professor Campbell, published in 1943, and set in a pre-war department of English in a midwestern university] from somewhere. “Imagine,” he wrote, “coming up from your pages, unmistakably, out of the past, long forgotten, that basement room that was mine.” Or one could be a “student girl” or “student boy”—this was regular idiom. Such a student worked where he lived at housework or yard work for his board and room. Sometimes this arrangement provided a cherished experience, sometimes a bitter
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one. As for food for "unorganized" students and bachelor faculty, in the basement of the Student Building was a cafeteria. I have almost no memory of it. Boarding Clubs, though they had been a way of life once, were mostly gone by my time. I ate at the Wyman sisters' boarding club, on Atwater, about dead south of Biology—thirteen good meals a week for five dollars. It was about half students, half faculty. Doubtless with our interest in the new "College" plans, one would think at once of the rich intellectual exchanges between faculty and students. "Exchanges" there were—familial, easygoing, candid, cheerful, and unending. "Intellectual?" Well, could be. Just as the road turned. What I remember is a thousand no-count jests... "No, I'm going to turn this plate round till I can take the piece nearest me if it takes all day." Sometimes when I pass the Elm Heights School, I think of the baseball games we used to play there in the springtime, evening after evening. "I could wish," said a history major, retiring from the mound and gazing off at Cleveland in Economics, "I could wish that I had not nicked Grover's cigar that way—he's giving us an hour exam tomorrow."

I had never been one myself to choose courses from youngish professors, having the opinion that all they had to offer was a nonvintage modicum of book learnin'—I favored white-haired men, or at least whitish, like Gulick or Kitty or Haskins (though I did make full exception with regard to my distinctly brown-haired college tutor, a very young man named Douglas Bush), and thus, feeling sorry for my students, I proposed to give them at least all I knew, taught as hard as I could in class, and relentlessly continued in conferences, where I obliged them to chew up whatever I had taught and they had thought beyond for contra, and hovered over the processes of digestion. When the Wyman's Christmastime dinner came round and each person was to receive a present, accompanied by appropriate verses from the donor, my present was a small aluminum egg cup, neatly adorned with the sparkling words "Conference Champion."

In my first few years at I.U. I went to visit friends at Earlham, Oberlin, and DePauw. I remember being struck at Earl-
ham by something I could not quite put my finger on—a more relaxed, quieter, more serene, perhaps kinder atmosphere; I thought the difference lay partly in the students being less competitive socially among themselves. And at Oberlin I felt a very lovely relationship between students and faculty—differences in age and erudition to be sure, but common to both groups the essentials of breeding, of love of intellectual aliveness and nurture, of sound values; thus their natural and enjoyed rapport. Mr. and Mrs. Carter, Edna Munro [director of physical education for women], and Sam Yellen all came from that world. As for DePauw, I thought there was something rather tied down there and a little school-ma’am-ish. Allowing for the regular differences between small private institutions and larger state-supported ones, I cannot help thinking that I.U. in the year around 1927 was considerably further down the line than one could wish. The general student atmosphere was too much a backwater—something willfully ignorant and superficial—something uncivilized, too, about the upper-level insistence on a playboy atmosphere. But then there was something very good about a certain grassroots quality—genuine, plain, simple, kindly.

One thing that we haven’t to any degree now, thank goodness (through a faculty ruling a number of years ago and the sturdy maintenance of the deans since), but certainly had then, was a shocking and persistent pressure to change grades—most of the time to qualify for initiation or for a team. Outstanding in my first year was a girl who cried all over me, she herself coming providently in a bright red raincoat, to have a B in one course changed to an A, and a C in another changed to a B. And I still can hear the tone of Miss [Edna] Johnson’s succinct remark to me once when I came into our office, a Theta—or would-be Theta—departing hastily, Miss Johnson sitting very upright: “I may be a Theta, but I am not necessarily a fool!”

When I think of the faculty in 1927 and its leisure-time cultural, social concerns, I think of the place as pleasant, warm, hospitable, and bright. Calling cards were a very necessary part of one’s equipment. Husbands got into black tie with good
In 1927 the Department of Music was in the pair of "temporary" frame barracks, built during World War I, that still stands, somewhat extended and, I hope, supported, in the area east of Lindley. The Department of the Fine Arts—Mr. [Robert Elisha] Burke and Harry Engel, I believe—was, well, perhaps it was partly in the Library. The Language Club was in existence. It met in the various houses of the members, at the Carters' at the first meeting of the year, and for the December meeting at the Vos home—after the paper we had Mrs. Vos's hot mulled grape juice. At our meeting after the Christmas MLA meeting we had the highlights of the three or four well-heeled members...
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who had attended the MLA. During Prohibition, when the MLA met one year in Toronto, our attendance at MLA perhaps rose somewhat. In the spring the May meeting was a picnic, with wives and offspring expected, and the main event was a softball game. Otherwise the Language Club was a strictly closed corporation. The year I was president—by then we were too large for private homes—I one evening suggested to the members the thought that wives should be invited to be members also. This suggestion was met with a silence that I still remember . . . . The men’s Faculty Club had its quarters in the basement of the Student Building, conveniently near the billiard room. The Women’s Faculty Club had come into existence shortly before 1927 and had its clubrooms in the bottom of Kirkwood. We made much less of our rooms than the men did of theirs, and I fear that, like the British, we took our pleasures sadly. Whenever one of the ladies took a doctor’s degree, this redoubtable group then anticipated a program in which the new doctor discussed her dissertation.

I would say that in those early days the best scholarship being done on the campus in the humanities, aside from Stith Thompson’s monumental pioneering work and John Robert Moore’s prolific essays, was William Thomas Morgan’s work in history, chiefly the reign of Queen Anne. He had a good-sized study at the Library, he had the presiding powers somehow squared round to buying Augustan material while it was still cheap and available, he had about all of this, and two thirds of his own books as well, shelved in this study. He lived his life there, and he had his heart out pretty much yearning over all who would work that field and harrow those books.

In 1927 we in the English Department gave our classes mostly in Biology Hall and in what was then Social Sciences; perhaps there were some classes in the Library. This sentence, merely in itself, indicates pretty well an essential fact with regard to the quarters of the English Department—we were, contrary to all nature, congenital orphans and so we remained, whether housed in Biology Hall, or in the Chemistry Building, or in Science (Lindley Hall), or in a secondhand Naval Hospital
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unit [named The English Building], till we arrived, three decades after my advent, in Ballantine.

There was in those days, at least in our Department a considerable informality, a certain amateur quality that I find surprising to recall and difficult to describe. I incline to think it was partly good and partly very bad. Any bad aspects of this amateur quality were intensified by no one's ever leaving (except surprising Roy Tower) or being ousted for anything short of moral turpitude or, since there were no retirement arrangements, retiring till the grave was closing over. In connection with the amateur quality, I recall pleasantly Mr. Jenkins and Dean Sembower—cultivated, civilized, individual, easy, and interesting; as for the ladies in our 1927 office, the majority of them were rather along in years. Looking back on this majority I incline to think they were scarcely suited for University posts—Miss Collins, Miss Whitted, Mrs. Williams, Miss Compton, for a time Miss Kennedy. (Miss Johnson, too, was to me an older lady, but special. With a respectable classical background and a remarkably ready, forever interesting and soundly judging mind, she made a unique contribution to the Department and to the students of the University. The anthology of children's literature that she and Miss Scott did was an early enterprise in this field, with a hundred excellences. It was a work tenderly remembered in my own family; one niece a few years ago wrote me that what she and Ron wanted for Christmas was Miss Johnson's book for their own little Alice, a fresh copy of the childhood friend of long illnesses and longer rainy days, "the grey book." When the day came that was the very last day for Miss Johnson and me to be office mates, a mighty nice part of my University life finished then.) Well, for the other ladies there are many things I like to remember. Sweet Miss Whitted. Gallant Miss Collins, with dependents and no resources, with her paralyzed face and her tired limbs, and with her ever beautifully groomed hair, her trim ankles and her well-polished shoes. I suppose, though, that such an assemblage as the majority I mentioned scarcely created a status and a University atmosphere beneficial to the professional advancement of other women.
In 1927 members of the English Department at Indiana State University, as far as I know, taught under the title of freshman Composition and one or English Literature. The teaching was done by taking an entire Composition section or teaching a couple of courses out of in English Composition. A year or so later I had two sections of Composition and one of Freshman English Literature.

Stith Thompson, the most distinguished member of my department, was the head of freshman Composition. He did an excellent job. A very small number of students entered Freshman English, but students that we used for several years still remember it as a valuable one, especially for the freshman.

The kind of English written generally by our incoming freshmen in 1927 was something a person could not write at first, even though Cornelia Vos had taught English at the matter as well as on a number of other students. This was not the case for incoming freshmen were now more literate at home than during Jim Work's chairmanship. I think the students did not change as much as possible, at least in part, to make the organizing an annual conference here of English high school teachers in the state, our hospitality was encouraging and refreshing, and a new in many various ways, of course. The conference was stimulating and given to both them and us. And (4) with the announcement, in 1960, I think, that, for years hence, the Conference would require that students planning to major in English composition national examinations, such as the SAT, GRE, such.

In 1927 Stith Thompson, gathering his students toward the end of the beginning of a semester, gave a test that would reveal the student's understanding of mechanics and spelling (it would be a machine-mark test now, but in those days we operated with a lead pencil during a weekend), and then divided up the students into sections, the top two thirds into Group 1 sections, regularly assigned to, I recall, as "dumbbell sections." Students in Group 2 sections went an extra hour a week to have material assigned that might otherwise have escaped them. Stith very succinctly phrased his own effort clearly. "I shall not quote the obvious." It was hoped that a hard worker in Group 1 section
The Department of English in the 1920's and 1930's could after one semester make it into a regular second-semester section. In the regular classes, toward the end of the first semester, a student wrote a paper of some length, usually his autobiography, and toward the end of the second semester, a piece of investigation that involved the use of the library, the shaping of reading notes for convenience and accuracy, and the sound use and form of footnotes. While the reading of freshman themes, especially over many years, is a stultifying experience, the actual teaching of such a course has forever a charm, challenge, and variety that it is hard to match in a subject-matter course. (Partly this sense of such a course rises from the fact that one knows one's students with an almost incredible fullness.) And I suppose many a student felt this way toward the course himself. Several years ago a student from the East returned here, after some fifteen years, for his own private reunion with the University, and brought his wife and his two children. On his last day he said to me: "I looked out from my room up in the Union Building this morning. That whole look of the campus in the spring sunshine—it was all so miraculously the way it used to be. Except for something...and then I knew what it was. Yes, that's what it was...and wouldn't be again, ever. That Composition class of ours...in the warm spring days, out there on the grass, under the trees."

I had some doubts whether, with students starting so far behind scratch as ours did, I could get very far if they did only one theme a week. I dreamed up a different approach for a second theme a week that wouldn't be a strain on them but would give them some fine practice. I got them to subscribe to Harper's (some years to the Atlantic) for three months of the semester—cut rate, of course. Then I taught them all I knew about how to do a top-notch literary criticism. Then for the last ten minutes of the meeting for which they had not been assigned a theme they did their stuff on an article or short story in the current issue, which I then marked and returned, like any other theme. You think they couldn't get much said in ten minutes? With a serene Simon Legree presiding over their efforts and with their own private pride that for the first time in their lives...
they were turned loose on prose that wasn’t an arrangement of pressed flowers but real-for-sure adult-world stuff in which they could take care of themselves, by gum, when they had given me the specified two minutes to run down in—local ground rules—and it was their ten minutes; they were as ready and cool as tigers. For whatever excellence of style each individual had achieved, by the time April came round he had an admirable facility, and solid coverage of his points, and he could turn out a first draft that mostly was as clean as a finished one.

Stith Thompson really ran a beautiful little course, a kindly, easy, gentle man, with a nice tough streak in him. It was in later years that we added a third semester of required composition. The real solution of the problem came later still, as I’ve said—have high school training done in good time, not late: done in high school. It was while Stith was Dean of the Graduate School that he placidly arranged to have a Faculty Lounge furnished in the one-time hospital building that had become "The English Building."

The main literature course for freshmen in 1927 was a genre course in English Literature, headed by John Robert Moore. It had perhaps two drawbacks, as I look back on it. The main one, which I became aware of rather uneasily right at first, was that, since freshman had about as little sense of the past then as freshmen have now, it was hard to work up any sense of chronological development, and the Department at that time offered no course that was in any sense a survey of the field. One way or another making use of small red copies of Neilson and Thorndike over in Reserve, I persuaded my young to run the "great periods" in appropriate connection with the works we were reading. Well, a tour de force doubtless, most remarkably bullheaded and devoted. "Alas, Mr. Smith," I quipped on my way to class one day to one who had been a veritable mustang, as we both remembered clearly, "no lecture this afternoon, I fear. I've lost my Neilson and Thorndike." "Never mind, Miss Campbell," said Smith, harness-broken but unbent. "Just tell me the number of the chapter and I'll romp over it for you."

Then Laurens Mills took over. He put in a moderately dull.
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quite old-fashioned anthology, done chronologically, and though anthologies with better format, better introductions, and better choices came on the market, alas, we never got to change from that choice. I began teaching in the experimental world literature course (ancestor of our present Freshman Literature course), and this course, mainly from the astonishingly resourceful activities of students to get into the sections of this course, gradually drew all the freshman literature students to itself. This phenomenon has been referred to—I forget by whom—as a strange example of cannibalism. I well remember the departmental meeting in which the fait accompli was acknowledged, Don Smalley from time to time letting fly with "De mortuo nil nisi bonum."

Among my elders in 1927 that I should mention besides Stith and John Robert were two others. Mr. Carter was an Oberlin and Yale man, integer vitae scelerisque purus, admirably bred in the classics, Chaucer and music, hard-trained, cultivated, modest, and witty. He was a man faithful to quietly lofty principle. It was a hard thing for him to be head of a department in a wicked and grasping world. He never liked to ask more for the Department than he was likely to get. All the same, he did somehow bring the Administration round to building quite a large extra wing on the Chemistry building while that building was under construction, and got us good offices and classrooms there in which we were all together. Poor man, after such a tussle and triumph, on its level equal to Mr. Bryan’s in getting the Medical School for I.U., I see myself coming up to Mr. Carter, tears trembling near the surface, asking if we should be losing then, really, our wonderful view over the campus, and he, so patient and good, telling me how our windows would look out on the “back campus”—“We shall all be Peter Pans.”

And I should mention here Alec Judson, of Yale, a Renaissance and seventeenth-century man, as eager, alert a mind and as sweet a nature, right through to the bone, as any man’s on the campus.

I remember the Department of early days with such warm
pleasure and affection! I can remember thinking: "How much nicer our Department is than most! We enjoy one another and have no nasty fights." It was true, too. We were poor, you know, and everybody taught four courses, I suppose, and in those pre-paperback days, the Library was with great difficulty brought to buying an extra copy or so for a reserve shelf for a course. In fact I have a feeling that the English Department did not make much of reserve shelves. I myself found it simpler and causing less wear and tear to furnish two or three copies of a book at my own expense. And for some years I fear the Library was closed on Sunday and on Friday and Saturday nights. All the same, the Department was a most flavorsome, varied, tolerant, and cheerful little family.

Hard days came down on us after the Self-Survey Committee some time in the Thirties made a recommendation that departments should give a general examination to senior majors and we were the department, perhaps the single department, that, quite idealistically, acted favorably on this recommendation. It is true that we could do with improving the quality of our undergraduates. But as we failed to gear our atmosphere generally or our course offerings toward enabling students to meet this considerable hazard successfully, the results were unfortunate: not only did poor students stay away in droves, but all smartly practical students did the same. I fear the quality of our majors improved scarcely at all, and the number of our majors went down every year. Thus our upper-level courses dwindled in number of students; whoever had a good upper-level course tended to hang on to it like grim death; there was no justification for new courses; and the number of our Composition students increased and increased. I can remember two nice things: Alec Judson asked to have Rudolf Gottfried teach Alec's Spenser course for a year or a semester. And John Robert, going on leave for a semester, asked that I take his eighteenth-century course—a kindness on his part and a pleasure on mine that I am not likely to forget.

The Depression did not ease off for us at the University, though the University was as pleasant a place as ever and went
forward under Mr. Wells. In the Department, however, with Mr. Carter's health gradually breaking under so many strains (as I have suggested, he was a very sensitive man and a man of pure principles); and with good people leaving who were able to scrounge up jobs elsewhere—alas, misery, fatigue, the pain of hope long deferred, jangling, meanness, and hard feeling came among us, and in these doldrums we stayed a long time. It was less hard on me personally than on persons with family responsibilities, and also I had the respite of being away in the war, but it was perhaps harder on me professionally than on the men. So in these difficulties we lingered till better times came and we entered on what I might term Modern Times. This year was a long time off from 1927; still, even so, at the far, wee end of that allee, there's a sort of brightness—the laughter and the good will and the small, long-ago Department disporting itself on the Carter's lawn.
My first decade here, which began in September 1929, in many ways constitutes a coherent unit. For it not only took on the somber tone of the Depression, but important administrative changes marked its close. Thus in 1937 William Lowe Bryan retired and Herman B Wells succeeded him as President, beginning the transformation of Indiana University into the institution we now know. Not long after that, in 1941, Henry Holland Carter was to retire as Chairman of the Department. In 1940 Herman T. Briscoe became the first Dean of the Faculties and in 1942 Fernandus Payne succeeded Selatie E. Stout as Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Within the Department, the retrenchment in staff which was brought on by the Depression ended with the appointment of eight new instructors in English (and one in speech) during the two years of 1939 and 1940, that youthful group still represented by David Dickason, Horst Frenz, and Rudolf Gottfried.

As I begin this, I have some misgivings, partly about my ability to write the kind of account asked for, partly about the way any such account will be received by my colleagues. I hope I'll be forgiven if every word here is not exactly le mot juste, for I am unaccustomed to writing under pressure of time and I am likely to turn out the dreary mimeograph-prose of the far too many committee reports I have had to hand in. I hope also that I can be honest and fair. I must confess that I feel a little like a character in a Marquand novel, recollecting the quaint details of an archaic period of his life, or like a father trying to tell his
hostile son what life was like way back then. The centennial year of the Department, 1968-1969, was my fortieth year as a member of its faculty. Many of my colleagues were not yet born in the decade I am writing about or were still having their noses wiped for them. Perhaps anyone under the age of forty ought to be warned against reading this account, since the two "generations" have a predisposition to the misunderstanding and distrust of each other. One other misgiving. In my report of how things were, I may seem to be finding fault with my earlier colleagues or with the University administration. I have no such wish to speak evil of the dead, nor of the living. All of those earlier colleagues and administrators were working under conditions over which they had little or no control and within the traditions of a system which was generally regarded as right. I feel sure that most of them were doing their best and trying to be absolutely just. But enough of misgivings and warnings.

Let me first say a few words about myself. When I came here in September 1929, I had just turned twenty-three and had just finished a year of graduate study for the A.M. at Oberlin. I was one of five new instructors, the last such large group to be hired before the Depression. Since my undergraduate major had not been English, I was particularly ignorant, as I still am, of many areas of literary history. Perhaps I was also too young to be entrusted with freshman classes. However, that was a period when most English departments hired young A.M.'s as instructors, with the prospect of taking time out later to "go back" for their Ph.D.'s. Luckily for me and my temperament, Carter, our chairman, took me as I was; and when I later tried further graduate work at Chicago and found that it went against the grain, he accepted my decision and welcomed my staying on here. Luckily for me also, Carter believed, as I do, that each teacher learns his craft mostly by observation of his own teachers, by discussion with his colleagues, and, of course, by experience. There was no visiting of classes, which I would have found offensive. There were no lesson plans and no syllabuses handed down by some central omniscience. Carter gave me free rein to make mistakes, and I made plenty of them. I had the benefit of
two first-rate teachers at Oberlin, and their methods were fresh in my mind. And a special benefit came to me when Frank Davidson allowed me to sit in his class in American Literature for a full year, so that I was able to observe a fine teacher at work. But above all, I was given the freedom to learn according to the best method—Frost's trial by error. What I had going for me was a serious interest in literature, together with the fact that I had not drifted into teaching, but had deliberately chosen it as a career only after much consideration of other careers.

I did have one exceptional problem. I was the first Jew hired to teach in the Department. The academic world has changed so much that it is hard for me to recall my anxieties about going into the teaching of English. The quota system was then operating in medical schools and elsewhere, and there were, for whatever reasons, almost no Jews teaching English. I was troubled enough to seek the advice of Professor Jelliffe at Oberlin. With a candor which I appreciated, he told me that I could probably find a place in the Big Ten or in other Midwestern state and municipal universities, but that the East and, of course, the South and most private schools would be closed to me. And when four openings turned up—Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Syracuse, and Indiana—he advised me to take the Indiana offer. His advice was good. Not that I found no signs of anti-Jewish prejudice or discrimination here. A few of my colleagues had contracted the disease, and, for example, never invited my wife and me to their homes, although they were inviting others of my younger colleagues. That was the sort of thing a Jew in those days, rather than cause embarrassment, learned to put up with (mistakenly, I now think) as he put up with a bad smell. However, I want to stress that the official policy, as seen in president, dean, and chairman, was absolutely without prejudice and discrimination, to which I must have been morbidly sensitive. Presidents Bryan and Wells, Deans Briscoe and Payne, and our Chairman, Carter, were not only without prejudice, but were not even conscious of being without prejudice. And the same was true of most of my colleagues.

Now what of the University I came to? It was small, provincial, and generally with little distinction in either faculty or
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student body. The enrollment on the Bloomington campus was about 5,000. The faculty numbered perhaps 200 to 300. To set down a few scattered impressions. The unmarried faculty, as a rule, lived in rooming houses and ate at “eating clubs” in private homes. Drinking and sex were the capital sins, and could easily lead to dismissal. The novels of Theodore Dreiser were kept in a locked case in the Librarian’s private office at the Library. Much of the faculty still called formally on new faculty members and left cards. There appeared to be a High Society among the faculty, ruled by certain self-appointed arbiters, chiefly faculty wives who had come from “old” Bloomington families, or who had come from the East and had brought with them an assumption of social superiority. They were, however, a dying breed, to whom few of the new faculty paid any attention. There were still many formal dinners, receptions, and dances. I confess that I made a foolish investment in a cheap tuxedo woven, as I later discovered, of a greenish moss. But toward the end of that decade, the formal dinners, receptions, and dances passed out, and I got rid of the tux. The cocktail party had not yet come to Bloomington. There were few cultural opportunities of the kind now available in abundance. There were some “Convo” talks and a brief concert series presented in the old wooden Assembly Hall or in the old Gym. There were almost no public lectures and no foreign movies. The School of Music was high-schoolish, and the University Theatre put on warmed-over Broadway trivia. The faculty had to provide its own cultural opportunities. And my first decade here saw the founding of the Campus Cinema Club, the Faculty Drama Club, the Faculty Dancing Club, and at least three interdepartmental discussion groups, one of them the Left Book Club.

Two evils distressed me when I arrived here, particularly since I had come from Oberlin, where they had never existed. The first was the fraternity-sorority system, an evil not only for the University as a whole, but also for the members, for whom the ill done far outweighs any benefits. The fraternities and sororities seemed to me then, and still do, to inculcate prejudice, discrimination, anti-intellectualism, trivial ideals of suc-
cess, and a social arrogance and a condescending noblesse oblige repulsive to all who are at the receiving end. The other evil was the discrimination against Negroes, indeed, a system of apartheid. Oberlin had so little prepared me for this that it took me several years to realize what the actuality was. Negro students were not allowed in the dormitories, in the swimming pool, in the Union. They had a single isolated table in the Commons. I'm ashamed to say that I made no real protest. When my first wife came here to live in 1933, she went to a reception of the American Association of University Women, and was shocked to see a Negro girl turned away at the door. My wife immediately resigned from the organization. If there were other resignations, I didn't hear of them. This official discrimination against Negroes was to end with President Wells. And no doubt that is a shameful period in the history of the University. But I can see now that President Bryan may have had to yield to overwhelming local and state pressures. The University had just come through the 1920's, when the Ku Klux Klan was a political power, strong enough in Bloomington to organize a march of thousands of hooded and sheeted Klansmen against the campus, strong enough in Indiana to elect a governor. Who can guess what action repugnant to himself as a person Bryan had to take, or thought he had to take, in order to preserve the University during those so-recent dark years?

I must add that, aside from this dark area, and aside from a Puritanical attitude toward drinking and sex, President Bryan was in every way tolerant and humane, with a great intellectual curiosity and a readiness to defend one's intellectual viewpoints. Let me mention two personal experiences out of several. In 1936 there was a bitter general strike in Terre Haute, and for a time the city was under martial law. I had just published American Labor Struggles and was invited there to talk to Kiwanis. My talk was strongly pro-labor and was, I'd guess, delivered with a youthful dogmatism. Many years later Carter told me that violent protests had poured in on Bryan, but at the time I never heard a word about these protests and went on my way completely unaware of them. Similarly, some lectures on Dreiser
which I gave at the Indianapolis Extension brought protests, as I learned years afterwards from Mary O'vis, but at the time I never heard a word about them. I don't know how far one might have tested this freedom of viewpoint. I was, at the best, or the worst, one of those Nation and New Republic liberals who sing the song in Pins and Needles: "One step forward and two steps back, / That's the method of our attack." Perhaps if I had been more to the left politically, say a Communist, or if I had challenged the prevailing attitudes on drinking and sex, I might have had less reassuring experiences. One further anecdote. Once, when the Campus Cinema Club was about to start, I had to see President Bryan to get some University support. He happened to be ill, and he invited me to see him at his home. To my surprise, the array of books at his bedside included Dreiser and Hemingway. He had read them. He did keep up.

To turn to the Department. The democratic procedure we now expect was not then in vogue. The chairman, together with the full professors, ran the Department. And that was, I suppose, the pattern in most departments here and elsewhere. Also, probably as elsewhere, seniority and rank governed in all matters. Within that framework, Carter was absolutely fair. Whatever decision had to be made—whether the choice of course, or the hour of one's class, or the assignment of summer teaching—he went by strict seniority. One result was that the younger and newer faculty had no chance to add to their income by summer teaching. The courses taught by the senior professors were the requirements for the undergraduate majors. However, it may have been the other way around. For this was the era of the "man," and our Department, like most English departments, had its Chaucer man (Carter), its Shakespeare man (Stephenson), its Non-Dramatic Elizabethan man (Judson), its Dramatic Elizabethan man (Mills), its Seventeenth-Century man (Leible), its Eighteenth-Century man (Moore), its Romantic man (Pitman, later Noyes), its Victorian man (Hale), and its American Literature man (Tower, later Davidson). The one anomaly was Thompson, who taught Folklore before there was such a thing as a Folklore man. There were only two modern courses—in po-
etry and drama—both taught by senior professors, Thompson and Jenkins. But I'm sure that most English departments were similarly conservative; Oberlin, for example, would not permit me to do my A.M. thesis on Joyce. It is only fair to add that along about 1937 or 1938, when I suggested to Carter that I start a new full-year course in Twentieth-Century American Literature, he agreed. And because there was official concern about duplication of material, Stith Thompson, of his own choice, generously gave up his Modern Poetry so that I might include the contemporary American poets in my new course.

A word about the conditions of teaching—besides, that is, the single large office in Biology Hall, where, in the aroma of formaldehyde and dogfish, we young instructors held our conferences with students all at once in a babble of voices, or besides the pervading stink of hydrogen sulfide in the new Chemistry Hall, to which our Department moved in 1931. Surprisingly, tenure was then no problem, even though the University had no tenure rule. Once appointed to the faculty, one stayed on as long as he wished, except in cases of "moral turpitude." I recall only three dismissals in the decade under review—one for being jailed on charges of drunken driving, one for being charged with homosexual advances to students, one for running off with a coed and leaving a wife behind. The basic problems, in actuality, were teaching load and pay. The teaching load resulted from our being a service department of the University. The service was to teach two, later three, semesters of Elementary Composition to all freshmen. In addition, we had each year to read the hundreds of Junior Proficiency exams in Composition, the Placement exams for entering freshmen, and the Exemption exams. Literature was a luxury, not at all the principal concern of the Department. It was the Composition classes which, above all else, had to be taught. The teaching load throughout the Department was four courses. For the instructors, that meant three classes in Elementary Composition and one in Freshman Literature. While the Composition classes were supposed to be limited to twenty-five students, they usually ran over that, not infrequently as high as thirty or more. We
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assigned fifteen weekly themes, or the equivalent, each semester. In addition, many of us, to add to our income, taught two extra classes (one in Composition, one in Freshman Literature) at the Indianapolis Extension, so that in fact we had a six-course load, four of the classes in Composition. The simple arithmetic is that we faced the burden—and it was a burden—of reading and commenting on anywhere from 80 to 120 themes each week, aside from holding conferences with that number of students. It was a never-ending task. No matter what else we were doing, the themes were always with us. Of course, we did the job, and did it conscientiously. And of course, it is possible for one to carry a heavy burden for a long stretch of time. But it must have been a great cost to our development as teachers, scholars, writers, and persons.

As for pay, Carter kept up the level pretty well, compared to that in other departments here and in English departments elsewhere. When I joined the staff, the beginning salary for instructors in the Department was $1,800. To this, some of us added about $450 a year by teaching the two extra classes at the Indianapolis Extension. With the Depression, the term “beginning salary” turned into an irony. For the Legislature, in 1932, made mandatory a 10% salary cut, which the University put into effect by cutting the lowest salaries 8%, the middle ones 10%, and the highest 12%. Consequently, after 1932 I earned $1,656. To ease that cut, we were given the opportunity of teaching a fifth course (almost always Composition), so that our total pay might be $1,920. I contemplate with amused dismay those last decimal places and the inability of the University to dispense with figures of $6 and $20. That suggests the pressure the Budget was under. Then, as now, the most effective means of raising one’s salary was to get an outside offer. But outside offers were nonexistent. Every English department was, like ours, trying desperately to provide for its own staff and to dismiss as few as possible. There were no additions, and replacements were rare. Faculty wives (and not only wives of English faculty) were drafted to help with the Composition...
load at a pittance per class. The low pay prevailed for several years, indeed until Wells became President and began his strenuous efforts to raise salaries. No doubt a Henry Adams would find a lesson in all this. The Market is all-powerful. For it can give much more than money. It can give one a sense of confidence and worth, or it can give one what Chekhov called—the apologetic smile of a minor post. Luckily the profession has benefited in recent years from the Market. And despite administrative difficulties and outcries, that has on the whole been a good influence.

During the decade under review, teaching was the main function of the Department. Research and writing were personal luxuries to be crowded into whatever nooks and crannies of time one could gouge out of a heavy schedule. We of the instructor rank taught only Elementary Composition and Freshman Literature. Each course had a director, and the content represented what he regarded as important, although the organization of the material and the method of teaching were left entirely to the instructor. Elementary Composition took up most of our time and energy. Both Thompson and Davidson, as directors, tried to be flexible, and by means of a Placement exam divided the freshmen into three groups according to preparation and ability: superior, average, inferior. I’m sure that we were conscientious and did the best we could. But we faced an almost impossible task—to make up in two hours a week during thirty weeks for all the sins of the past, the lack of training in the most rudimentary matters, the faulty home background, the general semi-literacy of the culture, and, even worse, the shoddy and false thinking and writing the students had been exposed to. Moreover, aside from self-righteously criticizing the English Department for its failure to work a miracle, almost all the other departments gave us no help whatsoever and were in practice indifferent, as they still seem to be, to the task of teaching students to write well. In fact, many departments gave up writing completely, and instead trained students in the skills of checking true-or-false blanks and circling or underlining numbers and words.
Looking back upon my classes in Composition, I realize that, partly because of the burden of far too many students and far too many themes, I was rarely imaginative and inventive, that I rarely got to the heart of thinking and writing. Too often I was a drillmaster in grammar, syntax, spelling, and punctuation. These were the easiest to point out in a theme, and the Handbook became the Bible of the course. In part, I’m sure, the fault was mine. For whenever I did indicate a willingness to experiment, Thompson and Davidson were receptive. And I recall on occasion—not nearly often enough—attempting to get some unified basis for an entire semester’s thinking and writing by using such a book as Robinson’s *The Mind in the Making* or Russell’s *The Scientific Outlook* instead of the customary hodge-podge of miscellaneous pieces in the Reader. One of the wisest things the Department did was to throw the burden of teaching the rudiments of Composition back upon the elementary schools and high schools, to divest itself of this unrealizable and crippling task, to give up being a service department, and to turn its attention to literature and to mature writing in the best creative sense.

As for freshman Literature, it was taught for many years as a type (today’s genre) course, and it used anthologies got up by the director. Thus we dealt methodically with poetry, essay, drama, and fiction. Each of these types was in turn subdivided into several categories, such as Descriptive Lyric or Informal Essay, and the authors under study were chopped up to fit into these categories. I believed then, as I do now, that the division of literature into types or genres is arbitrary pedantry and bears little or no relation to reality. When I once complained to Carter about the types course and the limitation imposed by assigned anthologies, he replied with his usual tolerant good sense that there are many possible approaches to literature and that a competent teacher could succeed with any of them (“despite any of them” was perhaps suggested by his smile). This kind of freshman literature course was, I gather, standard at many universities, and one cannot blame a person for operating within the customs of his time. But I think that the Depart-
ment owes a great debt to Al Robbins, who, when he was, some years afterwards, Director of Freshman Literature, tactfully brought about the change to what is essentially the freshman literature course of today, offering to the freshman solid books worthy of his best effort and giving the teacher a voice in selecting those books. Yet I must add that within the fixed framework, I had a certain freedom, particularly in the novel. And instead of the usual Meredith or Hardy or Galsworthy, I experimented with *A Farewell to Arms, The 42nd Parallel, and The Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, this last a dismal flop. Moreover, in time I made the simple enough discovery that outside reading assignments, while troublesome to arrange, could supplement the assigned anthologies.

To turn finally to the scholarly and intellectual life of the Department. Whatever there was came as the result of self-encouragement. Perhaps because of the Depression, there was little real encouragement by the Administration. One exception was Dean Fernandus Payne of the Graduate School. He (and Herman Wells, then Dean of the School of Business) often inquired with genuine interest about what I was writing. On the other hand, there was no pressure to do research, and perhaps that was fundamentally a good thing. I was aware that Thompson was doing his index of folklore motifs, that Judson was working on Spenser, that Moore was publishing his many articles on Dece. And that was about it. My own attempts at writing were haphazard. I published a piece in the *American Mercury* in 1930 and a story in *Hound & Horn* in 1931, neither of which I take any pride in. Then out of an inexplicable interest, perhaps a whim that preoccupied me, I turned to *American Labor Struggles*, which came out in 1936, and which led to my reviewing books on labor for the *Nation* and the *New Republic*. All of this got me little credit in the Department and in fact was detrimental to my advancement. I cite this not as a reproach or a complaint, but rather to suggest the attitude common to that time. It was bad form to go "outside one's field." The possibility of teaching and working in more than one department simply did not arise, and such interdepartmental pro-
grams as American Studies and Victorian Studies were just being
foreshadowed by Yale’s embryo American Civilization program.

The greatest block to doing research and writing was the
lack of time and energy. But here the fault was in part personal.
Very likely I didn’t have the necessary resolution and drive. For
I can observe, with admiration, the accomplishment in publica-
tion of Thompson and Judson, and also of Herb Muller, then
working under a similar burden at Purdue. The leisure to invite
my soul I was able to find only in the summer. And the serious
writing of poetry and fiction came much later, after the Univer-
sity started its system of sabbatical leaves. As I look back, I
am made aware that each sabbatical leave gave me the real lei-
sure to pull together a book, whether of poems or of fiction.
Let me add that our informal spontaneous intellectual life of
the Department was considerable. And I recall many literary
discussion in evenings at the homes of Davidson, Pitman, and
others, besides those which the young instructors engaged in
themselves.

This account, now that I come to the close, sounds, to me
as if it may give the wrong tone to that first decade of mine
here. Perhaps some reader may think that the title should have
been Lamentations. Yet I did not intend to make complaints,
but rather to suggest what being a member of our Department
was like. All in all, those were for me very happy years. Carter,
Davidson, Thompson, Judson, Pitman, and others made every
effort to bridge the age difference between the 40’s and the
20’s. There were tennis, croquet, and pingpong at the Carter
home. There were picnics with the Davidsons and Mary Eliza-
beth Campbell. There were trips to the state parks, and to In-
dianapolis to see plays at the English Theater. There was swim-
mimg in the quarry holes. I had the good fortune to make true
friends both inside and outside the Department, some of whom
have unfortunately died. Most of my colleagues I could respect,
and many of them I could feel affection for. My students, while
as a whole not up to the quality of our students today, were
ready for the best I had to offer them. The exceptions were a
very small number in the Composition classes who had entered
the course with such a terrible accumulation of past failure as to dishearten them and make them resentful. Students out of that first decade still write to me or send me a Christmas card. It has been interesting, and a matter of pride, to see the Department and the University grow in accomplishment and quality.

Above all, I came here chiefly because I wished to be a teacher. And that wish has been fully realized. Once in a great while in those early years, when I was overwhelmed by themes, I felt discouraged and went reluctantly to meet a class. But by far most of the time in those early years, and almost without exception since then, I have met each class eagerly and have looked forward to the next class. I have talked with many persons in other professions or occupations, or teaching at other schools, who are not able to say that. In every way I feel that the Department and the University have rewarded me well. This may sound like a Pollyanna conclusion. If so, I can't help that. For that is the way I recall it (English Department Newsletter, III, 26-33).
First of all, divide our present academic population by about four. In 1939 there were approximately 7,500 students on campus, shepherded by some 400 full-time faculty. Graduate students were rare, and T.A.'s practically nonexistent. The departmental list was really quite cozy, with less than two dozen members. I recall first wending my way down a fume-laden second-floor corridor of the Chemistry Building to the modest domain of the English folk in one wing. Big Don Smalley (now at Illinois) greeted me cordially at the office door, turned me over to Agnes Elpers, then the single incumbent of the secretarial desk, who in turn passed me into the sanctum of Henry Holland Carter, chairman. Courteously he found a common ground for preliminary conversation in his interest in a liberal journalist with the unforgettable name of Benjamin Orange Flower, on whom he had written some articles and I my Ph.D. thesis. In due course I met the other members of the elder guard (as they then seemed), Stith Thompson, Laurens Mills, John Robert Moore (already well launched on his Defoe studies), Alec Judson, Dr. Hale (one always used the title in addressing him), Frank Davidson, Arthur Leible, and the three worthy ladies, Edna Johnson, Cecilia Hendricks, and Miss Compton.

The then junior generation was a more limited group: Jo Piercy, Ralph Collins, Sam Yellen, Russell Noyes, and Mary Elizabeth Campbell. Since there had been no new appointments for several years, the advent of five aspiring instructors in English in one lot in 1939—at $1,900 per annum for degree holders...
—was a portent of the rapid expansion in the immediate future. Three of these came and went: the suave and charming poet Brad Mitchell (with the first foreign car on campus, a huge collie named Wab, and a plump little wife); Ken Cameron, now at N.Y.U. by way of the Pforzheimer Library; and Bernard Stambler, now on the faculty of the Juilliard School of Music, who titillated the Department by marrying one of his blonde freshmen. Two remain, Rudolf Gottfried and I, the last leaves on that particular branch. The early 1940's brought Horst Frenz (now chairman of Comparative Literature), Clark Emery (an Ezra Poundian who was lured away by the University of Miami), Dick Hudson (late dean of Coe College), Marshall Stearns (historian of jazz, and a liberal who unsettled the calm equilibrium of the community), and several others who lingered in Hoosierland before moving elsewhere.

One thinks, also, of other aspects of the rather self-contained social life of those days. True, such notables as Sir Thomas Beecham, in Alumni Hall, berated a largely non-Hoosier faculty audience on our cultural inadequacies. The Ted Shawn Dancers presented a program on the main floor of the old gym as three hundred spectators (almost exclusively feminine) creaked precariously on temporary bleachers. And the excitement of the opening of the new Auditorium in 1941 swept the campus, with five straight nightly performances attended by ladies in long gowns and gentlemen in dinner jackets. But most social activity seemed to be on a more immediately personal level. All newcomers were welcomed by rounds of formal calls with "dropped" cards—on an early September Sunday afternoon, with our packing boxes festooning the livingroom, my wife and I received Drs. Judson and Hale performing such a hospitable function. Practically everyone in the Department entertained practically everyone else at intime dinners; and among the younger group pinochle was a favorite post-prandial sport, interspersed with arguments over the publish-or-perish articles in hot production.

Dr. Carter himself moved toward informality in the Department by sponsoring such activities as male swimming parties in
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The pool in the old gym and by regaling his frequent dinner guests with his newly achieved art on the piano. The present enthusiasm among the young Englishers for the manly arts of handball and squash may well date from those days, also, since to the best of my modest knowledge Clark Emery and I swung the first squash rackets on campus in one of the two old handball courts (minus hunks of plaster on the walls and with holes in the hardwood floor). Administrative concern with the corpore sano had indeed been suggested by queries in my preliminary interview with Dean of the Graduate School Fernandus Payne: “Do you wear a hat?” and “How is your golf game?” (As of then, no, and nil, respectively.)

In those days there was no North Jordan extension, and Fraternity Row was Third Street. There were no Fee Lane dormitories, and all campus housing was in Memorial Quad and the old dorms west of the 10th Street playing field. The old library lacked its present addition to the stacks, and only wild dreams envisaged a completely new structure. The campus was dominated by the smokestack (bearing a huge I.U.) of the Heating Plant, with piles of coal where the new wing of the Union now stands. Varsity baseball was played on the present Union Building parking lot. The Student Building was the girl’s gym; and on the floor of what was later to become the Reserve Room of the Undergraduate Library when it was housed in the Student Building [in the 1960’s] energetic young folk (M.E. Campbell, the Dickasons, the Emerys, and such outsiders as Mlle Billant of the French Department) used to play high pressure badminton on Thursday evenings. Ah, well, sic transit—and doubtless better so (English Department Newsletter, III, 10-11).
The history of the Department in the last quarter of its first century can be largely told in three documents: Russell Noyes' account of some of the events of his chairmanship (1941-51); Philip Daghlian's essay on the chairmanship of James Work (1951-61); and William Riley Parker's compilation of the Annals of the Department, about half of which is given to the years after the Second World War. Two themes run through all three documents.

The first is the plain, but not simple, fact of increase—an increase in numbers and also an enlargement of quality: not only more but also more good and promising students and faculty members; strong as well as new programs of study in the Department and cognate to its programs; not only more books, but new libraries and even a new kind of librarian, the Department's liaison librarian, to help forward the ends of criticism and scholarship in literature and language.

The second theme is the extension of the purposes of the Department and of the very idea of studies in English. In one way, with the creation of a Department of Speech and Theatre and of separate programs and then departments in folklore, linguistics, and comparative literature, the central concerns of the Department were yet more sharply defined as the teaching of first-year courses in composition and literature and the study and teaching of the history of British and American literature. In other ways, without diminishing the dominant place of these central interests, members of the Department's faculty enlarged
The importance of other well-established purposes and programs and inaugurated some new ones. Thus, in these years the study and teaching of American literature and of the formal properties (as distinct from the historical identities) of literary texts moved to a central place among the purposes of the Department. The program in creative writing was enlarged, and a program in English language established within the Department. Members of the Department’s faculty were decisively involved in the creation of programs in American studies, Victorian studies, and the study of film which brought the study of literature to the boundaries of other disciplines. Finally, a number of faculty members worked to prosecute the long-standing idea that the faculty of a university department of English is in part responsible for how their subject is taught in secondary and even in elementary schools, and for the education of the people who teach English in these schools.

The accounts of Professors Noyes and Paghlian, and the Annals of Professor Parker, will specify some of the ways in which the quality and purposes of the Department were enlarged during the past quarter century. I will return to these topics in a summary chronicle of the 1960's in which I will also elaborate yet another theme at least implicit in all these accounts, that of the continuity which lies within and beneath the changes in the Department during its first hundred years. So far as the increase in size is concerned, it is well to be succinct here. Almost all the numbers go up, and the temptation is to tumble them all out, and so to obscure their significance in the dazzle of their jumps. To cite only a few examples representing others of the same character:
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### Numbers of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolled on Bloomington campus</th>
<th>Undergraduate majors in English</th>
<th>Graduate students in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946-47 11,167</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-49 15,378</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-51 14,560</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-53 11,386</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-55 10,546</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-57 13,217</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-60 14,487</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>269 (140 PhD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-63 17,829</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>387 (214 PhD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-65 20,955</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>411 (238 PhD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67 27,098</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>385 (224 PhD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68 29,006</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>347 (168 PhD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69 30,868</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>290 (146 PhD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71 30,718</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>297 (151 PhD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Degrees Awarded in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.B.</th>
<th>A.M.</th>
<th>M.A.T.</th>
<th>Ph.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946-47 31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-49 51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-51 36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-53 17</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-55 30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-57 43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-60 48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-63 78</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-65 124</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67 141</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68 203</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69 187</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70 191</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71 170*</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72 196</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Double major
The number of teachers in the Department of course increased as well. In 1948-49, at a temporary peak of post-war enrollment, there were forty-six persons on the faculty in English, twelve of them instructors. That number dropped to thirty-four in 1949-50 and then began to rise: forty in 1955-56, fifty in 1958-59, fifty-eight in 1961-62, sixty-three in 1963-64, seventy-two in 1964-65, seventy-five in 1968-69, seventy-three in 1972-73. In the same years the number of teaching fellows and associates increased from thirty-five in 1949-50, to sixty-four in 1955-56, to ninety-two in 1961-62, to 104 in 1964-65: the number remained over 100 until 1971-72, when it dropped to ninety-six.

These numbers reflect the condition, not the character, of the development of the Department since the end of the Second World War. What matters is not the numbers, but what people in the Department and the University did with the opportunities for change offered by these increases. One final number may serve to epitomize the significance of all these numbers. Since 1945, 145 men and women have been appointed to faculty positions (the rank of instructor or above) in the Department. When that figure is considered together with the careful attention given to faculty recruiting which is one of the motifs of the accounts of Professors Noyes and Daughlian, it suggests the order of change and possibility within which Russell Noyes, James Work, and their successors as chairmen administered the unmistakable will of their colleagues to make a major national department of English in a university which after 1945 also made good its chance to become a major national institution.

Donald J. Gray
As I look back on my forty years as a member of the English Department at Indiana University, the decades stand sharply defined. The decade of the thirties was *The Time of Depression*, of the forties *The Time of War*, of the fifties *The Time of Work*, of the sixties *The Time of Turbulence*.

*The Time of Depression*

The stock market crash came during my leave of absence to obtain the doctorate [Harvard, 1932]. I left graduate school in 1932 with heavy debts only to learn to my sorrow that the distressful consequences of economic collapse had reached Indiana University ahead of me. When I arrived in Bloomington I found that my salary of $1,900 had been reduced to $1,748. To eke out a subsistence I taught two extension classes each semester in Indianapolis [1932-35, and five semesters thereafter] for which I was paid a total for the year of $580.00. These extension classes were on top of the normal load of four classes on the campus. It is not surprising that the output of publication among the younger faculty was meager during the '30's. There was little energy left after meeting the demands of a six-class teaching load, and there were no summer grants for research. Fortunately when Herman Wells took over as President of the University in 1937, the financial bind that had severely restricted professional growth began to be loosened. Modest increases in salary began to be made at about that time and in 1939 sabbatical leaves were initiated. I recall little in the way of noteworthy doings of our English faculty during the de-
pression years. Several of our veteran professors read papers at the Modern Language Association and most of us attended the annual meetings. Dr. Hale wittily MC’ed the banquet at the Indianapolis meeting. On the whole I suspect we were a fairly provincial department of English. But Holland Carter gave us fine leadership and in 1939 appointed six instructors [including one in speech], four of whom were to become distinguished scholars. Two of these four are still on our faculty.

The Time of War

In the fall semester of 1940-41 I took advantage of the opportunity for sabbatical leave. During my absence the English Department was moved from the Chemistry Building to Lindley Hall. In early February 1941, when I was settling myself in new quarters, to my own and everybody else’s surprise I was called upon to take over as acting chairman of the Department. I little suspected at the time that this assignment was to be more than a temporary one, but it lasted over for ten years. Most of that decade coincided with the period of the second World War and the period of postwar adjustment. In spite of the stresses and demands of wartime, I think it can be fairly said that the Department of English honorably fulfilled its obligations to the country and at the same time moved steadily towards a status of national distinction.

As chairman I tried to do more than carry out a routine performance of duties. Each year I concentrated on one or two major projects affecting the entire Department or the University community. Near the close of my administration I prepared for the Dean of Faculties a summary record of accomplishments. This statement tells in outline the story of my decade in office, but a few excerpts chosen from my annual reports may be of value in supplementing and giving substance to this summary.

1942-1943

I continued the visitation of the classes of the younger instructors followed by consultations and criticism of their teaching begun in 1941-42. With other members of my senior staff I have made more than forty classroom visits
during the past two years. Our work has resulted in a weed-
ing out of incompetent instructors (we let two men go last
year) and a general lifting of teaching performance. The in-
structors themselves have expressed gratefulness for specific
criticism and have showed in many instances definite im-
provement resulting from advice they have received.

A second major project this year is the exhaustive check-
ing of the Cambridge bibliographies in English and Ameri-
can literature to set up a list of books and journals not now
in the University Library to be ordered as soon as available.
To carry out this work I organized my entire staff in groups,
each group headed by a chairman. Many sections of the bib-
liographies have already been completed, and order cards
have been filled out and passed along to the librarian for
ordering. This project is a longtime one and will extend well
into next year, perhaps the year after.

A third new project is the inviting of distinguished men
of letters to be in residence at Indiana University for several
weeks during each year. My own belief is that no one thing
that I have tried to do for the University has been more
worthwhile. The visit of Robert P.T. Coffin last year was in
every way successful, and the stay this year of Robert
Frost beyond anything we could have hoped for.

1943-1944

The chief new undertakings for the current academic
year include: 1. A thorough-going study of the departmental
course offerings resulting in basic revisions in our entire cur-
riculum. The chief features of the revised plan provide for
the elimination of sophomore literature, for an entirely new
course in freshman literature, and for the modification of
the senior comprehensive examination. 2. A survey of post-
war plans embodied in a detailed ten-page report soon to be
forwarded to the Dean of the College. 3. Reorganization of
the program in English language with the establishment of a
minor in this field within the Department.

1944-1945

I have held regular weekly meetings with my Standing
Committee [a prototype of the present departmental Ad-
visory Committee to the chairman]. The particular depart-
mental problems considered and the results may be summarized as follows:
1. The problem of the younger men was thoroughly aired and finally, after many weeks of discussion and study, new arrangements apparently satisfactory to the instructors were agreed upon.
2. The recommendations of the departmental postwar committee were reviewed and action taken on about two thirds of that report.
3. Study was given to curricular problems, particularly those centering in American literature. Conclusions were reached and recommendations on new courses were submitted to the College faculty.

My own activity as chairman beyond the daily routine in the office has been directed toward finding adequate staff replacements and in seeking qualified new personnel to fill senior positions in English prose fiction and in literary criticism. I have also spent a good deal of effort in building the tutorial staff. I have continued class visitations of the instructor group for evaluation and improvement of teaching.

1945-1946
The administrative duties of this office have become increasingly heavy during the past year. The business of staffing alone has demanded a continuous and extraordinary expenditure of time and effort. Of all departments, unprecedented expansion in enrollments has affected the English Department most, inasmuch as we service all students in the University in required composition, and in addition nearly three quarters of all entering students take work in one or another of our first courses in literature. From two years ago the regular full-time staff in English has jumped from 25 to 40, the part-time staff from 11 to 26. Realizing that the strength and effectiveness of any English department depend upon the quality of its faculty personnel, I have spared no effort diligently to seek out the best available persons to add to the full-time staff. At the same time by widespread correspondence with the colleges and universities over the country, I have been successful in attracting a larger number of well-qualified graduate students to our teaching fellowships than previously we have ever had in
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this Department. Herein we have gained a double strength: in the improved level of teaching in elementary composition; in the higher quality of our intrained graduate students.

1946-1947

The administrative duties of this office continue to be heavy, but have been eased somewhat this year over the two or three years previous chiefly because total enrollments and hence staff requirements are levelling off. However, with fifty-five full-time faculty and twenty-five Teaching Fellows as an approximate normal teaching staff, there will always be a shifting of personnel and numerous replacements to be made. During the coming year I expect to release twelve to fifteen instructors employed last year to handle peak enrollments in freshman work but who do not possess qualifications for permanent places on our faculty. For the most part these persons will be replaced with properly qualified Teaching Fellows who will be part of the teaching staff while they are completing their studies for the doctorate. I have this spring engaged ten exceptionally well-qualified Teaching Fellows for 1947-48, bringing our total in this group for next year to twenty-one. During the year I have endeavored, but without success, to fill a need on our permanent staff for a man in creative writing.

1947-1948

Administrative duties of this office have eased somewhat over the last two or three years chiefly because total enrollments in English and hence staff requirements are leveling off. However, with approximately fifty full-time faculty and twenty-five Graduate Assistants and Teaching Fellows as a normal teaching staff there will always be a shifting of personnel and replacements to be made. Of the group of instructors on annual appointment employed during the post-war bulge, eight will be released at the close of the current academic year. One new instructor, Herbert J. Merrill (this year's Strauss Fellow in English and a candidate for the doctorate) will be added on annual appointment. Pursuant of the policy to increase the teaching personnel in the Grad-
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Graduate Assistant and Teaching Fellow groups, the Department is adding two full-time Teaching Fellows, bringing this group total to three, and seven new Graduate Assistants, bringing the Graduate Assistant group total for next year to twenty-one. There is no change in status in the doctoral group of instructors on annual appointment.

I am pleased to be able to report that our three years' search for a qualified creative writer to head and to build up our program in creative writing has finally met with success. Thirty-one-year-old Peter Taylor, fiction writer of distinction, will join this faculty in September as assistant professor....

I have continued the search for a man in literary criticism.... Professor Louis Martz of Yale was the first choice of the Department and was approached about an appointment. A rising salary scale at Yale and a Guggenheim Fellowship for Martz during 1948-49 have postponed our hopes of attracting him. Professor Randall Jarrell likewise is to be on a Guggenheim during 1948-49. Because the Department thinks highly of both of these men and no others of equal calibre are immediately available, it has seemed best to wait another year before recommending a permanent appointment in literary criticism.... Five visiting lecturers in English this year have been sponsored by the Department. [They were Herbert J. Muller, Louis Martz, Karl Shapiro, Theodore Roethke, and George Sheburn, each here on a brief visit.]

I have again this year sent out several hundred letters and announcements describing our graduate assistantships. Results continue to bear out the value of this advertising. We are receiving applications in increasing numbers from highly qualified young persons who have completed their master's degrees and are ready to go on to the doctorate under the teaching-study program for our graduate assistants. The quality of our graduate students is improving and our instruction in freshman composition is becoming stabilized after difficult years between 1943 and 1947.... I am trying for the first time a plan of sending out a bulletin listing and describing this year's crop of doctors....
1948-1949

Staff recruitment remains a chief responsibility of my office. I should say that the personnel of the full-time faculty has very nearly, if not entirely, returned to normalcy after a stretch of six or seven years of war and postwar instability. Under a new policy of appointing temporary full-time teachers as Teaching Fellows, without faculty rank, the number of faculty in the instructor rank will be reduced next year to ten as against twenty-six only two years ago. Nine temporary instructors are being released this year. I am pleased to report that they accepted their releases philosophically and that eight have already made adjustments either for graduate study or teaching at other universities. The group of full-time Teaching Fellows will next year be increased to eight. All persons appointed as Teaching Fellows have completed at least a year’s work beyond the master’s degree and most of them are into their doctoral dissertations. Their average qualifications are the equivalent of or better than the average of the instructors leaving this year. Seven new graduate assistants are being added, bringing this group total for next year to twenty-four.

I am pleased to report that our program in creative writing has this year made a prosperous beginning. Peter Taylor’s creative writing classes, both undergraduate and graduate, were up to capacity enrollments with students of no ordinary talents. One student, David Wagoner, took his A.M. degree in creative writing with an original volume of poetry.

1949-1950

Administrative work in connection with the chairmanship of the Department of English has taken more time this year than in any previous year during my incumbency. Several factors have contributed to this result, though handling the increased numbers of majors and graduate students and providing key staff replacements were the two circumstances chiefly responsible.

English majors and graduate students are now coming in such numbers that I have found it necessary this year to delegate the largest share of the advising of majors to other
members of the staff. This year I have personally advised all graduate students, though next year (with an anticipated enrollment approximately double our present one) I shall have to plan on assistance here also. To provide staff adjustments and replacements for Alexander Judson, Will T. Hale, John Crowe Ransom, Peter Taylor, Frank Davidson (as chairman of Composition), Daniel Sherwood, and William Jansen easily led the demands on my time. I am pleased to report what appears to be a distinguished group of replacements: James R. Sutherland (in Literary Criticism and Eighteenth-Century Literature), William Wilson (in Creative Writing), Roy Battenhouse (in the Bible and Elizabethan drama), Philip Wikelund (in Composition and Restoration Literature), and Albert Robbins (in American Literature). Lining up these new staff members required a voluminous correspondence, followed by a goodly number of interviews and committee conferences. I have worked long and hard at this staff building, which I consider to be my chief responsibility as chairman. If we have a capable faculty, ninety percent of our problems (with a minimum amount of intelligent steering) are already solved.

Finding replacements for outgoing Teaching Fellows and Graduate Assistants has also required more attention this year than usual, not because there is a larger turnover, but because the number of applicants has more than doubled. The good result is, of course, that we have had a larger number of better qualified candidates from which to choose. Next year's group are on paper the best we have ever lined up.

Some changes in courses and curriculum were worked out during the year and will go into effect in September. These include an amalgamation of our two freshman literature courses into one course (world masterpieces) for all students; a new survey of English literature for majors; a new course for the general student, Major American Writers. The requirements for the Ph.D. degree were reviewed and revised.

Stimulated by the presence on the campus of John Crowe Ransom, our creative writing program has prospered. Twenty-five graduate students were enrolled in his seminar.
in Literary Criticism. At least three young men in his class in Writing of Poetry give promise of making their mark eventually among professional writers. They are John Woods (awarded the *Atlantic Monthly* prize in poetry), Ralph Caplan, who has published in the *Kenyon Review*, and Edwin Watkins, who has been recognized at the North Carolina Writers' Arts Conference. The *Folio* has been better than ever. By the measure of results with out students, Ransom's appointment here this year has been amply justified. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to match his distinction in the two fields of poetry and criticism, in combination with his usefulness to students.

1950-1951

Providing staff replacements this year, as it usually does, headed the demands on my time as departmental chairman. I am pleased to report what appears to be distinguished replacements: Alison White (Children's Literature) for Mabel Compton, who is retiring, and Merritt Lawlis (Elizabethan Literature and Assistant Director of Composition) for Thomas Edwards, on a one-year substitute appointment. The attempt to find a top-ranking critic for next year to continue the really splendid performances of John Crowe Ransom and James R. Sutherland has ended, I fear, in failure. [The practice was continued, after a year's interruption, with the appointment of Francis Fergusson as visiting critic for the academic year 1952-53.] . . . Some changes in courses and curriculum were worked out during the year and will go into effect in September. These include new courses in Yeats and Eliot, Restoration and 18th-Century Drama, and Intellectual and Literary Backgrounds of the 17th-Century . . . .

[Professor Noyes appended to his recollections "A Record of Administration," setting out some of the events and achievements of his chairmanship. A part of this record may appropriately be inserted here, before continuing Professor Noyes' recollections of the 1950's and 1960's.]

English Department 1941-1951: A Record in Administration Adjustment in the early '40's of staff and curriculum to a wartime status.
Direction of the ASTP in English.

Adjustment in the postwar period, 1945-49. Rapid expansion of all offerings to take care of G.I. enrollments. Full- and part-time staff reached an all-time high of eighty-one, nearly double the staff in 1941.

Expansion of the program in Creative Writing and Literary Criticism upon both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Attraction to the campus of distinguished visiting lecturers and professors for periods of residence: Marguerite Young, Fall 1941-42; Robert P. Tristram Coffin, six weeks, Spring 1942; Robert Frost, four weeks, Spring 1943; Alan D. McKillop, Summer 1946; Robert Penn Warren, one week, Spring 1947; Howard Vincent, Summer 1947; John Crowe Ransom, full year, 1949-50; and James R. Sutherland, full year, 1950-51.


Establishment of the Folio as a student-managed literary magazine.

Establishment of social traditions: the annual departmental picnic which has run consecutively for ten years and informal staff teas.
Encouragement of faculty research. The Department has an outstanding record of sabbatical leaves, faculty research grants, and, partly in consequence of these awards, a distinguished record of published research.

Establishment of the Standing Committee with democratic procedure in all major departmental business.

Revision in 1951 of the Ph.D. examinations with the establishment of the 15-hour written Qualifying Examination to elevate standards.

Preparation of the English Majors Handbook.

Analysis of library requirements and the ordering of essential books in English and American literature and the procurement of special collections: the Watkins Wordsworth Collection; the Defoe Collection.

The Time of Work

Everyone knows of the Herculean labors and accomplishments of James A. Work in shaping the destinies of the Department of English in the decade of the fifties. Only superlatives are in order to describe him. In the highest degree he was brilliant, dedicated, inspired, and humane. He was determined to place our Department among the nation's best. By universal acclaim he did just that. He did it by harnessing his rich gifts to an indefatigable drive for excellence. He set lofty standards which the faculty were glad to emulate.

Jim Work took strides forward in democratic procedures among the faculty. He reorganized first the undergraduate and then the graduate degree programs. He extended the Department's public readings and guided the setting up of the journal of Victorian Studies. He did many other things to lift the Department into excellence which are a matter of record. Most of all he energetically searched the country over to find and add to our faculty potential and acknowledged scholars of distinction. The times were in his favor, for it was a decade of national prosperity and expanding college enrollments. But the important thing to keep in mind is that it was Jim Work who gave us the dedicated and inspired leadership that we needed (English Department Newsletter, III, 16-24).
By 1951 the Department, along with the University, had emerged from the complications and stresses of the postwar readjustment. Enrollment had settled into its steady upward climb. Facilities had approached a kind of equilibrium with needs. The temporary wooden English Building had had its worst leaks repaired, the concrete foundations had been air-hammered open to permit turnoff valves for the steam pipes with a resulting immediate improvement in the departmental respiratory well-being, and the termites hadn’t yet started to swarm. The Department itself fell into two nonpolitical groups, the old and the young, but relations between the two were open if somewhat sporadic. A great many different varieties of composition were being taught, the basic literature course was Freshman Literature, the undergraduate major and the graduate program were firmly historical in approach. Criticism was increasingly in the air, partly through the presence of the Visiting Critics, but perhaps more because many of the younger faculty had themselves been involved, in their own graduate studies, with some aspect or other of the New Critical Revolution. There was a general feeling, expressed with varying degrees of intensity, that the time was ripe for the Department to become more visible on the national scene. Indeed, a good start had been made in that direction in the final phase of the previous chairmanship. Finally, many of the Department were ready for some kind of inspirational leadership, even though nobody was quite sure what he wanted.
It was into this kind of setting that James A. Work came from Stanford University in the late summer of 1951. Almost immediately he began the energetic quest for excellence in his department which motivated all his actions for the rest of his life. A large, representative planning committee, elected at the beginning of the year, worked many hours that fall under his guidance, democratically bringing into being the program he had carefully planned in advance. The next step, the totally elected Advisory Committee, had the same makeup it has today, although its specifically advisory rather than legislative function was more clearly marked than it has been since. Then there was the group of working committees, similar to those today, which were originally constituted on the nomination of the planning committee. After the first year Work selected these committees himself, always keeping in touch with what they were doing. He chaired the committees on graduate study and the undergraduate major himself, and he maintained, and frequently exercised, ex officio membership in all the others. Thus the basic organizational pattern was established early: some kind of participation for each member of the Department, and yet the whole clearly and unambiguously under the active control of the chairman. A later age, much more self-conscious about the virtues of some form of participatory democracy, and unable to realize situations and attitudes as they were twenty years ago, might view such arrangements with apprehension or even distaste. But they worked at the time and had much to do with bringing the Department to a peak of distinction that has not been surmounted.

The particular achievements of the Work chairmanship may be reviewed under the headings of curriculum, public activity, and personnel.

The first major accomplishment in curriculum was the undergraduate major, modelled with amazingly few variations on the program Work had known at Stanford. This program called for a common core, a selection of elective courses in English, the opportunity to specialize in a particular field of English, and some experience of various modes of teaching. The
core consisted of one-semester introductions to Chaucer and Shakespeare on the sophomore level, and a two-semester, eight-hour English survey, 1557-1900, at the senior level, to a total of fourteen hours. The remaining eleven hours of a minimum major could be deployed in many ways, the most common being either a concentration in English literature, involving prescribed one- or two-author courses chosen from the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, or a concentration in American literature, involving the nine hours of the three-semester American survey plus a senior seminar in American literature. This latter combination, though widely elected, was less firmly based on an educational philosophy than the English concentration. There, the student brought to his senior survey considerable knowledge from his one- or two-author English courses. The American specialist came to the survey with only introductory knowledge of Chaucer and Shakespeare, neither of whom was treated in the survey. This anomaly was never resolved during the life of the program. Other concentrations were offered in writing, the English language, and folklore, but of these only the first had much success.

The second major accomplishment in curriculum was in the area of English composition, during the '50s our most extensive single activity. At one point during this period we offered seven different kinds of freshman composition: a semester of noncredit remedial work, three semesters of the regular sequence, and three semesters of an advanced sequence, all offered at all times. The bureaucratic complications of such an arrangement were as huge as might be imagined. Work urged that all members of the staff, including full professors, should teach at least one section of composition each year, and this experiment was reluctantly and not very successfully tried in 1952-53. He himself undertook to practice what he preached, although there has always been some question as to what happened to many of the themes that that particular class wrote. By this time Work was involved in so many different enterprises that he had difficulty in remembering the class, and when he did get there, remembering what they were supposed
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to be doing. Out of this noble but not very successful experiment emerged the dictum that in the future there should be minutely detailed syllabi for all varieties of composition.

At the suggestion of the administration Work had been conducting a highly successful fall conference for high school teachers of the English language arts and in the process came to learn something about the problems of the high schools and their relation to the teaching of English in college. He convened a series of meetings with the chairmen of English and their composition directors of the other state-supported institutions of higher learning in the state. After many lengthy sessions in which Work played a leading role, especially as meticulous reviser of draft versions, in 1959 a pamphlet emerged (the Joint Statement on Freshman English in College and High School Preparation; it is described in an article in College English, 22 [1960-61], 29-32), which stated clearly, with sample themes and standards of grading, the essentials of writing skill which the state-supported university departments of English expected of their incoming students. The pamphlet was highly valuable in itself and remarkable as a rare example of institutional cooperation.

At the same time he was proceeding to the logical next step in the improvement of composition—the abolition of the remedial course. The University of Illinois had just launched a four-year phased program to achieve this goal. Benefiting from that example on the one hand, and reaping the fruits of his labors with the high school teachers on the other, Work was able to convince the many concerned parties that the remedial course should be dropped, chiefly because students were coming to college better prepared in the mechanics of writing.

Revision of the graduate program, the third major step in his program of curriculum reform, almost didn’t get done before his death. His increasing involvement in activities off campus in the later ’50’s and the fact that, unlike the case with the undergraduate program, he had no particular model in mind, combined to delay serious consideration of the graduate program until 1959. The procedure then was highly characteristic of
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Work’s methods. A large and rather senior committee was convened, and each member was asked to prepare a reasonably full statement of an ideal graduate program. These statements were distributed to the full committee, and each proposal was thoroughly discussed by the entire group. The proposals covered the entire range from the totally prescriptive to the almost completely unstructured. All, however, had the common element of some kind of historical organization. In this connection it was characteristic that Work refused, almost brusquely, to allow one of the committee meetings to embroil itself in establishing a definition of literary history, on the implied ground that such matters had long since been settled. The entire process was protracted, wordy, sometimes exasperating, and often dull. Suddenly, in the fall of 1960 a deadline was announced for the two-year Graduate School catalogue, and I can remember Work sitting in his office, rapidly resolving points at issue and coming up with a program statement in time for the copy deadline. Unfortunately he was not to live to put it into full operation.

The greatest innovation in the new program was the 600 course, the heavy reading graduate lecture course, deliberately designed to break across traditional period boundaries, and assuming that the professional commitment of the student caused him to supply on his own the meditation and questioning that the lecturer’s very tight schedule precluded. At its best this kind of course became a valuable third kind of teaching, somewhere between advanced undergraduate lecturing and graduate seminar teaching. In addition, these courses were valuable means of at least partial preparation for the elaborate qualifying examination that was part of the program.

A well-intentioned attempt to make the foreign language requirement more meaningful by calling for a masterpiece knowledge of one foreign language did not survive very far into the ‘60’s. Originally conceived as a form of pressure on the prospective graduate student’s choice of undergraduate courses, it turned out instead to be one more hurdle to be jumped during graduate school, and was thus an early casualty to later attempts to reduce the time required to complete the doctorate. The new
course in the English language, intended to replace the traditional requirements of Old and Middle English, was an excellent idea, but acute and complex manpower problems prevented it from realizing its possibilities until many years and several revisions later.

The "image" (as we had not yet learned to say) of Jim Work's Department of English was first apparent to the larger community through the series of readings from literature which were established early in his career and were admirably conducted by the hardworking committee on public exercises. For years these programs, which have continued in differing forms, were a basic feature in the weekly calendar of events. In 1953 a highly successful series of departmental lectures was instituted and ran for many years. Under the general title of English (or American) men of letters of a given period, the appropriate members of the department gave lectures on authors of their choice. The series was usually opened by a well-known outside speaker. It was a source of satisfaction to the Department, and a measure of its increasing reputation outside, that regularly the local products did as well as, and usually better than, the visiting firemen.

Some of the early lectures were also delivered on the road at some of the Extension Centers, as the Regional Campuses were then called. The experience was mutually educational, and Work learned a great deal about the Centers and about the problems involved in achieving some kind of uniformity between their offerings and activities and those at Bloomington. He made several circuits of the Centers, attended by the directors of the freshman courses. These visits, together with his activities connected with the high schools, made him and the Department quite well known throughout the state.

Although the School of Letters has never been officially connected with the Department, and in those days the Writers' Conference was not connected either, Work was very much interested in both, attended many of their functions, and each summer gave a massive party in their honor. The School gave him an opportunity to observe and to get to know potential
visiting critics, who were in general studied warily, as exemplars of exotic species, which some of them certainly were. Work faithfully attended one critic’s course in Shakespeare—at least until the fabled evening when the critic’s public lecture strayed from the structure of complex words into sustained attacks on American policies at home and abroad, charges of germ warfare, and other matters not usually treated in literary lectures, the whole delivered in a blue quilted Chinese Communist suit.

The establishment of Victorian Studies has always struck me as a classic example of Jim Work’s methods of procedure. When three very junior instructors came to him with a well-reasoned plan for establishing an interdisciplinary journal for the Victorian period, he was not in the least put off by the unconventionality of their approach. He studied their proposal carefully, persuaded himself of its merit, and from then on labored mightily to bring it about. When the editors-to-be firmly insisted on letter press printing instead of some less expensive and infinitely less elegant form, Work resisted the normal human impulse to tell the young cubs that they really had their nerve to carry on in this way and instead backed them fully and ultimately successfully in their demand. (Work did express gratification, however, on hearing that a colleague had amused himself by sounding off to the editors about their presumption at a cocktail party and even briefly frightening one of them.) The success of Victorian Studies was immediate and had much to do with the fine reputation the Department enjoyed elsewhere, especially in Great Britain.

Work deliberately involved himself in the activities of the National Council of Teachers of English because, as he told me, he wanted to help upgrade the caliber of the organization, especially its College Section. In short order he came to be one of the more prominent members, functioning one year as chairman of the nominating committee and becoming quite well known in the field of English education. He was one of the influential group which hammered out the document called Basic Issues in the Teaching of English. He was invited to assume the editorship of the NCTE volume on the college teaching of En-
English, and, before his death, had done a great deal of work on the project, including the assignment of the individual essays. When the volume did appear it was appropriately dedicated to him.

He was of course well known in MLA circles because of his eighteenth-century interests. During his chairmanship he was most conspicuous among chairmen in demand by job applicants at the annual meetings. Out of contacts at these meetings grew the informal meetings of the Big Ten English chairmen. There is little doubt that by the end of his life Work and the Department he had created were both very highly regarded throughout the land.

Given the reputation the Department was achieving, it was gratifying but not very surprising that he made more distinguished senior appointments than any other chairman. More significant by far, however, was the way he built up the body of the Department. The formula was simple: find the most outstanding Ph.D.'s in the current year's crop and then hire as many of them as possible. Field of specialization meant relatively little. Infinitely more important was evidence of excellence. He readily accepted the suggestion that beginning candidates should spend most of their time during interviews at Bloomington with junior members of the Department and their spouses, with whom the new people would live much of their lives if they came. Another highly desirable feature of these occasions was the humane custom of assuring incoming candidates that there were as many job openings as there were candidates present, so that competition among themselves was not one of the hazards of the interview process. The entire procedure was carefully scripted and zestfully produced. Many candidates found these Workouts, as they came to be called, quite exhausting, but none forgot them. In addition to dining and partying and meeting potential colleagues, the candidates were displayed before administrators from vice-presidents on down, given a whirlwind and highly selective tour of Bloomington (he kept wishing there were some way of preventing them from seeing downtown Bloomington) and the campus, including a
trip to the vault of the Lilly Library, and typically winding up with a backstage tour of the University Theatre, with the dazzled candidate eventually finding himself alone on the empty stage of the University Auditorium. Few candidates we really wanted were capable of resisting such overtures.

Once here, the new colleague was made to feel that he belonged. The Works entertained frequently, most generously, and with considerable discrimination. In any given year there might be a couple of massive parties for the entire Department; one of a fondly remembered series of parties for new teaching associates, held the night before freshman registration until it became obvious that the T.A.'s were not performing their duties effectively the next day in the field house; small parties on very special occasions, such as a dinner to celebrate the successful launching of Victorian Studies; and parties for no apparent reason, although almost certainly there was one. It is little wonder that a strong sense of corporate unity flourished all through those almost ten years.

And the focus of all this was Jim Work. It took a year or so for the full mode to develop, but from then on his trademarks were unmistakable: the collection of tweed sport jackets, the bright-colored shirts long before that was the common fashion, the bow ties (they had to clip on), the short crew cut, the young Hemingway mustache, the pipes and tobacco, Baldr dozing at his feet, or Baldr lost and being searched for half the night, and once, Baldr being wrestled with by a job candidate during his interview, the twinkling eyes and the ready smile which flashed on whenever he encountered a human being, the genuine friendliness for all he met, and the strong sense of fairness that he usually displayed. One could also observe that at times he was dilatory, long-winded, exasperating. But rarely has there lived a person less given to taking offense from others. He was often kidded by all kinds of people, and yet I have never seen him take umbrage.

The crucial thing about Jim Work, and all who knew him realized it sooner or later, was that everything he did was for the betterment of the Department of English at Indiana University.
Two of his favorite phrases were "the best" and "act fast." Striving for the first usually involved practicing the second. For the decade of the '50's at Indiana University he was preeminently the right man in the right place at the right time. We shall not look upon his like again.
Russell Noyes concludes his account of his years in the Department with a paragraph on the 1960's, which he calls "The Time of Turbulence."

The decade of the sixties is not yet finished, but even at this point turbulence seems the right word to describe it. The undeclared war in Vietnam, an unsettled economy, pollution of our natural resources, riots in the cities, and worldwide unrest—these and a multitude of other disturbing conditions have established the temper of the times. Within the halls of academia and specifically within the Department of English at Indiana University reverberations of this turbulence have been felt. It has taken the steady hands of three chairmen during a period of seven years to keep us on course and moving forward. Enrollments have continued to expand at the same time that demands for qualified faculty have increased. Financial support to meet competition from other colleges for superior faculty has not been adequate. As a consequence (and sometimes because greater opportunities for fulfilling individual potentials were offered), we have lost several of our best people. Also we have had poor luck in attracting some distinguished scholars we sorely need to hold our position of eminence. On the side of accomplishment the English Department under Bill Parker's leadership can be proud of the continuing production of scholarly publication, the rapport among us resulting from the issuance of the English Department Newsletter, the improvement of the Department's salary structure, a more effective
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administrative structure, the two-class teaching load, etc., etc. As an older member of this faculty I sense the excitement of the younger members to meet new challenges and opportunities. For myself I can say I have never been happier or prouder to be one among this faculty (English Department Newsletter, III, 16-24).

Professor Noyes is right about the turbulence. I think that he is also correct in his judgment that through the 1960's the Department, in his metaphor, remained on course. There is a continuity which can be traced from the most important circumstances, content, and purposes of study and teaching in the Department in the 1960's back to those of the entire period after the Second World War and then back yet further to those important throughout the Department's history. Some of the points of that continuity will be the topics of the concluding paragraphs of this account of the final decade of the Department's first century. But first it is right to authenticate the immediate sense of those who went the whole course that some of the changes in the 1960's were so marked, or so frequent, that they did profoundly alter the feel and pace of how literature and language were studied, taught, and learned in the Department.

Consider, to begin with, some changes in the most evident circumstances of teaching and learning. From the beginning of the century faculty members had normally taught four courses each semester, about half of them likely to be first-year courses in literature or composition. In 1959 this schedule was reduced to three, and in 1968, to two courses each semester. The latter reduction was accompanied by an attempt systematically to accommodate the increasing number of enrollments in the Department by designating certain courses—principally the first-year courses in literature, second-year courses in literary genre, and the historical survey courses in British and American literature—as lecture courses enrolling 150 to 300 students. Elementary composition continued to be taught in courses enrolling only twenty-five students. But the number of semester-courses in composition required by the College of Arts and Sciences was
reduced from three to two in 1963, and then to one in 1967. By the latter date, members of the faculty had long since abandoned the experiment of the early 1950’s, when for a year or so every faculty member taught a section of elementary composition, and by the mid-1960’s courses in elementary composition were taught exclusively by graduate students serving as Teaching Associates. The number of enrollments in advanced undergraduate courses in English increased markedly—from about 240 in 1950-51, to about 540 in 1960-61, to over 1,600 in 1967-68—and in consequence members of the faculty more and more frequently taught undergraduate discussion courses and seminars. They also with increasing frequency throughout the 1960’s taught graduate courses, including the graduate lecture courses instituted in 1961, and served on the committees supervising doctoral dissertations (the requirement of an A.M. thesis, except in creative writing, was discontinued in 1968).

These changes did not greatly alter the numbers of students each faculty member usually taught each year. The figures in the table below are the numbers of students taught each year by those faculty members who taught a full schedule in 1958-59, the year before the schedule was reduced from four courses each semester to three, in 1967-68, before it was reduced to two courses each semester, and 1970-71.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Number of Students</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1958-59* 198</td>
<td>197-199</td>
<td>106 to 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68* 192</td>
<td>179-183</td>
<td>30 to 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71 208</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>39 to 345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For one reason or another, fewer than half the members of the faculty taught a full schedule of eight or six courses a year in these years.

These students were often taught, however, in ways quite different from those of the 1920’s and 1930’s. Faculty members lectured to graduate students as well as to undergraduates more often. They taught freshmen almost exclusively in large lecture
courses and they taught courses in writing only to students enrolled in creative writing courses or to prospective teachers who were required to complete a third-year course in advanced exposition. They spent a good deal of time teaching undergraduate majors and graduate students in seminars and directing and reading doctoral dissertations. The consequences for students were simple conversions of these circumstances. Undergraduates majoring in English, graduate students, students in advanced writing courses, and a relatively few students enrolled in special programs such as honors were likely to learn in courses with small enrollments. Undergraduates who were not majoring in English were likely to learn in lecture courses with large enrollments. And the chances of a freshman being taught by a faculty member in a lecture course, and by a graduate student in a course in elementary composition, were increased from highly probable to almost certain.

Other changes were remarkable not in their kind but in their frequency. For the first time in the twentieth century, and perhaps in its history, the faculty and staff of the Department moved into new offices intended for them from the beginning when Ballantine Hall opened in 1959. If the quarters seemed to be relatively permanent, their occupants seemed to be increasingly transient. After the brief chairmanships of Stephens and Rea in 1919-1923, only three men administered the Department as chairmen in nearly four decades: Carter, Noyes, and Work. As many men administered the Department in the seven years after Work’s death: Philip Daghlian as acting chairman in 1961-62, and C.L. Barber (1962-66) and William Riley Parker (1966-68) as chairmen. (Two others were to follow, my chairmanship from 1968 to 1972, and that of Kenneth Gros Louis, commencing in 1973.) After the departure of most of the instructors appointed to meet the then exceptional enrollments of the late 1940’s, the Department’s faculty increased at about the same pace in the 1950’s and 1960’s. Forty-six men and six women joined the faculty between 1950-51 and 1959-60, and forty-two men and six women between 1960-61 and 1969-70. But twenty-one faculty members retired, died, or resigned during the 1950’s (eight of those who resigned had been appointed within the decade);
while thirty-one faculty members retired, died, or resigned in the 1960’s, twelve of whom had been appointed within the decade. Of the fifty-eight members of the faculty in the Department in 1960-61, twenty-four were no longer members of the faculty in 1970-71. Of the seventy-five members of the faculty in 1970-71, forty-two had not been faculty members ten years earlier, and twenty had joined the faculty within the previous four years.

These numbers could be maneuvered, with some strain, to force a line of continuity. To say that 40% (24 of 58) of the members of the faculty in 1960-61 were no longer in the Department ten years later is also to say that 60% (34 of 58) were still there. Further, ten of these thirty-four faculty members had joined the Department before 1950. But only ten, of a faculty which numbered seventy-five in 1970-71, remained. Professor Daghlian in his account of Work’s chairmanship remembers the first installment of this change, in the 1950’s, as an exhilarating but coherent extension of the purposes and identity of the Department. But the arrivals and departures of faculty members in the next decade seemed often to join with fundamental changes in the numbers of students taught, and the ways in which they were taught, to create a sense not of continuity but of distinct and abrupt difference, of novelty, volatility, disjunction—change so deep and rapid that its relationships to the past were not patent and its consequences for the future not easily predicted.

Students also seemed, and were, different in how they defined and manifested themselves within the Department in the 1960’s, in what they asked of university study and in how well they were prepared for it. The undergraduate English Club, founded in 1906 and still active enough in 1948 to persuade faculty members to sing, dance, and recite in a Faculty Varieties Show, had disappeared by the end of the 1950’s. Folio, which in the 1950’s had been changed to a national literary magazine publishing poetry by Cummings and William Carlos Williams—its press run in 1956 was 1,700 copies, three-quarters of which were distributed beyond the campus (Arbutus, 1956)—ended its twenty-five year existence in 1960. The old Graduate Club and its successor, an organization of graduate stu-
Students in English remembered for its staging of *The Second Shepherd’s Play* in 1953, were both gone by the mid-1950’s. When undergraduates and graduate students began again to organize themselves ten years later, social and literary purposes were superseded by political ones. In the mid-1960’s undergraduate and graduate students in English each formed organizations to ask that they participate in the means by which the policies which affected them were framed and approved in the Department. For two years, beginning in 1969, undergraduate and graduate students were voting members of certain departmental committees, and through their student associations all students in the Department also voted on proposed changes in the curriculum and similar matters. When in 1971 this means of participation was discontinued, by the vote of the faculty, students remained organized in an Association of Graduate Students in English (first established in 1968) and in a more loosely organized association of undergraduate students, whose elected executive committees served as advisory committees to the departmental chairman.

In other ways too students bore a presence in the Department and in the University in the 1960’s which seemed to be different from that characteristic of students of previous decades. For one thing, they were better prepared for university study than their predecessors had been. That at least is the logic and effect of some efforts and decisions in the Department and University in the 1950’s and 1960’s. For example, in 1953 the Department’s undergraduate honors program was enlarged, and in 1954 a three-semester sequence of elementary composition courses for superior students was instituted. If these programs were intended to attract a larger number of unusually capable students to study in the Department, the decision in 1957 to no longer to offer remedial composition followed from a premise that all students entering the University were at least adequately prepared in English for university study. So did the later decision in the Department and in the College of Arts and Sciences to reduce from three to two, and then to one, the number of elementary composition courses required of undergraduates;
and the decision approved by the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences in 1965 (and rescinded in 1972) no longer to give credit for beginning instruction in foreign languages. Beginning in 1962 admission to the University was normally granted only to students who had graduated in the upper half of their high school classes and who scored at or above the median for Indiana students on standard college aptitude tests. After 1965 an increasing number of federal and University fellowships were provided to bring exceptionally able students to graduate study. In 1966-67, for example, of 214 doctoral candidates enrolled in the Department, fifteen were studying on federal fellowships created by the National Defense Education Act, nine on University fellowships, eight on Woodrow Wilson fellowships, and one on a fellowship supported by the Ford Foundation; six other students held NDEA fellowships for study toward a Master of Arts in Teaching degree.

Later in the 1960's, this emphasis on the admission of well-prepared students was complemented, but by no means counterbalanced, by a concern by some faculty members, administrators, and students to admit and educate students who for reasons of race or poverty were deficient in their preparation for undergraduate or graduate study. It is right, I think, to connect both these concerns, to admit to university study well-prepared and inadequately prepared students, with the claims pressed in the 1960's by faculty members and students that the curricula and requirements of the University somehow accommodate the quality of the student's previous educations and the diversity of their interests. Thus, on the one hand, the plausible assumption that well-prepared students ought to know what they are doing permitted a readiness to reduce course and program requirements in the Department (a topic to which I will return) and encouraged the provision in the late 1960's of independent reading courses in the Department; the creation in 1969 of the Independent Learning Program in the College of Arts and Sciences, in which students and their faculty advisers worked out their own undergraduate programs in subjects which often cut across departmental lines; and the establishment early in the
decade of a campus-wide honors division. On the other hand, in
the summers of 1964 and 1965 faculty members in the Depart-
ment worked with their colleagues in the departments of En-
glish of predominantly black colleges and universities to devise
first-year courses in literature and writing for poorly prepared
students. Some graduate students in English helped to design
and teach courses in literature and composition in the Univer-
sity's Upward Bound program, established in 1967 to supple-
ment the educations of promising high school students from
poor families. Other graduate students and members of the fac-
tulty designed, taught, and administered courses in composition
and language taught in the minority groups program of the Un-
iversity Division, begun in 1968.

Some of the means by which the curricula of the University
explicitly accommodated diversity among its students in the
1960's could be pushed back to connect with the practices of
previous decades. To offer a chance for a university education to
able but uncertainly prepared students has been a function of
the University ever since its faculty broke from the traditions of
the classical curriculum in the last decades of the nineteenth
century. The Independent Learning Program, except that it en-
courages interdepartmental study, is not all that different in its
design from the honors program described in Mrs. Keisler's rem-
inisences of her honors study in English in the late 1930's. The
differences are of scale, and they are at once exemplary and im-
portant. For one of the most important differences between the
students of the 1960's and their predecessors, and the most im-
portant source of the difference their presence made in the De-
partment and the University, is that there were more of them;
and they were demonstrably more ready to dispute the means
and purposes of their educations. In a University grown large
and perceived as numb and heavy in its execution of its educa-
tional means and purposes, students often thought it efficacious
to move the organized weight of numbers against the weight of
custom which had not been recently examined. Thus it seems
peculiar to the 1960's that changes which in another time might
have evolved more slowly, and might have been negotiated in
tidy committees of men and women (mostly men) quite sure of themselves and one another, were debated in large committees and public meetings of students as well as faculty members, enacted in complicated bureaucracies, and sponsored at least in their beginnings by intentions which tried to reach ground assumptions of university education and to bring fundamental alternatives to what was already in place. What was different about the 1960's, then, what helped to give the decade its tone of turbulence, is that in these years large numbers of students and faculty members tried hard and continually to work out new ways to conduct, among other matters, the study of literature and language. Even when the new ways turned out to be familiar ways revived or revised to fit the moment, they came with a frequency and out of an urgency which were without precedent even in the similarly crowded years after the Second World War, when the urgency was quickly to get, rather than to change, the education the University and Department had traditionally offered.

Running through and beneath these differences were continuities with the near and more distant past of the Department which are sometimes even more important. To begin with connections with the near past, from the end of the Second World War the signs are consecutive that the Department was becoming a major center of literary study in a major university. The University Press was created in 1950; it continued the publication of the monograph series in humanities inaugurated in 1939 and began to publish (under the editorship of Samuel Yellen) a series of volumes of poetry. Libraries in Bloomington not only increased their holdings, but began to multiply. A stack addition to the main library was added in 1956; a separate undergraduate library was established in the old Student Building in 1959; and finally an entirely new building, with separate towers for the principal and the undergraduate collections, was opened in 1969. In 1962 William Cagle was appointed to the new position of English liaison librarian, whose entire responsibility it is to keep current and strengthen the collection of the University library in British and American literature. Anthony
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Shipps succeeded Cagle in 1967, when the latter became assistant director of the Lilly Library. The Lilly, a separate structure opened in 1960 and directed by David Randall, was built to house the 20,000-volume library of Josiah Lilly and the University’s collection of other rare books and manuscripts, a collection which now numbers 240,000 volumes and has made the Lilly one of the principal research libraries in the world.

Another of the signs and sources of the flourishing life and distinction of literary study in Bloomington in the decades after the Second World War was the presence of nationally and internationally known critics and scholars of literature and language who came to teach in the Department or in the School of Letters, the Writers’ Conference, and conferences organized by the programs in linguistics, Victorian Studies, and others. When Joseph Friend, who had been a graduate student in the Department in the early 1930’s, returned in 1952 to complete his study, he found it “hard to recognize the old University... Clearly I.U. has become a great University: famous visiting professors (Francis Ferguson was there that year), a distinguished summer program (with such foreign firemen as Cleanth Brooks, Alfred Kazin, and R.P. Blackmur on hand), a brilliant assemblage of linguists from all over to argue phonetics and such (Roman Jakobson, Charles Hockett, Louis Hjilmselev, et al.)” (English Department Newsletter, III, 14-15). Ferguson was teaching in the Department of English in 1952-53 as its visiting critic, a practice begun in the 1940’s when Robert Frost, Robert P. Tristam Coffin, and then Robert Penn Warren had each spent part of a year or semester teaching in Bloomington. John Crowe Ransom, in 1949-50, was the first visiting critic to spend a year in the Department. Subsequently, except for 1951-52, a visiting critic was a member of the Department’s faculty each year until 1959: Ransom was followed by James Sutherland, Ferguson, Herbert Muller, Leon Edel, Ronald Crane, David Daiches, Richard Chase, and Elder Olson. In the 1960’s, a version of this practice was revived when distinguished critics and writers were invited to teach for a week in graduate seminars. Among others, Ian Watt, Barbara Hardy, Walter Ong, and Roy Harvey Pearce.

Brooks, Kazin, and Blackmur were in Bloomington in the summer of 1952 as members of the faculty of the School of Letters, which had moved from Kenyon College to Indiana University in 1951. The members of the faculty in the School's first summer in Bloomington were Eric Bentley, Francis Fergusson, Arthur Mizener, Philip Rahv, Delmore Schwartz, Allen Tate, Austin Warren, and Philip Rice. To list the names of all those critics and writers of similar distinction—all are named in the *Annals*—would reduce this paragraph to a roster: the character of study in the School of Letters in the 1950's and 1960's need only be suggested by remarking that 'in the 1950's and 1960's its faculty included Kenneth Burke, Leslie Fiedler (whose short story, "Pull Down Vanity!" tells a great deal about a Bloomington summer in Letters), Irving Howe, William Empson, Northrop Frye, Richard Ellmann, George Steiner, Karl Shapiro, Randall Jarrell, Robert Lowell, and John Berryman.

The Writers' Conference, founded in 1940, also brought Ransom, Tate, Jarrell, and Shapiro to the campus to teach and lecture in the summer, along with many other writers—including Lillian Hellman, John Horne Burns, Stephen Spender, Glenway Wescott, Richard Eberhart, Richard Wilbur, Nelson Algren, J.F. Powers, Kurt Vonnegut, Jr., and Gwendolyn Brooks. Jakobson, Hockett, and the other linguists to whom Professor Friend refers were in Bloomington in the summer of 1952 to participate in a conference of linguists and anthropologists organized by Thomas Sebeok, who had joined the Department as an instructor in 1946 and moved to the Department of Linguistics in 1959. Claude Levi-Strauss, Archibald Hill, Charles Osgood, and Henry Lee Smith also read papers at or participated in the 1952 conference. This conference was followed by one on style in 1958 in which I.A. Richards, W.K. Wimsatt, Monroe Beardsley, Rene Wellek, Roger Brown, Dell Hymes, Seymour Chatman, and Jakobson participated; and by another on paralinguistics and kinesics in 1962 at which Weston La Barre and Margaret
Mead read papers. *Victorian Studies*, a quarterly journal in interdisciplinary studies, founded in 1957 by Philip Appleman, William Madden, and Michael Woolf, all of the Department's faculty, sponsored symposia in 1962 (on the idea of interdisciplinary study) and in 1967 (on the city) which were attended by eminent British and American historians of literature, politics, painting, religion, and other topics. From 1964 to 1972 some members of the Department's faculty conducted a series of conferences on eighteenth-century British letters which has resulted in the publication of three volumes of papers by distinguished literary scholars on biography, the familiar letter, and satire in eighteenth-century England.

During the 1950's and 1960's members of the Department's faculty were themselves steadily doing and being recognized for distinguished study in their profession. When the rank of Distinguished Service Professor was instituted in the University in 1953, Stith Thompson was among the first named to the rank. John Robert Moore, William Riley Parker, and Herbert Muller were similarly honored by the end of the 1950's, and in the next decade five other members of the Department's faculty were named to distinguished professorships: University Professors Samuel Yellen, John Ashton, and Horst Frenz; James A. Work Professor William Wilson; and Rudy Professor Edwin Cady. Some members of the Department's faculty assumed principal administrative offices in the University. John Ashton, who came to the University as dean of the College of Arts and Sciences in 1946, later served as a vice-president of the University (1952-64) and dean of Graduate School (1958-64). Stith Thompson was dean of Graduate School from 1947 to 1950. Ralph Collins was vice-president and dean of faculties from 1959 to 1963 when he was succeeded by Ray Heffner (1964-66). Members of the Department's faculty also took on important tasks within their profession, such as James Work's participation in the conference in 1958 which produced the Modern Language Association's statement on *Basic Issues in the Teaching of English* (PMLA, 74 [1959], Directory, 1-12). William Riley Parker's service in the late 1950's and early 1960's
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as Chief of the Language Development Section of the U.S. Office of Education, and the service in Bloomington of many members of the Department's faculty in the English Curriculum Study Center (to be discussed later) and the center, established in Bloomington in 1965, which is preparing an edition of the writing of William Dean Howells. In 1966, Professor Parker counted eleven members of the faculty who had held Guggenheim fellowships. At least half again as many had held or were in the next five years to hold Fulbright fellowships or awards from the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Endowment for Humanities, the American Philosophical Society, the National Science Foundation, and other agencies. In 1957 a ranking of the faculty and effectiveness of graduate programs in English published by the American Council on Education placed the Department at Indiana thirteenth in the nation. In 1964 the Department was ranked tenth; in 1969, twelfth, although most (about 80%) of the 400 members of college and university departments of English whose opinions are the basis of these rankings, and who knew enough about the Department to offer an opinion (a third did not), thought the quality of graduate education in English at Indiana had improved or not changed in the past five years.

These names, titles, awards, and rankings are genuine but literally superficial measures of what students and faculty members were doing in the past two decades to earn these distinctions. The point is that the distinctions, and their causes, were continuous from the late 1940's, and that a part of teaching and studying in the Department in these two decades was a sense that this once-provincial place was now one of the capitals from which, as well as through which, important currents of literary study flowed. I will conclude this account of the 1960's in the Department of English by suggesting one final point, which in its demonstration may also suggest something of how and why study and teaching in the Department in these years seemed to be so large and quick with life and moment. If the scale, quality, and tone of the work of the Department in the 1960's were continuous with those of the preceding decade, some of the
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most important purposes in both these decades have also been important, at least at one time or another, since almost the beginning of the Department’s history. Specifically, I will consider the continuities apparent in the prosecution of three of the Department’s purposes: the general education of undergraduates, the education of teachers, and the teaching of literary history.

It has always been true, and it still is, that almost all undergraduates study at some time in the Department of English. Almost all enroll in elementary composition courses (about ten percent of entering students are now exempted from this requirement); many (between 5,000 and 10,000 enrollments each year throughout the 1960’s) enroll in first-year courses in literature; and many (over 5,000 enrollments each year in the mid-1960’s) enroll in the Department’s other courses in literature, writing, and language. It is not to discount the invention of literally thousands of teachers who in the past century have taught Indiana freshmen how to write to say that about all that has changed during that time in the elementary composition program is the number of courses offered and required, and the fact that after the 1950’s the course has been taught almost entirely by Associate Instructors rather than faculty members. The abolition of the remedial course in composition in 1957 was followed in the next decade by the dismantling of the complex of superior and normal courses, until the seven elementary composition courses once offered (one semester of remedial composition, three semesters each of composition for superior and for average students) was reduced in 1967 to a single course. During the 1960’s there was also a shift from courses organized around what has been called a conservative rhetoric (the distinction is Hans Guth’s: writing conceived as the practice of established forms of discourse: exposition, argument, paragraphs of cause and effect, etc.) to courses based on a liberal rhetoric (writing as manifestation of the self, a process of discovery). Recently too, beginning in 1969, and reviving and extending an experiment tried by Frank Aydelotte in 1909, freshmen have been enabled and encouraged to fulfill the two hours
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of composition now required by enrolling in courses not only in literature but also in religion, comparative literature, and history in which they are required to write frequently about the matter they are studying. But the primary act of teaching composition is still to help students write a theme. By whatever tactic this end is tried, this kind of close and direct teaching has remained into its second century one of the principal ways in which the Department exercises its part in the education of all the students who enter the University.

The most significant change in the first-year courses in literature offered throughout the Department's history to all undergraduates came in 1950 when the world literature course described by Professors Daghlian and Frenz (College English, 12 [1950], 150-53) became the only first-year literature course offered by the Department. In this course, to quote Professors Daghlian and Frenz, "The main emphasis was on the text being read, and the general aim was to introduce the students to some of the better literary productions of our tradition by means of a close, careful, and leisurely reading of them. Biographical and historical considerations were deliberately left in the background" (151). In 1945 and 1946 this attention to the close reading of a literary text and to its formal characteristics was also being practiced in first-year courses organized around genre (introduction to drama, fiction, poetry, the essay). In 1950 these courses were converted to second-year courses which have since become some of the most heavily enrolled of the undergraduate courses offered by the Department. In 1950 second-year courses in Shakespeare and in major American writers were added; and in 1952, a second-year course in masterpieces of English literature. These latter two courses were dropped during the 1960's, but later a second-year course in American literature and culture was added, and in the most recent (1971) revision of the undergraduate curriculum a second-year course in topics in British literature and culture joined it.

All these courses have been designed so that they can appropriately be enrolled in by students who will perhaps study in no other course in literature during their undergraduate educations.
They differ from the first-year courses in British literature taught all through the 1920's and 1930's in their emphasis on the formal properties of literature or on its relationships with its culture. But even the old first-year course in British literature had attended, not always comfortably (see Professor Yellen's recollections), to literary types as well as to literary chronology. Another, admittedly long, step back into the history of the Department, and one encounters Sampson at the end of the nineteenth century with his impatience with the thematic, ethical, and historical teaching of literature and his insistence that freshmen be taught "how to apprehend literature"; and then Griggs, with his grand four-year program in Eastern as well as Western literatures and cultures. It is not just that the same distinctions and emphases recur—literary analysis or literary history, the text studied in itself or in its relationships with something else. It is also that the task remains the same. In every year for which data exist, more students have enrolled in the kinds of courses in literature described in the preceding paragraph than have enrolled in other undergraduate courses in English, elementary composition courses excepted. In 1950-51, for example, over a third as many (3,186 enrollments, vs. 1,843); in 1960-61, more than twice as many (5,453 vs. 2,425); in 1970-71, nearly twice as many (7,340 vs. 4,417). Ideas about the proper first knowledge of literature in a liberal education have varied, but one very large and unremitting responsibility of faculty members and teaching assistants in the Department has always been the provision of this first knowledge so that all students can learn in the Department's courses how to read literature.

The Department's responsibility for the education of teachers of English in the schools and in colleges and universities has a history as long as that of its responsibilities in the general education of undergraduates. But it is not nearly as consecutive. George Washington Hoss, the first faculty member (discounting the one-year tenure of Henry Hibben) in English in the University, had served as state superintendent of instruction and bore in his title responsibility for the "Theory and Practice of Teaching." Later, Sampson and his colleagues gave direct atten-
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tion to how writing and literature were taught in the secondary schools of the state. But then, at the turn of the century, "Teachers' Courses" in literature, writing, and language began to move out of the Department and into the School of Education and the Department of Comparative Philology. For a half a century an interest in how to teach English and English teachers was dormant in the Department, or at best fitfully expressed in, for example, the creation in 1926 of a still flourishing course in children's literature intended for prospective elementary school teachers, and in the program of the first meeting of the Indiana College English Association, convened in Bloomington in 1935 and given almost entirely to questions about how to teach first-year college and university courses in literature and composition. It was not until the chairmanship of James Work in the 1950's that an attention to the teaching of English in the schools and the education of its teachers again became as explicit in the Department as it had been during Sampson's chairmanship.

Professor Daghlian has noted Work's achievement in inaugurating in 1952 the annual and still current English Language Arts Conferences and in leading the departments of English of the four state universities to define and publish in 1959 the expectations and standards of their elementary composition programs. Work also helped to organize efforts which in 1963 placed courses in English language and advanced exposition among the state requirements for certification as a secondary school teacher of English language arts. In 1960 he joined with administrators in the departments of speech and journalism, the School of Education, and the College of Arts and Sciences to arrange the appointment of Edward B. Jenkinson as the University's first coordinator of language arts, whose task it is to establish and enlarge connections between the University's faculty and teachers in the state's schools. In 1963 Jenkinson established the English Curriculum Study Center, and he enlisted many members of the Department's faculty to write a series of essays, bibliographies, and courses of study in composition and literature which in the mid-1960's were published by the Uni-
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versity Press. Members of the Department’s faculty also helped to plan and taught in one of the first federally supported summer institutes for secondary school teachers of English, conducted in Bloomington in the summer of 1965. Other members of the Department’s faculty helped to plan and teach courses in the summer institutes of 1964 and 1965 in which teachers of English in predominantly black colleges and universities came to Bloomington to study the pedagogy as well as the matter of their subjects.

This explicit attention to the teaching of English and the education of college and university as well as secondary school teachers is also reflected in the curriculum of the Department in the 1950’s and 1960’s. A Master of Arts in Teaching degree, intended for secondary school teachers, was established in the Department in 1952. Early in the 1950’s two graduate courses in the teaching of composition in the University, intended for new teaching associates, were created. Some of the courses in language, literature, and composition first taught in the summer institutes of 1965 for secondary school teachers have been incorporated into the Department’s graduate curriculum and recommended especially to candidates for the A.M. and M.A.T. degrees. In 1965 the graduate curriculum of the Department was also revised to include courses in the history of English studies and the assumptions and practices of its pedagogy and to enable students to write doctoral dissertations on topics in pedagogy. In 1963 an undergraduate course in advanced exposition (W350) was instituted, to enable prospective secondary school teachers to meet a certification requirement some members of the Department’s faculty had helped to establish. Later in the decade some of the Department’s senior seminars were taught in eight-week instead of semester-long sessions in order to enroll students who were completing the certification requirement of practice teaching during the other half of the semester.

It is true that a commitment to the education of teachers is sometimes more apparent in the department’s programs than it is in its practices. No student has yet written a dissertation
wholly given to pedagogy, and the content of programs like the M.A.T. and of courses like that in advanced exposition is not easily distinguished from the content of other programs and courses in the Department which are not designed specifically to educate teachers. On the other hand, the graduate courses in composition, literature, and language which came out of the summer institutes for secondary school teachers have been consistently taught, and in ways which honor their origins. The courses for new teaching associates were discontinued in 1967, but their purposes have been recently revived in a new course in the teaching of English in the university, in which faculty members as well as graduate students in English and the School of Education participate as students. Other members of the Department's faculty have recently joined with colleagues in the School of Education to plan entirely new undergraduate programs for the education of secondary school teachers of English and such related subjects as journalism and speech. In sum, in the past two decades especially, the attention of some members of the Department's faculty to the teaching of their subject has been consistent enough to fashion some durable instruments: the English Language Arts Conference, the English Curriculum Study Center, courses in pedagogy in the undergraduate and graduate curricula, an important and often-used network of relationships with secondary school teachers of English and faculty members in the School of Education. In those seasons of the will when some members of its faculty turn to consider how English and its teachers are taught, they have immediately to hand the means of prosecuting this traditional purpose of the Department, a purpose which for all its intermittences has never been entirely neglected.

The purpose which has dominated in the Department throughout its history has been the teaching and study of literary history, that is, the study of the historical circumstances surrounding the literary texts of a particular chronological period or, more often, the study of the relationships between literary texts written within the same period. Paul Strohm and I have described elsewhere how the curricula and course requirements of the Department have insured and emphasized an education
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in literary history ("Literary History at Indiana," New Literary History, 3 [1972], 421-30). I will here note only two changes in the past two decades, one within and one without this dominant purpose, both of which are extensions of interests pursued throughout the Department's history. The most evident change within the Department's commitment to literary history has been its enlargement since 1945 to include an ample study of the history of American literature. In these same years other programs and interests—in creative writing, English language, and the principles and methods of the several ways in which literature can be apprehended—have grown alongside courses and programs emphasizing literary history, not so much to compete with this emphasis as to offer alternatives to it and perhaps even a perspective on it in which the assumptions and methods of the study of literary history itself can be articulated and examined.

Again, numbers will say most succinctly how the Department's program in American literature has grown. In 1944 only two undergraduate courses in American literature were listed in the catalogue, a year-long survey and a course in contemporary literature. Only a single graduate course was listed. In 1970 twelve undergraduate courses and eight graduate courses in American literature were described in the University catalogue, and in 1970-71, at least thirty-seven undergraduate courses (including senior seminars, one in the literature of American Indians) and graduate courses in American literature were taught. In 1950, by which time the number of undergraduate courses in American literature had increased to nine, undergraduates were enabled to choose to major in American literature: nineteen students graduated with this major in 1961, and twelve in 1962, the year before the option was eliminated. About a third of the doctoral dissertations completed between 1945 and 1960 were on topics in American literature (eighteen of fifty-two, not including dissertations in folklore and English language), and about forty percent of those written between 1960 and 1970 (seventy-six of 192, including two written on British and American writers).
Undergraduate and graduate courses in creative writing began to cohere into a program at about the same time as the sequence of courses in American literature began to enlarge. Throughout the twentieth century the Department offered courses in the writing of fiction, poetry, and sometimes even plays. With the appointment of Peter Taylor (1948-49) and then of William Wilson in 1950 as the first faculty members appointed primarily to teach courses in creative writing, the program began to take on a clear shape and an increasing size. The first graduate courses in the writing of poetry and fiction were initiated in 1949, and a master's degree in writing was established in that year. From 1953 to 1963 it was possible to take an undergraduate major in creative writing within the Department. Throughout the 1950's at least nine undergraduate and graduate courses in creative writing were listed each year in the catalogue, and by the end of the 1960's about twenty sections of undergraduate and graduate creative writing courses were being taught each year, enrolling over 300 students. In 1972 the program was further enlarged with the revival of a freshman course in creative writing which had been taught in 1944 and now, characteristic of the postwar history of the Department, was being revived as a lecture course enrolling 150 students who would also be taught in discussion sections.

The development of undergraduate and graduate programs in English language after 1945 followed much the same course. After the dissolution of the Department of Comparative Philology in 1942, year-long graduate courses in Old and Middle English returned to the Department of English, soon to be joined by courses in the history of the English language and the structure of modern English. From 1944 through the end of the 1960's, all doctoral candidates in English were required to complete two semesters of study in English language, sometimes (from 1944 through the 1950's) specified as courses in Old and Middle English, later (from 1961 to 1968) as a year-long course in the structure and development of the language, and then as one introductory course to the study of English language and one other course in English language. (In 1961 candidates for a
master's degree in literature in the Department were also required to complete two semesters of study in English language; in 1968 this requirement was reduced to a single semester.) In 1955 a Ph.D. in English language was established within the Department, followed by an A.M. in English Language in 1961. In the 1950's undergraduates could choose to major in English language within the Department, although it does not seem as if this choice was often taken. But the number of undergraduate courses in English language also increased during these decades, primarily to educate prospective secondary school teachers in the nature of language. A course titled "English Grammar for Teachers" and separate courses in the history and structure of the language and in American dialects were added in 1944. In 1965 a second course in English language for teachers was added in the undergraduate program, and in 1968 a new course (Introduction to the English Language) was created to replace the course in grammar with which prospective teachers had, since 1944, begun their study of the English language. Beginning in 1963, when in large part through the efforts of members of the Department's faculty five hours of study in English language were required for certification in Indiana as a secondary school teacher of language arts, enrollments in undergraduate courses in English language have been steady and relatively large (515 in 1967-68; 549 in 1971-72). The program has become one of the principal means by which the Department meets its responsibility for the education of secondary school teachers of English.

Some other courses and programs have emerged in the post-war decades in which members of the Department's faculty have studied and taught literary texts in identities and relationships which are different from those customarily emphasized in the study of the history of British and American literature. From their beginnings, some faculty members in the Department have taught courses in comparative literature, which was established as a separate program in 1949, and in folklore, established as a graduate program in the same year. Graduate programs in American Studies (established in 1963) and Victorian Studies (established in 1967) have offered seminars in which the matter
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and methods of other disciplines were brought to the study of literary texts. Some members of the Department's faculty created and began to teach courses in film, first offered in the comparative literature program in 1965. By far the most spacious alternative to the study of the history of British and American literature, however, has been offered in courses which emphasize either an attention to the formal properties of literary texts or to the various ways in which they can be studied. One way to measure the expanding importance of this alternative since 1945 is just to name some of the courses which afforded it. Since 1950 literally tens of thousands of students—probably over 100,000 by now—have studied in the first-year course in literature and in the second-year courses in literary genre. In the 1950's the Department's visiting critic each year taught undergraduate courses in the methods and problems of literary criticism. An undergraduate course in the history of criticism was introduced in 1953, in literature and society in 1959, in analytical reading ("1.202: Literary Interpretation. Close analysis of representative texts...designed to develop the art of lively, responsible reading") in 1966, and in psychology and literature in 1969. In the graduate program a long-established (since 1908, when the Graduate School itself was organized) seminar in literary criticism was joined in the 1940's and 1950's by courses taught by the visiting critic (Methods in Criticism, Modern Criticism and Its Sources). In the 1960's a graduate lecture course in the history of criticism was added, along with seminars in stylistic analysis, the relationship of the study of language to the study of literature, critical approaches to literature, and literary criticism in America.

Another way to mark the emergence of an attention to several of the ways in which literature can be studied is to trace briefly the recent history of requirements for graduate and undergraduate degrees in the Department. In 1953, when undergraduates majoring in English were no longer required to pass a written comprehensive examination, a set of course requirements was instituted which was even more emphatic in its attention to literary history than those of, say, 1932, when the
undergraduate-written comprehensive examination was established. Undergraduates majoring in British literature were required to complete a two-semester survey of British literature and to complete semester-long courses in each of three literary periods (16th- and 17th-century, Restoration and 18th-century, and 19th-century literature). Undergraduates majoring in American literature were exempt from the latter requirement, but they too were required to complete a survey of British as well as of American literature. (No course in American literature was required of undergraduate majors in British literature.) These requirements were somewhat relaxed in 1963 when all undergraduate majors were required to complete (among other courses) two semesters of a survey of British literature, one semester of a survey of American literature, one course in British literature before 1660, one in British literature from 1660 to 1900, and one other course in American literature. In 1967 these latter requirements were dropped, leaving only the requirements of the survey courses in British and American literature (along with courses in Chaucer, Shakespeare, and a senior seminar). In 1971 course requirements enforcing the study of literary history were yet further reduced, and only the two-semester survey in British literature, together with a senior seminar and the second-year course in literary interpretation, were required.

In the graduate program an emphasis on the study of literature in its history was from the beginning of the century enforced through the nature of required examinations. Until 1970 candidates for master’s degrees were required to sit for an oral examination over five, and then (in 1961) four chronological periods of British and American literature. In 1951 the old system of a preliminary and then a final oral comprehensive examination for doctoral candidates was elaborated into one which required a written preliminary examination (“two four-hour tests covering the history and development of English and American literature and language:” 1952 Catalogue, p. 75) and a written qualifying examination (six three-hour examinations, four of them on the English and American literature of different
chronological periods). When the preliminary examination was abandoned in 1960, the qualifying examination became yet more elaborate, being divided into eight examinations on British and American literature in its several periods (students chose to write five of these eight examinations), and three examinations on the work of major writers. Then in 1968 the doctoral examination was fundamentally changed. A set of two four-hour examinations was instituted, one on the literature of a literary genre. Two years later the examination for a master's degree was changed to an oral examination on the writing of three authors chosen by the candidate. In 1972 it was changed again to a written examination, which was also to serve as a revived preliminary examination for the doctoral program, and which explicitly invited an analytical as well as a historical discussion of a number of individual literary texts chosen from the entire history of British and American literature.

The intention of these changes was to emphasize that there are several ways in which to study, teach, and know literary texts. The important point about the change in the doctoral examinations, for example, is not so much that students were asked to prepare themselves in the literary history of one rather than of five historical periods. The point is rather that they were also required to study the nature of a literary form and its development through several historical periods. Similarly, the reason for the revisions of the undergraduate program in 1971 was not only to implement a desire to decrease the number of required courses. It was also to add to the required survey course in British literature the requirement of an introductory course in analytical reading and other modes of literary interpretation (L202), and to enable students to meet the requirement of a senior seminar by choosing from among courses which explicitly named some of the different ways to come to literature: studies in literary form, studies in literary history, literature and psychology, literature and language, literature and religion, literature and society, and literature and music and the fine arts. Another of the intentions, or perhaps hopes, of the revision of the undergraduate program was that by identifying
literary history as one among several styles of literary study, a perspective might be opened on this dominant style of study which would, to quote the essay on which Professor Strohm and I collaborated, "make it possible for our students and ourselves to focus more intently on the subjects and the methods of our historical studies, not only to think about literary works in their history but to think about literary history itself" (429).

For there can be no question that the study of literature in its history remains dominant among the several ways in which members of the Department's faculty study and teach literature. Simply to glance at undergraduate and graduate catalogues is to learn where the center is and that it still holds: the line moves familiarly from Old English to twentieth-century British literature, from colonial American literature to American writing since 1945. When first-year courses in literature are excluded, many more courses are taught in the Department each year in literary history—in which texts are chosen and studied because they were written at a certain time—than are taught in any other kind of study or way of studying literature. In the first semester of 1955-56, when the undergraduate program instituted in 1953 and heavy with requirements of study in literary history was fully implemented, fifty-three sections of courses beyond the first year were taught. Almost half—twenty-five—were undergraduate (eighteen) or graduate (seven) courses in literary history. Eight of the remaining courses were second-year courses in literary genres, Chaucer, Shakespeare, or masterpieces in British and American literature; two were courses in English language, eight in creative writing, and ten in a variety of topics from children's literature to the courses taught by the visiting critics. In the first semester of 1965-66, when the undergraduate and graduate programs instituted in the early 1960's were current, 109 sections of courses above the first year were taught. Again, almost half (fifty-three) were undergraduate (thirty-six) or graduate (seventeen) courses in literary history. Fourteen of the remaining courses were sections of introductory second-year courses (half of these were sections of a course in Chaucer);
twelve were in creative writing, eleven in English language, ten in teacher education (children’s literature, advanced exposition, the course for new teaching associates), and nine in such other topics as methods in literary research and the nature and history of English studies. In the first semester of 1972-73, as it happens, the numbers of sections taught of courses above the first year was again 109, and again almost exactly half—fifty-five—of these sections were in undergraduate (thirty-two) and graduate (twenty-three) courses in literary history—and this after the revisions of the graduate program in 1968 and of the undergraduate program in 1971 which reduced requirements of study in such courses. Sixteen sections of second-year courses were taught, seven of them the now required course in literary interpretation. Seven sections were of courses in English language, nine in creative writing, seven in teacher education, and fifteen in other topics, including eight senior seminars in topics other than studies in literary history.

It is certainly true that within courses in the literature of a historical period, teachers practice an eclectic address to the study of literary texts. But the texts studied in these courses are chosen because of the time at which they were written, and the presumption of such choices is that something is to be learned about a literary text by placing it among other texts written not necessarily by the same writer, or in the same form, but at the same time. The titles of many doctoral dissertations completed in the Department in the past two decades are perhaps similarly misleading in their suggestion of a single-mindedly historical address in a study which may also be marked or even commanded by the practices of formalist or other modes of literary study. Nonetheless, the titles of most dissertations testify that most doctoral candidates also define the matter of their study by placing it within chronological bounds. Further, almost all doctoral students still define themselves, if not as literary historians, then as specialists in the literature of a distinct historical period.

That is also, not surprisingly, how almost all of their teachers define themselves—as especially competent in the literature of a particular historical period. The kinds of work pub-
lished by members of the Department's faculty arrange themselves in a pattern like that made by the kinds of courses they teach—about half on topics in literary history and half in other topics or modes of study. In the bibliography of publications by members of the Department's faculty in 1969-70, for example, thirty-four members of the faculty are listed as having published books, essays, editions, poems, short stories, or textbooks (I exclude reviews). Fifteen of these faculty members published fourteen essays and two books which consider literature in its historical circumstances. Four published an essay each which is fundamentally a reading of a literary text. Three published an essay each discussing the esthetic or method of a style of literary study allied to psychology or the study of culture. Two helped to edit volumes in the edition of Howells' writing, another collaborated in the editing of material having to do with the making of one of Eisenstein's films, and two published essays (three in all) on topics in literary textual editing. Two published poems (seven) or short stories (three). One published a book, and another a textbook in intellectual history; one published three essays in folklore. Three published or reprinted textbooks, one in language, one in composition, one in literature: two edited annual bibliographies or yearbooks of literary scholarship; and two published essays on topics in university education, one of them a discussion of the teaching of grammar.

The range and mix here are instructive, making as they do a rude map of the several provinces which in the past two decades have been opened or extensively worked in the federation of studies called English. The history which made the map of English studies at Indiana University is like that of departments of English all over the country. Since the end of the Second World War, alternative, sometimes contesting modes and topics of study have emerged alongside a traditional emphasis on the study of British and American literature. It began with the skirmishes between literary historians and formalist critics in the 1940's and 1950's, between those who would study a text primarily in time and those who advocated the
benefits of looking at it as a structure which makes its meaning apart from its history. It continues (sometimes in skirmishes in which formalist critics find themselves attacked rather than attacking) in the more recent effects on literary study of formulations by linguists, anthropologists, psychologists, philosophers, sociologists, and historians of how humans make and receive verbal and symbolic structures and how these makings function in an individual life, a culture, an entire society, or historical period. But neither then nor now have our still dominant habits of thinking about literature in its historical identities been displaced by these new claims and interests. Their promise, it seems to me, is rather that these new interests will change, and be changed by, the ways in which literary history is studied in the presence of alternatives which continually challenge, add to, and borrow from our ideas of how literature is to be understood in time.

Most members of departments of English study history because we are drawn to objects which existed in and carry with them a past which we want to learn because we want to understand these objects as fully as we can. But almost all of us are in departments of English rather than in departments of history because the objects toward which we are drawn are literary texts. If the development and survival of literary texts in time is an invitation to historical study, it is also a sign of their extraordinary power. Modes of study have emerged in the past quarter century which offer to explain that power or somehow to open us to it in new ways or even to find it in objects not conventionally defined as literary (films, the texts of popular culture, the discourses of major cultural figures like Darwin and Freud). These modes of study have grown or been adapted in departments of English because the dense complexities of literary texts sustain, invite, even require several kinds of attention—because, to put it another way, what we study is larger and more complicated than any of the methods of our study. That fact, and the present conjunction within departments of English of several means of the study of literature, ought to make it difficult for us not to learn from one another how much there
is to say about the common objects of our several studies, and to learn too how to refine the methods of our studies so that, however incompletely, we more adequately honor the power that brought us to these objects in the first place.

In a sense, the beginnings of such a useful knowledge, of our predecessors as well as of our colleagues, is one of the intentions of this collection. In 1960, after the expansion of the University in the immediate postwar period and on the edge of its expansion in the 1960's, Herman Wells wrote about the uses of departmental histories and other memorials of the past such as portraits and busts of distinguished scholars and teachers.

Only 10% [of the faculty] have been with us 20 years or more, whereas 60% have had ten or less years of service, and 40% have joined our ranks since 1955 ... Our departments should seek to perpetuate comprehension of the achievements of their predecessors and to honor their distinguished colleagues ... Perhaps in the period of extraordinary stability which existed here in the first 40 years of this century such ... reminders were little needed. Most members of the faculty were alumni and remained so long in service that they had as a part of their lives a sense of institutional history, commitment, and purpose. But we can no longer afford to take this for granted (President's Report, 1959-60, pp. 17-18).

The cost of the ignorance of the past about which then President Wells wrote is that those who do not know or do not remember the past are likely to force the new apart from the established and thus to leave unattended the connections which could temper and enlarge them both. On the other hand, those who know more about the past than they do about the present are likely to make the same mistake, or, worse, bleakly to see it all happening again, to mistake revival for repetition and to imagine their history as a wheel rolling downward on a plane depressed at the near end by their own discouragements. We are not now everything that has been done in the Department of English at Indiana University. But everything that has been done was at least once a part of the study called English. To know as
much as we can about the possibilities of our study, to measure and refine our practice by the accomplishments and alternatives of the past as well of the present, that finally is not to repeat the past, nor to dismiss it with the yet more thoughtless pension of our piety. It is to use it as we can also use the present, as a means of increasing the possibilities of this moment.
Indiana University was chartered as a seminary in 1820, opened in 1824 (to ten students), became a college in 1828, and became a University in 1838. Its Preparatory Department existed from 1820 to 1890. Its first four presidents were Andrew Wylie (1829-51), Alfred Ryors (1852-53), William Mitchell Daily (1853-59), and John Hiram Lathrop (1859-60), who became Professor of English Literature and later president of the University of Missouri after his short term at Indiana.

All through his tenure as president, Dr. Wylie taught courses in rhetoric, composition, and "polite literature" (Harding, p. 8), as

Editor's note: Professor Parker compiled these Annals to 1967 and published them in the English Department Newsletter in that year (1, 151-73). He invited corrections and added some corrections and additions in a manuscript revision in which he brought the Annals to 1968. I have incorporated these revisions in the present version, silently added some others, and brought the Annals up to the end of the academic year 1971-72. I have also slightly changed the format, mostly to eliminate references under the names of faculty members to the names of students whose doctoral dissertations they directed: this information is now compressed at the end of the Appendix listing doctoral dissertations written in the Department.

The sources named in the Annals are: James Albert Woodburn, History of Indiana University, Volume I, 1820-1902, (Bloomington, 1940); Burton Dorr Myers, History of Indiana University, Volume II, 1902-1937: The Bryan Administration (Bloomington, 1952); Thomas D. Clark, Indiana University, Midwestern Pioneer, Volume I: The Early Years (Bloomington, 1970); Burton Dorr Myers, Trustees and Officers of Indiana University 1820 to 1950 (Bloomington, 1951); Samuel Bannister Harding, Indiana University 1820-1904 (Bloomington, 1904); and Theophilus A. Wylie, Indiana University, Its History from 1820, When Founded, to 1890 (Indianapolis, 1890). When no source is cited for data in the Annals, the sources are departmental records or University catalogs.—D.J.G.
well as in "moral sciences, mental philosophy, . . . logic, evidence of Christianity, and the Constitution of the United States" (Clark, I, 61). In 1838, when Indiana College was reorganized into Indiana University, "one department was dropped, that of [modern] Languages and English Literature" (Myers, Trustees, p. 128). After 1838 until 1860, students studied rhetoric and later "English Composition and Declamation" in a curriculum dominated by the study of classical languages and literatures (Harding, pp. 40-45).
1860-75, Cyrus Nutt, Fifth President

1860-61 Henry Bascom Hibben (1829-90), Professor of Logic, Rhetoric, and Belles Lettres (changed to Professor of English Language and Literature), M.A., Transylvania College, 1848. One of a faculty of nine. English composition was required of all sophomores; English literature, of seniors. Hibben joined the Union army as a chaplain in 1861 and never returned to teaching. Because of a lack of funds, the professorship in English was discontinued after his departure (Woodburn, I, 267; Wylie, p. 124; Clark, I, 102).

1860 Professorship of modern foreign languages established. Emanuel Marquis, born in Germany in 1829 and instructor in German and French at Asbury College, now DePauw, from 1856 to 1858, was the first to hold the professorship (Woodburn, I, 267-68; Wylie, pp. 124-25).

1867 Women students admitted; separate chairs of Greek and Latin established. Elisha Ballantine (1809-86), who had been Professor of Mathematics and then of Languages in the University in the 1850's, returned to occupy the professorship in Greek. Cyrus Morris Dodd (born 1826), who had been Professor of Mathematics in the University, was the first faculty member named to the professorship of Latin (Wylie, pp. 119-21, 129-31; Woodburn, I, 268, 270).

1867-73, Indiana Student founded as monthly; then semi-weekly; then daily in 1898. 1882-

1868-71, George Washington Hess (1824-1906), Professor of English Literature and the Theory and Practice of Teaching, 1868-71 (chair established 1867-80; then Professor of English and Eloquence, 1873-80. B.A., M.A., Asbury College (DePauw), 1850. Hess had previously been Professor of Mathematics at Butler University (1858-66), and Superintendent of Public Instruction in Indiana (1865-68). He left in 1871 to accept the presidency (1871-73) of the State Normal School, Emporia, Kansas, returned to Indiana in 1873, and left again to edit a school journal in Kansas (Woodburn, I, 295-96; Wylie, pp. 131-32).

1871-72 Rev. John L. Gay, Professor of English Literature. Three years study at North Carolina (1831-34); no degree; studied and practiced law in Alabama; ordained deacon and priest in Episcopal church 1843, 1845 (Woodburn, I, 450; Wylie, pp. 143-44; Clark, I, 122-23).

1872-73 George Parrott, Professor of English Literature. B.A., M.A., Ohio Wesleyan University, 1852, 1855. Traveling minister of Methodist Episcopal Church; president of Vincennes University. After his year at Indiana, retired to private business (Wylie, pp. 144-45).

1873 William Gay Ballantine (1848-1937), Professor pro tem. of English Literature. B.A., M.A., Marietta College, 1868. Ordained 1880. Son of Elisha Ballantine. Resigned to accept professorship of chemistry and natural science at Ripon College; returned as Professor of Greek (1876-78), left again to accept professorship of Hebrew and Greek Exegesis at Oberlin Theological Seminary (Wylie, pp. 148-49).

1873-75 Sarah Parke Morrison (died 1919), Tutor and later Adjunct Professor of English Literature. First woman admitted to the University, "on the same terms as were offered to young men" (Wylie, p. 146). When she was ad-
mitted, she already held a B.A. from Mount Holyoke (1857); B.A., M.A., Indiana, 1869, 1872 (Woodburn, I, 287-89; Wylie, p. 146; Clark, I, 124-26).

1873 Greek dropped as an entrance requirement; Latin retained. System of commissioned high schools, whose graduates were to be admitted directly to University study, established (Woodburn, I, 282-83).

1874 Purdue University opened, with Eli F. Brown as Professor of English Literature and Drawing, 1874-75.

1875-84, Lemuel Moss, Sixth President

1875 State contests of the Interstate-Oratorical Association.

1879 Professorship of history established. John Gray Newkirk (born 1847) was the first appointment to the professorship. Richard Heath Dabney (born 1860) succeeded him in 1886. The latter appointment "was the actual beginning of an organized, separate program of history in the university" (Clark, I, 220; Woodburn, I, 324-78; Wylie, p. 151, pp. 160-61; Clark, I, 214, 220-21).

1880 First resident graduate student: Allen B. Philpitt, B.A., M.A., Indiana University, 1880, 1887. Instructor, Latin, Greek, 1884; Associate Professor, 1885 (Wylie, p. 156).

1880-1893 Orrin Benner Clark (1850-94), Professor of English Language and Literature. First chairman of the Department of English, 1886-93. B.A., M.A., University of Chicago, 1872, 1875; M.A., Harvard, 1886. Professor of English at Antioch College, 1876-78; Professor of Greek at Indiana, 1878-80 (Woodburn, I, 326, 470 with portrait; Wylie, pp. 150-51; Clark, I, 283).

1882 First earned master's degrees (Myers, II, 636-37).

1882-83 Maria Porter Brace, lecturer pro tem, (Jan.-Feb.), then Professor of Elocution. B.A., Vassar College, 1872 (Woodburn, I, 327; Wylie, p. 154).

1883 Indiana University awards first earned Ph.D.: to Charles H. Gilbert, a zoologist: twenty-two years after Yale, seven after Harvard (Myers, II, 636-37. But see Clark: "The problem of degrees dogged the university . . . After the lapse of two or three years the Indiana graduate could apply for a Master's degree on the basis of work done independently, . . . or under the guidance of a professor . . . In the graduation exercises of 1889 Carl H. Eigenmann and Oliver P. Jenkins were given doctorates for their 'original' research in ichthyology.' Apparently they were the last recipients of the doctor of philosophy degree until [in 1904] the university instituted a genuine graduate program which led to this degree after substantial advanced study." I, 225-26).

1883 Modern Language Association founded.

1884 Shakespeare Club founded by Orrin Benner Clark as "an agency of the Department" of English.

1884-88 Preparatory Department: William Lowe Bryan (1860-1955), instructor in English (Woodburn, I, 327; Clark, I, 214).
1885 After a fire, Indiana University moves to new (and present) campus in Dunn's Woods (Clark, I, 139-41). In the 1884-85 academic year, the University has 157 students, eighteen faculty members (Myers, Officers, p. 334).

1885 Bliss Perry (1860-1954) declines offer from President Jordan to join the English faculty (Woodburn, I, 337).

1885-87 William Julian (Lowe) Bryan named Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Acting Instructor in English (1885-86), then Professor of Philosophy and Instructor in Elocution (1887). B.A., M.A., Indiana, 1884, 1886. President of Indiana University, 1902-37 (Woodburn, I, 327; Clark, I, 228).

1885 Independent Literary Society founded to rival Athenian and Philomathean Societies, organized in 1830 and 1831 (Woodburn, I, 316; Clark, I, 169). Orrin Benner Clark, Chairman, 1886-93

1886-87 System of (originally eight) “majors,” including English Literature, introduced for juniors and seniors. Departments established, including one in English, in Rhetoric and Elocution or Oratory, and in Pedagogy. English majors required to have backgrounds in Greek, Latin, and English philology; all students required to attend daily lectures in English for a year and to complete one year of English composition (three times a week throughout the sophomore year). Elocution required of all students (Woodburn, I, 375, 388; Harding, pp. 72-75, 82-84; Clark, I, 214-15).

1886-93 Department of Rhetoric and Oratory (Elocution).

1887 First master’s degree in English awarded.

1887-88 James Albert Woodburn (1865-1943), Assistant Professor of Rhetoric and Composition. B.A., M.A., Indiana, 1876, 1885. Sent by Jordan to Johns Hopkins in 1888-90 “to prepare himself for university teaching in history”; returned as Professor of American History in 1890 (Woodburn, I, 379).

1888-89 Henry Beman Miter (1852-97), Professor of Elocution and Rhetoric (Oratory). Resigned to take appointment at Washburn College (1889-90) and then at Marietta College (1891-95) (Woodburn, I, 397; Wylie, p. 371).


1889-90 Preparatory Department: Franklin F. Gunn, Acting Instructor of English, Latin, and Greek. Appointed Associate Professor of Greek in the University, 1890 (Woodburn, I, 399; Wylie, p. 372).

1889-90 Theodore Dreiser, a student, receives a grade of “Good” in a course in
"The Study of Words" taught by a faculty member he names "Arthur Peddoe Gates, Litt. D., Ph.D., an osseous, skeleton-like creature" to whom "A library ... was the same as a cathedral to a devotee" (probably Orrin Benner Clark). He also attended one or two of the at-home readings of "Walter Deming Willikus" (Edward Howard Griggs), "a youth who at the age of twenty-two had read—or so I believed—all the literary treasures of not only the English but all other languages," a "tall, frail, graceful, a willowy candle-waxy man, or boy really, with a head that hung like a great, heavy flower on a thin stem." Dreiser left to work in Chicago after his first year; "Try as I might, I could not think of myself as a suitable, let alone essential part of anything that was here going forward .... And yet, and in spite of this, I had grown mentally to love this patchwork college or university, which was as yet a mere spindling suggestion of its future" (Theodore Dreiser, Dawn [New York, 1931], pp. 410-14, 463-64).

1889-91 Jeremiah Whipple Jenks appointed Professor of Political Economy and Social Science. Left for Cornell. Jenks had been (1886-89) Professor of English and economics at Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois. He held a doctorate in economics from the University of Halle, Germany (Woodburn, I, 379, 405; Clark, I, 227).

1890-91 Indiana University has 394 students, twenty-nine faculty members, an income from all sources (including tuition and state appropriations) of $54,000 (Myers, Officers, pp. 334, 431).

1890 Preparatory Department abolished. First summer classes; a private venture which did not become an integral part of the University curriculum until 1900 (Woodburn, I, 77, 394-95).

1891-93, John Coulter, Eighth President

1891 Extension courses offered, although Extension Division not founded until 1912 (Woodburn, I, 408-09).

1891-93 William Elmer Henry (1857-1936), Instructor in English. B.A., M.A., Indiana, 1891, 1892. Left for study at the University of Chicago; later (1897-1906) state librarian (Woodburn, I, 424).

1892 Ph.D., having been conferred upon fourteen persons, discontinued until 1908 (Myers, II, 28).

1892-1941 Charles J. Sembower (1871-1947), Instructor, 1892-97; Assistant Professor, 1897-1903 (at Cornell for study 1895-97); Associate Professor, 1903-08; Professor, 1910-41 (at Ohio State 1920-21). Dean of Men, 1921-41; faculty representative to Big Ten Conference, 1913, 1919-20; chairman of standing committee on athletics, 1919-41. B.A., Indiana, 1892, Ph.D., Pennsylvania, 1910. Biographer of Charles Cotton (1911) (Myers, II, 8, 252, 398; Clark, I, 343).

1892-93 Department of General Literature: Griggs and Henry constitute its faculty.

1892-95 In 1892-93, student enrollment either 524 (Myers, Officers, p. 431) or 463 (Woodburn, I, 412), thirty-eight faculty members. In 1893-94, enrollment 572; in 1894-95, 748 (Woodburn, I, 430). In 1892-93, Indiana was third in numbers of students and faculty among midwestern state uni-
versities; in 1894-95, the University ranked eighteenth in number of students among "twenty-two leading universities of the country" (Woodburn, I, 430, 412, 425).

1893-1902, Joseph Swain, Ninth President
Martin Wright Sampson, Chairman, 1893-1906

1893-1906

O.B. Clark and G.W. Saunderson resign or are dismissed; Griggs leaves for Stanford; Henry resigns: only Sembower remains as a faculty member in English (Woodburn, I, 416, 424; Clark, I, 283).

1893

Departments of General Literature and of Rhetoric and Oratory abolished. Courses in rhetoric and public speaking listed under separate heading among courses offered by Department of English.

1893-98

Lancelot Minor Harris (1868-1941), Instructor, 1893-96; Assistant Professor, 1896-98. B.A., Washington and Lee University, 1888. Left for Charleston College, South Carolina (Woodburn, I, 443).

1893-1906

Martin Wright Sampson (1866-1930), Professor and Chairman. B.A., M.A., University of Cincinnati, 1888, 1890. Left for Cornell (Woodburn, I, 419, 435; Myers, II, 8, 398).

1893-97

Course in journalism (reporting) taught by Sampson, who in 1903 submitted (at the President's request) plan for a program in journalism. Such a program was not established until 1907 (Myers, II, 27, 52-53).

1894

Charles Davidson (1852-1919), Associate Professor. Ph.D., Yale, 1892. Left after one semester for Adelbert College (Woodburn, I, 427).

1894

Arbutus, University yearbook, begins publication.

1894-95

Indiana University has 636 students, forty-five faculty members. Library has 20,000 volumes (Woodburn, I, 425).

1894

Faculty revises grading system: only "pass" or "not passed" grades awarded (Woodburn, I, 424).

1894-1902

Horace A. Hoffman (1855-1950), teacher of Greek, named Dean of Departments of Liberal Arts (Woodburn, I, 441).

1894-9

Willis P. Chamberlain (died March 1895), Instructor. B.A., Indiana, 1895.

1894-1938

Guido Hermann Stempel (1868-1955), Instructor, 1894-98; Assistant Professor, 1898-1904; Associate Professor of Comparative Philology, 1904-22 (on leave 1911-12); Professor, 1922-38. Head of Department of Comparative Philology; 1906-38. B.A., Iowa, 1889, M.A., Wisconsin, 1894, student at Leipzig 1895-97 (Woodburn, I, 441-42).

1894-98

Charles Swain Thomas (1868-1943), Instructor. B.A., M.A.; Indiana, 1894, 1895. Left for Centre College, Danville, Kentucky. Later (1901-08) chairman of Department of English, Shortridge High School, Indianapolis; on editorial staff of Atlantic Monthly Press (1920-25), lecturer and then Professor of Education (the teaching of English) at Harvard (1920-36) (Woodburn, I, 441-42; Who Was Who, 1942-50).

1895-98

1895-1910  Edward Payson Morton (died 1914), Instructor, 1895-1900; Assistant Professor, 1900-10. B.A., Illinois College, 1890; M.A., Harvard, 1893 (Woodburn, I, 439).


1895-1940  Henry Thew Stephenson (1860-1957), Instructor, 1895-1900; Assistant Professor, 1900-1908; Associate Professor, 1908-19; Professor, 1919-40. Chairman of the Department 1919-21. B.S., Ohio State, 1885, 1890; M.A., Harvard, 1898 (Woodburn, I, 438-39).


1896  First student play presented: *At the Gates of Wisdom* (Woodburn, I, 435).


1896-1900  Elmer Ellsworth Griffith (1861-1900), Associate Professor. First faculty member to teach course in public speaking (1897-98). B.A., M.A., Indiana, 1885, 1890; M.A., Harvard, 1895 (Woodburn, I, 313).

1897  Beardsley, Prescott, and N.W. Stephenson leave.

1898  Indiana University has 1,049 students (*Arbutus*, 1903).

1898  Harris, McMillen, and Thomas leave.

1898-99  Philip Jacob Gentner, Instructor. B.A., Harvard, 1898.

1898-1903  Hamilton Byron Moore, Instructor, 1898-1900; Assistant Professor, 1900-03. Ph.B., Cornell, 1897.

1899-1906  John Mantel Clapp (1870-1953), Assistant Professor, 1899-1904; Associate Professor, 1904-06. B.A., M.A., Amherst, 1890, 1893. Left for Lake Forest College, Illinois. Taught first course in advanced public speaking (1900) (Myers, II, 8).

1900  E.E. Griffith dies.

1900  University-sponsored summer sessions begin (Woodburn, I, 396).


1901  First Graduate Club organized (*Arbutus*, 1903).

1901  First course in Oral Reading (Clapp).


1901-02  Augustus Wesley Senior, Instructor. Ph.B., Cornell, 1897.

1902-37, William Lowe Bryan, Tenth President

1902  Aydelotte and Senior leave.
1902 Indiana University has 1,285 students, sixty-one faculty, income of $129,761. One year later enrollment increased to 1,469 students (Myers, Officers, p. 433; Arbutus, 1903).

1902 First course in Oratorical Composition (Clapp).

1903 First assistants in English appointed: Emma, Rosalie Munger and Otis Bedney Sperlin.

1903 Moore leaves.

1903-07 Lewis Nathaniel Chase (born 1873), Instructor, 1903-04; Assistant Professor, 1904-07. B.A., M.A., Ph.D., Columbia, 1895, 1898, 1903. Left for University of Louisville.


1904 Graduate School organized; eighty-two students enrolled. Graduate degrees already conferred since 1881-82: 249 M.A.'s, 12 M.S.'s, and 14 Ph.D.'s (Myers, II, 28, 756).

1905-07 Ross Franklin Lockridge, Assistant, 1905-06, then Instructor in public speaking. B.A., LL.B., Indiana, 1900, 1907.


Will David Howe, Chairman, 1906-19

1906 Clapp and Sampson leave.

1906-08 Archibald McClellan Hall, Lecturer. B.A., M.A., Ph.D., Butler, 1888, 1889, 1892; B.D., Yale, 1897.


1906 Departmental "English Club" formed (Arbutus, 1906).

1906-38 Department of Comparative Philology established, with Guido H. Stempel as its chairman (Myers, II, 37).

1907 Chase, Hall, Lockridge, and Teter leave.

1907 "Journalism Course" established, a sequence of courses taught by Fred Bates Johnson, formerly of Indianapolis News (Myers, II, 53).

1907 First course in Forms of Address (Hall).

1907 First Bloomington theater, Harris Grand (now Towne Cinema).


1908 University Library moved from Maxwell Hall to new building which it occupied until 1969. Library holds 64,000 volumes (Myers, II, 608).
1908 Carl H. Eigenmann (1863-1927) named first Dean of Graduate School (Myers, II, 55).

1908-09 Graduate courses in English listed for first time: Metrics, Literary Criticism, The Anglo-Saxon Period, Middle English Literature (Aydelotte), The Elizabethan Age (Aydelotte), The Age of Milton and the Age of Dryden, The Eighteenth Century (Howe), The Romantic Period to the Death of Scott (Howe), The Victorian Period, Literary Seminary (Research Course) (Stephenson and Aydelotte), Bibliography of English Literature (Howe, Stephenson, Aydelotte, and Morton).

1908 School of Education established, with President Bryan as its acting dean. Until 1928, Education functioned in fact as a department, a status it had had (as a department of pedagogics or education) since 1892 (Myers, II, 54).

1908 First musical, The Mikado, performed (Myers, II, 56).


1908-13, Cecilia Hennel Hendricks, Teaching Fellow, 1906-08; Instructor, 1908-13, 1931-53; Assistant Professor, 1945-52; Associate Professor, 1952-53 (emeritus). Interim Professor, 1956-57. Director, Indiana Writers' Conference, 1940, B.A., M.A., Indiana, 1907, 1908.


1909-10 Indiana University has 2,564 students, income of $295,900 (Arbutus, 1911; Myers, II, 85). Forty-one B.A.'s, five M.A.'s awarded in English (Arbutus, 1910).


1910 Department of Music established (Myers, II, 235).


1910 Morton leaves.


1910-11  Ralph V. Sollitt, Assistant in public speaking, 1908-10; Instructor. B.A., Indiana, 1910.

1911-12  Indiana University has 2,431 students; fifty-five of them graduate students, four in English. Forty-six B.A.'s, seven M.A.'s awarded in English (Arbutus, 1912).

1911  Department of Journalism established. Joseph William Piercy (1866-1943) named Professor of Journalism and Director of the Department, 1911-38.


1911-12  Frank C. Senour (1871-1928), Instructor, 1911-16; Assistant Professor, 1916-23; Associate Professor, 1923-28. B.A., M.A., Indiana, 1911, 1913.


1911-12  C. Everett Conant, Acting Associate Professor of Comparative Philology. Ph.D., Chicago, 1911.

1912  Bureau of Correspondence Study established. First correspondence courses, offered in 1908, were in English literature (Myers, II, 665-66).

1912-15  Lilian Beeson Brownfield (1873-1961), Instructor. B.A., DePauw, 1895, M.A., Ohio Wesleyan, 1904, Ph.D., Indiana, 1914. First Indiana doctorate in English. Left for Lake Erie College, then to DePauw in 1922; retired in 1940.


1913  Hendricks leaves, to return in 1931.


1913-50  Will Taliaferro Hale (1880-1967), Instructor, 1913-18; Assistant Professor, 1918-24; Associate Professor, 1924-29; Professor, 1929-50 (emeritus). Interim Professor, 1956-57. B.A., M.A., Vanderbilt, 1902, M.A., Columbia, 1912, Ph.D., Yale, 1914.


1914  First Ph.D in English: Lilian Beeson Brownfield, "A Study in the Thought of Addison, Johnson, and Burke," directed by Will D. Howe. Published 1918.

1914-19  Earl M. Hudelson, Teaching Fellow, 1911-12; Critic teacher in English; listed as critic teacher or tutor in Department of English until 1918; then in School of Education. B.A., M.A., Indiana, 1911, 1912.
1915  Aydott and Brownfield leave.
1915-54  Edgar George Frazier (1868-1948), Associate Professor of public speaking. B.A., Tabor College, 1900.
1915-16  Gertrude S. Bell, Instructor in English and Education.
1915-19  George Fulmer Reynolds (1877-1964), Associate Professor. Ph.B., Lawrence, 1898, Ph.D., Chicago, 1905. Left for University of Colorado (emeritus).
1916  Extension center established in Indianapolis; first of what were to become the regional campuses (Myers, II, 670).
1916  Rice leaves.
1917  Fort Wayne Extension Center established (Myers, II, 670).
1917  Withington leaves.
1917-19  Mabel Smith Reynolds, Instructor. B.A., Western (Iowa), 1901.
1918-20  Maurice Garland Fulton, Acting Assistant Professor, then Assistant Professor. Ph.B., M.A., Mississippi, 1898, 1901.
Henry Thew Stephenson, Chairman, 1919-21

1919
Greever, Howe, Reynolds, Wilson leave.

1919-21
Edna Johnson (1876-1967), Instructor, 1919-22; Assistant Professor, 1922-41 (emeritus). B.A., M.A., Indiana, 1898, 1904.

1919-23
John Dougan Rea (1889-1933), Associate Professor, 1919-20; Professor, 1920-23. Chairman of the Department, 1921-23. B.A., M.A., Ph.D., Yale, 1903, 1905, 1918. Left for Miami University.

1919-21

1919-20

1919-21

1920
School of Commerce and Finance established (Myers, II, 221).

1920-42
Selacht Edgar Stout (born 1871), Dean, College of Arts and Sciences. Formerly Chairman of Department of Latin. Ph.D., Princeton, 1910 (Myers, II, 224).

1920
Hollowell and Woodbridge leave.

1920-58
Samuel Frank Davidson (1887-1971), Instructor, 1920-26; Assistant Professor, 1932-37; Associate Professor, 1937-49; Professor, 1949-58. Chairman, Elementary Composition, 1936-50; Director, American Literature courses, 1931-58. B.A., M.A., Indiana, 1913, 1916.

1920-43

1920-54
First appointment in English at Indianapolis Extension Center: Mary B. Orvis (1884-1964), Instructor, 1920-21; Assistant Professor, 1921-49; Associate Professor of Journalism, 1949-54. B.A., Wisconsin, 1907, M.A., Indiana, 1918.

John Dougan Rea, Chairman, 1921-23.

1921
School of Music established (Myers, II, 238-43).

1921
Snow leaves.

1921-55

1921-39

1921-22

1922-23  Faculty of Department (full-time) numbers twenty-two; part-time faculty, two; salary range $1,600-4,700. In 1923, sixty-four B.A.'s, two M.A.'s awarded in English (Arbutus, 1923).


1922-59  Laurens J. Mills (born 1889), Assistant Professor, 1922-27; Associate Professor, 1927-45; Professor, 1945-59 (emeritus). Director, Freshman Literature, 1942-50. B.A., Earlham, 1912, M.A., Ph.D., Chicago, 1919, 1925;

1922-61  John Robert Moore (1890-1973), Associate Professor, 1922-29; Professor, 1929-56; Distinguished Service Professor, 1956-61. Director, First-Year Literature, 1924-42. B.A., Missouri, 1910, M.A., Ph.D., Harvard, 1914, 1917.


1922-23  Russell Ray Steele, Instructor. B.A., M.A., Adrian, 1918, 1914.

1922  Extension courses formally organized in Gary center: courses had been taught in Gary since 1917 (Myers, II, 675).

1923  School of Education established with the status of other schools in the University (Myers, II, 263).

1923  Graduate instruction in folklore begins (Thompson).

1923  Kitzman, Rea, Ramsberg, and Steele leave.


1923-50  Alexander C. Judson (1883-1973), Professor. B.A., Pomona, 1907, M.A., Ph.D., Yale, 1908, 1911.


1924  Brightfield and Meeks leave.


1925  Crocker, Karr, and Rusk leave.

1925  Course in world literature (English 103, eventually L101-102) offered.


1925-45  Lee Norvelle (1892- ), Assistant Professor, 1925-38; Associate Professor, 1938-48; Professor, 1948-63 (emeritus). Left to become chairman of Department of Speech and Theatre in the University, 1945-58. B.A., Indiana, 1921, M.A., Iowa, 1932, Ph.D. (psychology), Indiana, 1931.

1925-33  James Hall Pitman (died 1958), Associate Professor. B.A., Rutgers, 1919, Ph.D., Yale, 1922.

1925-26  Critic teacher in English (School of Education): Emily Roxanna Orcutt. Ph.B., M.A., Chicago, 1911, 1924.

1926-27  Faculty of Department numbers twenty-six. University in 1927 has 5,742 students, 310 faculty (Myers, II, 349). In 1927, eighty-eight B.A.’s, six M.A.’s in English awarded (Arubtus, 1927).

1926  New wing to University Library completed (Myers, II, 303). In 1927, Library holds 183,500 volumes; acquisitions, 9,000 per year.

1926  Bond and Millican leave.

1926  Course in children’s literature transferred from School of Education to English.


1926-27  Harold’ Golder (died 1934), Assistant Professor. B.A., Carleton, 1920, M.A., Ph.D., Harvard, 1921, 1925.

1926-66  Josephine K. Piercy (1895- ), Instructor, 1926-40; Assistant Professor, 1940-50; Associate Professor, 1950-64; Professor, 1964-66 (emeritus). B.A., M.A., Indiana, 1918, 1919, M.A., Columbia, 1922, Ph.D., Yale, 1937.
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1926-27 Frederick S. Rockwell, Instructor, B.A., Yale, 1924.

1926-46 Chauncey E. Sanders (1898- ), Assistant Professor. On leave 1942-46 (resigned). B.A., Minnesota, 1921, Ph.D., Chicago, 1926.

1926-72 Agnes Elpers, Secretary, 1926-50; Principal Secretary, 1950-55; Administrative Secretary, 1955-72 (retired).


1927-47 Fernandus Payne (1881- ), Dean of the Graduate School.

1927-73 Mary Elizabeth Campbell (1903- ), Instructor, 1927-39; Assistant Professor, 1939-53; Associate Professor, 1953-69; Professor, 1969-73 (emeritus). B.A., M.A., Radcliffe, 1925, 1926, Ph.D., Yale, 1938.


1928-29 Faculty of Department numbers twenty-eight; salary range $1,800-5,200. University has 5,344 students. In 1929, ninety-five B.A.'s, four M.A.'s awarded in English (Arbutus, 1929).

1928 Frank Senour dies.


1928-29, 1932-72 Russell Noyes (1901- ), Instructor, 1928-29; Assistant Professor, 1932-41; Associate Professor, 1941-48; Professor, 1948-72 (emeritus). Chairman of the Department, 1941-51. B.S., Massachusetts Agricultural College, 1924, M.A., Ph.D., Harvard, 1928, 1932.


1929 Manley and Noyes leave.


1929 Undergraduate honors program established in College of Arts and Sciences.


1929-73 Samuel Yellen (1906- ), Instructor, 1929-41; Assistant Professor, 1941-47; Associate Professor, 1947-53; Professor, 1953-63; University Professor, 1963-73 (emeritus). B.A., Western Reserve, 1926, M.A., Oberlin, 1932.

1930-31 Faculty of Department numbers thirty-one; salary range $1,700-5,700. In 1931, fifty-four B.A.'s, eleven M.A.'s in English awarded (Arbutus, 1931).

1930 Bridgman and Miles leave.

1930-59 Donald A. Smalley (1907- ), Tutor, 1929-30; Instructor, 1930-41; Assistant Professor, 1941-47; Associate Professor, 1947-51; Professor, 1951-59. B.A., M.A., Indiana, 1929, 1931, Ph.D., Harvard, 1939. Left for Illinois.

1931-40 Department of English housed in newly completed Chemistry Building.

1931 Tower leaves. Cecilia Hendricks returns (see 1908).


1932 Hammond, Whiting, and East Chicago Extension center opened (later named Calumet Center); South Bend Center established (Myers, II, 675-76).


1932 Indianapolis Extension Center: Gertrude Kaiser Hebelein (1906- ), Lecturer, 1932-35; Instructor or Assistant in English, 1935-54; Assistant Professor, 1954-68; Associate Professor, 1968-.

1933 School of Commerce and Finance reorganized as School of Business Administration, later (1938) School of Business (Myers, II, 453-54).

1933 Pitman and Tyler leave.


1933-61 South Bend Extension Center: Floyd H. Deen (1890- ), Instructor, 1933-49; Assistant Professor, 1949-57; Associate Professor, 1957-61 (emeritus). B.A., DePauw, 1918, M.S.Ed., Ph.D., Indiana, 1931, 1940.

1934 Spanish (and Portuguese), French (and Italian) become separate departments.

1934 Frazier leaves.

1934-36 Vergil Augustus Smith (1900- ), Instructor in speech, 1934-41; Assistant Professor, 1941-45. To Department of Speech and Theatre, 1945-64 (emeritus). B.S., Indiana State, 1926.

1934-35 Tutors: James Walden Abel (public speaking), Charles Scott Bouslog, Samuel Ernest Brown, Walter Brown (joined faculty of Calumet Center 1936), Charles Gruenert, Anna Louis Hastings (Ph.D., Indiana, 1942), John Lewis Hicks, Jr., William C. Hodapp, Robert Hamilton Moore, William I. Painter (also assistant in School of Education), Harold David Rose (Ph.D., Indiana, 1933), James D. Rust.


1935-63  Ralph L. Collins (1907-63), Instructor, 1935-39; Assistant Professor, 1939-47; Associate Professor, 1947-53; Professor, 1953-63. Director, Indiana Writers' Conference, 1941-49. Vice-President and Dean of Faculties, 1959-63. B.A., University of the South, 1928, Ph.D., Yale, 1933.


1936  Calumet Extension Center (Northwest Campus): Walter Francis Brown (1909- ), Lecturer, 1936-40; Instructor, 1940-43; Assistant Professor, 1943-. B.A., M.A., Indiana, 1931, 1940.

1937-45  Highest salary in Department (unchanged): $5,700.

1937  Speech and Hearing Clinic established.


1937-45  Robert Lloyd Milisen, Instructor in speech, 1937-40; Assistant Professor, 1940-45. Left to join Department of Speech and Theatre, 1945-. B.A., Simpson (Iowa), 1931, M.A., Ph.D., Iowa, 1933, 1937.


1938-62, Herman B Wells, Eleventh President

1938  Total budget of Department of English passes $100,000. Salary range (unchanged, 1939-43): $1,800-5,700.


1939  Publications of Indiana Humanities Series and Folklore Series inaugurated (Myers, II, 701).

1939  William E. Jenkins and Ellen Williams retire.

1939- David H. Dickason (1907- ), Instructor, 1939-44; Assistant Professor, 1944-48; Associate Professor, 1948-54; Professor, 1954-. B.A., Wooster, 1929, M.A., California, 1931, Ph.D., Ohio State, 1940.

1939- Rudolf B. Gottfried (1909- ), Instructor, 1939-45; Assistant Professor, 1945-49; Associate Professor, 1949-56; Professor, 1956-. B.A., Ph.D., Yale, 1931, 1935.


1939-45 Kate Rutherford, Instructor in speech. B.A., M.A., Indiana, 1933, 1939.


1940-47 Department housed in Science (now Lindley) Hall.

1940 Writers' Conference established. Directors: Cecilia Hendricks, 1940; Ralph L. Collins, 1941-49; Richard B. Hudson, 1950-51; Philip B. Daghlani, 1952-55; Robert W. Mitchner, 1956-. Faculty of 1940 conference includes John Gould Fletcher, Jesse Stuart, Will David Howe, and Jeannette Covert Nolan.

1940-41 Faculty of Department numbers thirty-five. University enrollment 8,108. In 1941, twenty B.A.'s, seven M.A.'s in English awarded; tenth Ph.D. in English awarded 1940.

1940-59 Herman I. Briscoe (1893-1959), Dean of Faculties (except 1943-44).

1940 H.T. Stephenson retires; Allen, Knecht, and White leave.


1940 Horst Frenz (1912- ), Instructor, 1940-45; Assistant Professor, 1945-49; Associate Professor, 1949-54; Professor, 1954-69; Distinguished Professor of English and Comparative Literature, 1969-. Chairman, Comparative Literature Program, 1949-. M.A., Illinois, 1939, Ph.D., Gottingen, 1936.


1941 Faculty of Writers' Conference includes Sally Benson, Carl Carmer, Herbert J. Muller, Kerker Quinn, John Crowe Ransom, Irwin Shaw.

Russell Noyes, Chairman, 1941-51

1941 Jeffersonville (Southeastern) Extension Center established.

1941 Edna Johnson and C.J. Scembower retire; Huber leaves.


1941-45 Orvin P. Larsen, Assistant Professor of Speech. B.A., Augustana, 1932, M.A., Ph.D., Iowa, 1937, 1939.


1941-42  Visiting lecturer (fall): Marguerite Young; Visiting Professor (spring): Robert P. Tristam Coffin.


1942  Faculty of Writers' Conference includes David Dalcher, John T. Frederick, Katherine Anne Porter, John Crowe Ransom.

1942  Junior (now University) Division established.

1942  Summer Institutes of Folklore begun. *Hoosier Folklore Bulletin* founded (by Herbert Halpert).

1942  Linguistics program established.

1942-46  Fernandus Payne (1881- ), Dean, College of Arts and Sciences.

1942  Harmon, Holt, D. Ross, M. Ross, and Stambler leave.


1942-44  Wayne S. Farrow, Instructor in speech. B.A., Albion, 1932, M.S.Ed., Indiana, 1940.


1942-45  Richard Moody (1911- ), Assistant Professor of Speech. Left for Department of Speech and Theatre, 1945-. B.A., Drake, 1932, M.A., Ph.D., Cornell, 1934, 1942.


1942-45  Harry J. Skornia, Assistant Professor of English (Speech) and Director of Radio Programs. B.A., Michigan State, 1932, Ph.D., Michigan, 1937.


1943 Visiting poet: Robert Frost

1943-45 Faculty of Department numbers thirty-seven in 1943-44, plus five acting or part-time instructors. Seventeen B.A.'s awarded in English in 1944, thirteen in 1945 (Arbutus, 1944, 1945). Salary range: $1,940-5,200.

1943 Estella Whitted retires; Mitchell leaves.

1943 Rare books room established in library; Oscar L. Watkins Wordsworth collection of 2,300 titles acquired. Library holds nearly 500,000 volumes in 1944.

1943-44 Ford Poulton Hall (1898- ), Dean of Faculties.

1943-44 John P. Leland, Acting Assistant Professor of Speech. B.A., Augustana, 1936, M.A., Iowa, 1938.


1943-44 Instructors in English in Army Specialized Training Program: John P. Cowley, Allen B. Kellogg, Donald J. Lloyd, and Frederic E. Reeve. Thomas A. Sebok, instructor in East European area and languages.

1943-52 Jeffersonville (Southeastern) Extension Center: A.J. Beeler, part-time instructor in English; Instructor, 1946-48; Assistant Professor, 1948-52 (resigned); part-time teaching, 1952-65.

1944 Emery, Farrow, Hastings, Leland, Rodney, Rust, and Wylie leave.


1945 Department of Speech and Theatre established with faculty of seven: Lee Norvelle, Chairman, 1945-58.

1945 Gorrell and Strain leave.

1945-46 Faculty of Department numbers forty, eight of whom are on leave for government service. Highest salary in Department: $5,750.

1945 Kokomo Extension Center established.


1945-65 Irvin Ehrenpreis (1920- ), Instructor, 1945-50; Assistant Professor, 1950-55; Associate Professor, 1955-61; Professor, 1961-65. B.A., City University of New York (City College), 1938, M.A., Ph.D., Columbia Teachers College, 1939, 1944. Left for University of Virginia.


1945- W. Edson Richmond (1916- ), Instructor, 1945-48; Assistant Professor, 1948-54; Associate Professor, 1954-63; Professor (English and Folklore), 1963-. B.A., Miami, 1939, M.A., Ph.D., Ohio State, 1940, 1947.


1946 Faculty of Writers' Conference includes Walter Havighurst, Don Herold, MacKinley Kantor, Marie Sandoz, John IL Tunis.

1946-47 Faculty of Department includes fifty-five. Highest salary in Department: $6,250. 11, 167 students enrolled on Bloomington campus. In 1947, thirty-one B.A.'s awarded in English (Arbutus, 1947).


1946-70 John W. Ashton (1900-72), Professor, 1946-64; University Professor, 1964-70 (emeritus). Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, 1946-52; Vice-President, 1952-64; Dean, Graduate School, 1958-64. B.A., Bates, 1922, Ph.D., Chicago, 1928.


1946-49 Patrick A. Brannigan (1908- ), Instructor. Left for Indianapolis Regional Campus, 1949-. Instructor, 1949-54; Assistant Professor, 1954-70; Associate Professor, 1970-. B.A., M.A., Columbia, 1942, 1946.

1946- Philip B. Daghl, (1915- ), Instructor, 1946-48; Assistant Professor, 1948-54; Associate Professor, 1954-62; Professor, 1962-. Director, Indiana Writers' Conference, 1952-55; Assistant Chairman, 1954-61, 1962-64; Acting Chairman, 1961-62; Associate Chairman, 1967-69. B.A., Ph.D., Yale, 1936, 1941.


1946-47 Richard Elwyn Fuson (1918- ), Instructor. B.A., M.A., Iowa, 1938, 1940; Left for University of Tulsa.


1946- Robert W. Mitchcher (1910- ), Teaching Assistant, 1944-45; Instructor, 1946-49; Assistant Professor, 1949-55; Associate Professor, 1955-63; Professor, 1963-. Director, Writers' Conference 1956-. B.A., DePauw, 1933, Ph.D., Indiana, 1947.


1946-59 Thomas A. Sebeok (1920- ), Instructor, 1948-48 (ASTP, 1943-46; joined faculty of Department second semester 1945-45); Assistant Professor, 1948-59; Associate Professor, 1959-60; to Department of Linguistics, 1960-. Distinguished Professor, 1967-. B.A., Chicago, 1941, M.A., Ph.D., Princeton, 1943, 1946.


1947  Faculty of Writers' Conference includes Howard Fast, Brendan Gill, Rolfe Humphries, Randall Jarrell, Marya Zaturenska.

1947-59  Department housed in English Building (converted navy hospital).

1947-48  Faculty of Department numbers fifty-one, of whom twenty-one hold the rank of assistant professor or above; twenty-nine hold a doctorate; nineteen hold rank of instructor but essentially have status of teaching associates or acting faculty and will not serve beyond 1948-49. Highest salary in Department: $6,650. "Thirty-two B.A.'s in English awarded 1948 (Arbutus, 1948).

1947-50  Stith Thompson, Dean of Graduate School.


1947-53  Indianapolis: Robert Lewis Campbell, Instructor, Part-time instructor, 1937-42, 1953-64. In 1964, Assistant Professor of Journalism, Assistant to the Director, then to the Dean of the Indianapolis Campus. B.A., M.A., Indiana, 1934, 1937.


1948  Faculty of Writers' Conference includes Lillian Hellman, John Horne Burns, Irving Stone, John Frederick Nims, Kenneth Fearing, William E. Wilson.

1948  First Ph.D. in linguistics at Indiana awarded (to Paul Garvin).

1948  Baughman, Boyd, Kogan, Mull, Nyquist, Peelman, Vogelbaum, and Vordenburg leave.


1948-49  Peter Hillsman Taylor (1917- ), Assistant Professor (Creative Writing). B.A., Kenyon, 1940.

1949 Faculty of Writers' Conference includes Andrew Lytle, Karl Shapiro, (summer) Stephen Spender, Arch Obler, Glenway Wescott.


1949 Programs in Comparative Literature and Folklore established; Brown County Playhouse inaugurated.

1949 Daniel Sherwood dies; Anderson, Blum, Hicks, Jansen, McMahon, Perkins, Risley, Taylor, and Westerfield leave.


1949-50 Newton P. Stalknecht (1906- ), Professor of Philosophy; Chairman, Department of Philosophy, 1949-61; Fellow, School of Letters, 1952-; Director, 1953-.

1949-50 John Crowe Ransom, first of annual visiting professors of criticism.

1949- Indianapolis: Patrick Brannigan, Helen McMahon, Instructors. (See entry under 1946).


1950 Faculty of Writers' Conference includes Merle Miller, Louise Bogan, John Crowe Ransom, Lillian Smith, Caroline Gordon, Allen Tate.


1950 Indiana University Press founded.

1950- Roy W. Battenhouse (1912- ), Associate Professor, 1950-56; Professor, 1956-. B.A., Albion, 1933, B.D., Ph.D., Yale, 1936, 1938.


1950-51 James Sutherland, Visiting Professor of Criticism.
1951 (summer) School of Letters moves to Indiana University from Kenyon College. Faculty of first session: Eric Bentley, Francis Fergusson, Arthur Mizener, Philip Rahv, Philip Rice, Delmore Schwartz, Allen Tate, Austin Warren. Faculty of Writers' Conference includes Peter Taylor, Glenway Westcott, Richard Eberhart, John Bartlow Martin.

James A. Work, Chairman, 1951-61

1951-52 Faculty of Department numbers thirty-eight, plus nine teaching fellows, thirty teaching assistants. 14,360 students enrolled on the Bloomington campus in 1951-52 (a decline from 14,805 the year before, and 15,802 in 1947-48). In 1951, thirty-six B.A.'s, twenty-one M.A.'s, and five Ph.D.'s awarded in English.

1951 Elected Advisory Committee established; departmental "Readings from Literature" series established; Midwest Folklore founded (W. Edson Richardson, editor).

1951-52 Ralph E. Cleland (1892-1971), Dean of Graduate School.

1951-65 Frank T. Gucker (1900-73), Dean, College of Arts and Sciences.

1951 Compton, Edwards, and Emry leave.


1951 Merritt E. Lawlis (1918- ), Instructor, 1951-53; Assistant Professor, 1953-58; Associate Professor, 1958-65; Professor, 1965-. B.A., Wabash, 1940; M.A., Ph.D., Harvard, 1947, 1951.


1951-61 James A. Work (1904-61), Professor and Chairman. B.A., Grinnell, 1926; Ph.D., Yale, 1934.


1952-53 Faculty of Department numbers thirty-eight; teaching fellows, seven; graduate assistants, thirty-eight. Resident graduate students, fifty-two; undergraduate majors, seventy-five. 11,386 students enrolled on Bloomington campus. In 1953, seventeen B.A.'s awarded in English.

1952-54 Each member of faculty teaches at least one course in composition.

1952 Career Opportunities for Majors in English published by Department (mimeographed; then printed, 1953-54, 3rd ed., 1954-55).

1952 Annual conferences of High School Teachers of the English Language Arts established; M.A.T. program inaugurated.

1952  First Ph.D. in Comparative Literature awarded (to Robert D. Brown).
1952  H.H. Carter retires; Cameron leaves.
1952-53  Francis Ferguson, Visiting Professor of Criticism.
1952-53  Faculty in English at regional campuses:
Calumet: Instructor Walter Brown.
Fort Wayne: Assistant Professor Floyd Neff, Instructors Sylvia Bowman, Robert Max Towns (Academic Counselor, B.S., M.A., Indiana, 1948, 1949).
South Bend: Assistant Professor Floyd Deen.
Southeastern: Instructor Virginia Wallace.
1953  Faculty of School of Letters: Cleanth Brooks, Richard Chase, Irving Howe, Alfred Kazin, Robert Lowell, Philip Rahv, Harold Whitehall. Faculty of Writers’ Conference includes Frances Gray Patton, John Selby, John Malcolm Brinnin, Oliver Jensen, Elizabeth Enright.
1953  Undergraduate program revised; honors program reorganized; series of departmental lectures established on a unifying theme.
1953  First Ph.D., in Folklore (at Indiana or in the U.S.) awarded (to Warren E. Roberts).
1953  New rank of Distinguished Service Professor established; Stith Thompson among the first honored.
1953  Cecil Hendricks retires; Flynn, Hudson, and Taplin leave.
Ray L. Heffner (1925- ), Instructor, 1953-56; Assistant Professor, 1956-60; Associate Professor, 1960-63; Professor, 1964-66. Vice-President and Dean of Faculties, University of Iowa, 1963-64; Vice-President and Dean of Faculties, Indiana, 1964-66. B.A., M.A., Ph.D., Yale, 1948, 1950, 1953. Left for presidency of Brown.

Warren E. Roberts (1924- ), Instructor, 1953-56; Assistant Professor, 1956-61; Associate Professor, 1961-66; Professor of Folklore 1966- B.A., Reed, 1941, Ph.D., Indiana, 1953. Left for Department of Folklore in the University.

Herbert J. Muller, Visiting Professor of Criticism.


Faculty of Department numbers thirty-seven; fifty-eight teaching assistants. 110 undergraduate majors in English; sixty-nine graduate students in English in residence. 10,546 students enrolled on Bloomington campus. In 1955, thirty B.A.'s, three M.A.'s, three M.A.T.'s and five Ph.D.'s awarded in English.

Writing Laboratory begun (by Stanton Millet and James L. Morton). Sections of elementary composition for superior students established.

Waggoner and White leave.


1954-55 Leon Edel, Visiting Professor of Criticism.


1955-66 Ronald S. Crane, Visiting Professor of Criticism.


1955-67 Gary (Northwest): Lester M. Wolfson (1923- ), Assistant Professor, 1955-61; Associate Professor, 1961-64; Assistant Chairman of Department, Gary, 1964. Then Director and Assistant Dean, South Bend campus, 1964-66; Dean, 1966-68; Acting Chancellor, then Chancellor, 1968-69; Professor, 1967-69; B.A., M.A., Ph.D., Michigan, 1945, 1946, 1954.


1956 Faculty of School of Letters: Richard Chase, Richard Ellmann, Northrop Frye, Karl Shapiro.

1956 (summer) Faculty of Writers' Conference includes Howard Nemerov, Helen Eustis, Ruth Krauss.

1956-57 Faculty of Department numbers forty-five, plus two interim professors (Hale and Hendricks). Seventy-one teaching assistants. 133 undergraduate majors, eight-five graduate students in English in residence. In 1957, thirty-four B.A.'s in English awarded (Arbutus, 1957).

1956- Donald J. Gray (1927- ), Instructor, 1956-59; Assistant Professor, 1959-63; Associate Professor, 1963-68; Professor, 1968-. Director of Elementary Composition Program, 1960-62; Assistant Chairman of Department, 1964-66; Vice-Chairman, 1968; Chairman, 1968-72. Ph.B., Loyola (Chicago), 1950, M.A., Minnesota, 1951, Ph.D., Ohio State, 1956.


1956-57 David Daiches, Visiting Professor of Criticism.


1956-57
Faculty in English at regional campuses:
Indianapolis: Assistant Professors Patrick Brannigan (1946), Gertrude Heberlein (1932), Helen McMahon (1946), Rufus Reiberg (1953), Instructor J.R. Keller (1955).
Fort Wayne: Assistant Professor Sylvia Bowman (1947); Instructor Milton B. Byrd (1953); Lecturer Harold D. Kelling (1955).
South Bend: Assistant Professor Floyd Deen (1933); Instructors Seymour Gross (1955), Alfred J. Levy (1956).
Calumet: Assistant Professor Walter Brown (1943); Instructor Allen C. Austin (1955).
Gary (Northwest): Assistant Professor Lester Wolfson (1955), Karl Zink (1954).
Kokomo: Assistant Professor John J. Gross (1956).

1957
Faculty of School of Letters: R.W.B. Lewis, Karl Shapiro, Leonard Unger, Harold Whitehall.
Faculty of Writers' Conference includes Jessamyn West, Walker Gibson, Jean Poindexter Colby.

1957
Victorian Studies founded (by Philip Appleman, William Madden, and Michael Wolff).

1957
Course in remedial composition abolished.

1957-63

1957-58

1957-60

1957-59

1957-58
Richard Chase, Visiting Professor of Criticism.

1957-60

1958
Faculty of School of Letters: R.P. Blackmur, Kenneth Burke, Richard Chase, John Crowe Ransom.
Faculty of Writers' Conference includes Elizabeth Enright, Reed Whittemore, Maurice Zolotow.

1958-59
Faculty of Department numbers fifty. Teaching assistants, sixty-three. 13,217 students enrolled on Bloomington campus. In 1957-58, 159 undergraduate majors, eighty-eight graduate students in English in residence. In 1959, forty-three B.A.'s, eleven M.A.'s, and nine Ph.D.'s awarded in English.
1958-64 John W. Ashton, Dean of Graduate School.
1958 Frank Davidson retires; Fowler, Hapgood, and Orrick leave.
1958-59 Claus Cluever (1932- ), Lecturer in English and Comparative Literature. To Comparative Literature, 1959-.
1958-59 Elder Olson, Visiting Professor of Criticism.
1959-63 Ralph L. Collins (1907-63), Dean of Faculties.
1959 Department of English housed in Ballantine Hall.
1959 Normal teaching assignments in Department reduced from four courses each semester to three.
1959 *Joint Statement on Freshman English in College* published.
1959 Laurens Mills retires; Cluever (to Comparative Literature), Phillips, Sebeok (to Linguistics), and Smalley leave.


1959-67 Ulrich Weisstein (1925- ), Assistant Professor of English and Comparative Literature, 1959-62; Associate Professor, 1962-66; Professor, 1966-67. Left to become Professor of German and Comparative Literature in the University. B.A., J.W. Goethe University (Frankfurt), M.A., Ph.D., Indiana, 1953, 1954.

1959- Wallace E. Williams (1926- ), Lecturer, 1959-63; Assistant Professor, 1963-66; Associate Professor, 1966-70; Professor, 1970-. Director, Elementary Composition Program, 1966-67; Director, Undergraduate Studies, 1967-68. B.A., Alabama, 1950, M.A., Ph.D., California, 1955, 1963.


1960 Faculty of School of Letters: Glaucó Cambón, James M. Cox, Richard Ellmann, R.W.B. Lewis.

Faculty of Writers' Conference includes Mark Harris, Jean Lee Latham, David Wagoner, Frances Gray Patton.

1960-61 Faculty of Department numbers fifty-eight. Teaching associates, eighty-one. In 1961, sixty-two B.A.'s, nine M.A.'s, seventeen M.A.T.'s, and nine Ph.D.'s in English awarded; in 1962, seventy B.A.'s, sixteen M.A.'s, eleven M.A.T.'s, and six Ph.D.'s.

1960 Large lecture sections of first-year literature course, L101-102, introduced.

1960 Lilly Library opened.
1960 Folio discontinued.


1960-61 Faculty members in English on regional campuses:
Indianapolis: Assistant Professors Patrick Brannigan (1946), Gertrude Heberlein (1932), Helen McMahon (1946), Rufus Reiberg (1953); Instructor Joseph Raymond Keller (1955); Lecturer Robert S. Bickham (1960).
Fort Wayne: Associate Professor Sylvia Bowman (1947); Assistant Professor Harold D. Kelling (1955).
Gary (Northwest): Assistant Professors Lester Wolfson (1955), Karl Zink (1954); Instructor George N. Thoma (1953); Lecturer Marvin Mirsky (1960).
Kokomo: Associate Professor John J. Gross (1956).
South Bend: Associate Professor Floyd Deen (1933); Assistant Professors John Cassidy (1957), Alfred Levy (1956); Instructors Sheldon Halpern (1959), Francis J. Molson (1959).
Southeastern: Assistant Professor David Shusterman (1956), Paul R. Smith (1955); Instructor Stella Smith (1958).

1961 Faculty of School of Letters: John Berryman, J.V. Cunningham, Robert Fitzgerald, Irving Howe, Steven Marcus.
Faculty of Writers' Conference includes John Berryman (lecturer), Nathaniel Benchley, William Jay Smith, Elizabeth Janeway.

Philip B. Daghlian, Acting Chairman, 1961-62
1961  
James A. Work dies (January); John Robert Moore and F.H. Deen (South Bend) retire.

1961  
Graduate program revised; graduate lecture courses (600') introduced.

1961-  

1961-67  

1961-70  

1961-62  

1961-64  

1961-64  

1961-64  

1961-63  

1961-70  

1962  
Faculty of School of Letters: Wayne Booth, Rikutaro Fukuda, Hans Hennecke, Elder Olson.  
Faculty of Writers' Conference includes Berton Roueche, Tad Mosel, Lionel Wiggam, Charlotte Zolotow.  
1962-68, Elvis J. Stahr, Twelfth President  
C.L. Barber, Chairman, 1962-66

1962-63  
Faculty of Department numbers sixty-three. Teaching associates, ninety-nine. 17,829 students enrolled on Bloomington campus. In 1962-63, seventy-eight B.A.'s, twenty M.A.'s, seventeen M.A.T.'s, and four Ph.D.'s awarded in English.

1962  
Undergraduate literary magazine Pegasus founded.

1962  
Fisher and Taylor leave.

1962-  

1962-67  


1963 (summer) Faculty of School of Letters: James M. Cox, A.K. Ramanujan, Mark Spiika, Newton P. Stallknecht, Harold Whitehall.
Faculty of Writers' Conference includes Tad Mosel, John Brooks, Maurice Zolotow, Lionel Wiggam.

1963-64 Faculty of Department numbers sixty-three, plus one part-time lecturer; eighty-seven teaching associates. Enrollment on Bloomington campus, 19,296. 218 graduate students enrolled in English, 113 of them doctoral candidates. In 1964, 113 B.A.'s in English awarded, twenty-nine M.A.'s, twenty M.A.T.'s, and fourteen Ph.D.'s.

1963 Ralph Collins dies; Clayton and Cox leave.

1963 Number of semester courses in composition required of students in College of Arts and Sciences reduced from three to two.

1963 American Studies Program founded; undergratuate program in English redesigned.

1963 English Curriculum Study Center founded.
1963-68


1963-


1963-


1963-64


1963-

Indianapolis: Louise Daumer (née 1951) returns; Associate Professor, 1963-70; Professor, 1970-. B.A., Butler, 1936, M.A., Ph.D., Iowa, 1941, 1944.

1963-66


1963-66


1963-66


1964-

Faculty of School of Letters: Robert Fitzgerald, Ihab Hassan, John Hollander, George Steiner.

Faculty of Writers' Conference includes Anya Seton, Kurt Vonnegut, Jr., Lionel Wiggam, Henry Mark Petrakia.

1964-

Series of conferences on eighteenth-century British literature begun.

1964-

Rank of instructor abandoned.

1964-


1964-


1964-68


1964-


1964-73


1964-72


1965 Faculty of School of Letters: Erich Heller, John Logan, Henry Rago, Nathan A. Scott, Jr. Faculty of Writers' Conference includes Harry Mark Petrakis, Madeleine L'Engle, Robert C. Meredith.

1965-66 Joseph Lee Sutton, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences.

1965-66 Faculty of Department numbers seventy-three, plus one part-time lecturer; 121 teaching associates. 302 graduate students enrolled, 147 of them doctoral candidates, 113 of them beginning graduate study in 1965-66. Bloomington campus enrollment, 28,612. In 1966, 132 B.A.'s, seventy-seven M.A.'s, twenty-nine M.A.T.'s, and nine Ph.D.'s in English awarded.

1965-67 Prospective Teacher Fellowship Program (M.A.T.) inaugurated.

1965 Center for Edition of Writings of W.D. Howells founded.

1965 Davis, Ehrenpreis, and Rosenbaum leave.


1965-66  Faculty members in English on regional campuses:*

Indianapolis: Associate Professor Louise Dauner (1963); Assistant Professors Patrick Brannigan (1946), Gertrude Heberlein (1982), Helen McMahon (1946), J.R.Keller (1955).

Fort Wayne: Professor Sylvia Bowman (1947); Associate Professors Philip R. Headings (1964), Patrick M. Ryan (1965); Assistant Professors Charles Frank (1964), Eugene B. Murray (1963); Lecturer Charles T. Gregory (1963).

Kokomo: Assistant Professor David Orr (1962), Resident Lecturer James R. Hurt (1964).


South Bend: Associate Professors John Cassidy (1957), Lester Wolfson (1955); Assistant Professors Malcolm Day (1961), Gloria Shapiro (1965); Lecturers George R. Bramer (1962), Francis Molson (1959), Thomas P. Ryan (1965).

Southeastern: Associate Professor David Shusterman (1956); Assistant Professors Paul Smith (1955), Stella Smith (1958); Lecturers Calvin Young (1964), Archibald E. Irwin (1965).  

1966   Faculty of School of Letters: Glauco Cambon, Francis Ferguson, R.W.B. Lewis, Walter J. Ong, Makoto Ueda, David Wagoner.

Faculty of Writers' Conference includes Gwendolyn Brooks, William Peden, Bruce and Naomi Bliven.  

*Subsequently, faculty members in the departments of English on regional campuses will be listed under the year in which they joined the faculty only if they served as faculty members five years or more, or are presently (1972-73) serving on the faculty.
Faculty of Department numbers seventy-four, plus one part-time lecturer. 117 teaching associates. Enrollment on Bloomington campus, 25,717. 400 undergraduate majors in English, 387 graduate students, 214 of them doctoral candidates. In 1966-67, 141 B.A.'s, ninety-eight M.A.'s, thirty M.A.T.'s, and eighteen Ph.D.'s in English awarded. Budget of the Department of English passes $1,000,000.

Joseph Lee Sutton, Dean of Faculties.

Byrum Earl Carter, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences.

Graduate Student Association in Department organized.

Josephine Piercy and Harold Whitehall retire; Free, Heffner, Roberts, and Small leave.


David Bleich (1940- ), Lecturer, 1966-68; Assistant Professor, 1968-72; Associate Professor, 1972-. B.A., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1960, M.A., Ph.D., New York University, 1962, 1968.


Harvey James Jensen (1933- ), Assistant Professor, 1966-70; Associate Professor, 1970-. B.A., Minnesota, 1955, M.A., Ph.D., Cornell, 1962, 1966.


Miroslav Beker, University of Zagreb, Visiting Professor. B.A., Ph.D., Zagreb, 1951, 1961.


1967 Faculty of School of Letters: Miroslav Beker, Ursula Brumm, Richard Ellmann, Sven Linner, Jackson Matthews, Leonard Unger.

Faculty of Writers' Conference includes Gwendolyn Brooks, Elizabeth Enright, Jerome Weidman.

1967-68 Faculty of Department numbers seventy, plus two part-time lecturers. 108 teaching associates. Enrollment on Bloomington campus, 27,098. 545 undergraduate majors in English, 411 graduate students, of whom 168 were beginning graduate study in 1967-68, and 238 were doctoral candidates. In 1967-68, 203 B.A.'s, ninety-three M.A.'s, forty-one M.A.T.'s, and thirteen Ph.D.'s in English awarded.

1967 Requirement in elementary composition for students in College of Arts and Sciences reduced to one semester-course.

1967-69 The Ballantonian, undergraduate literary magazine, founded.

1967 Graduate program in Victorian Studies inaugurated.


1968 (summer) Faculty of School of Letters: Miroslav Beker, James M. Cox, Edwin Honig, C.T. Hsi, H.J. Lang, Roger McHugh.

Faculty of Writers’ Conference includes Jesse Hill Ford, Douglass Wallop, William K. Zinsser, Jean Poindexter Colby.

1968-71, Joseph Lee Sutton, Thirteenth President

1968 William Riley Parker dies (October); Levine, Anderson, and Cooney leave.

1968 Normal teaching responsibilities reduced from three courses each semester to two.


1968- Northwest: Alan P. Barr, Assistant Professor, 1968-71; Associate Professor, 1971-. B.S., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1959, Ph.D., Rochester, 1963.


Donald J. Gray, Chairman, 1969-73

1969 Regional campus system established; each campus given its distinct administration under (eventually) a chancellor of the campus. Regional campuses of Indiana University and Purdue University at Indianapolis merged.
to become Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI). University now organized in three divisions: regional campuses, IUPUI, and Bloomington campus. Departments of English in each division, and on each regional campus within that division, are independent of one another.

Byrum E. Carter, first chancellor of Bloomington campus, 1969-

1969 (summer)
Faculty of School of Letters: Stanley L. Cavell, Austin C. Clarke, Baruch Kurzweil, John Logan, Richard H. McKinnor, Earl Rotvit.
Faculty of Writers' Conference includes John Ashbery, Stephen Birmingham, Maia Wojciechowska.

1969
Madden, Gottesman, Stathas, Scrimgeour leave.

1969

1969

1969

1969-70 Albert Wertheim, Visiting Professor (see entry under 1970).

1969

1969

1969


Faculty of Writers' Conference includes Selden Rodman, Harry Mark Petrakis, Robert Canzoneri.

1970-71 Faculty of Department numbers seventy-five. Associate instructors, 107. 50,368 students enrolled on Bloomington campus. 569 undergraduate majors in English; 347 graduate students, of whom 168 are doctoral candidates. In 1970-71, 170% B.A.'s (including double majors), seventy-three M.A.'s, forty M.A.T.'s, and thirty-five Ph.D.'s. awarded in English.

1970 L141-142, combined freshman courses in literature and composition, introduced.
1970 - John Ashton retires; Smith, Wolff leave.

1970 -

1970 -

1970 -

1970 -

1970 -

1970 -

1970 -

1970 -

1970 -

1970 -

1970 -

1970 -

1970 -

1970 -

1970 -

1970 -

1970 -

1970 -
1970-

1970-

1970-71
Faculty in English on Indianapolis and regional campuses:


1971

1971 (spring)
Faculty of School of Letters: Kimon Friar, W. R. Robinson, Earl Rovit, Fritz Senn, Newton P. Stalknecht.

1971 (summer) Faculty of Writers' Conference includes Anton Myrer, Elizabeth Spencer, Gwendolyn Brooks, Madeline L'Engle.
1971-72 Revised undergraduate curriculum inaugurated.

1971 Curtis and Hafner leave.


1917 Regional campus established at Richmond: Indiana University East. Named to faculty:


1972 Faculty of School of Letters: Benjamin Hrusovski, Helen Armistead Johnson, Roger McHugh, Martin Mueller.

1972 Faculty of Writers' Conference includes Gerold Frank, Sandra Hochman, Paul Darcy Boles.

1972 Quarry, undergraduate literary magazine, founded.

1972 Russell Noyes and Agnes Elpers retire.

1972-73 Faculty of Department numbers seventy-three; ninety-three Associate Instructors. Budget of Department for 1972-73: $1,462,652, of which...
$1,385,920 budgeted for salaries of faculty ($1,070,920) and Associate Instructors ($315,000). Salary range: $9,800-30,000. Enrollment on Bloomington campus: 31,280. Undergraduate majors: 608. Graduate students in residence: 297, of whom 151 are doctoral candidates, and eighty-one are in their first year of graduate study (nine of these first-year students are enrolled in the doctoral program). In 1971-72 (to June), 196 B.A.'s in English awarded, sixty-six M.A.'s, thirty-seven M.A.T.'s, and thirty-seven Ph.D.'s.

1972-73 Revised graduate program inaugurated; includes written examination for M.A., also to serve as a revived preliminary examination for the doctoral program.


Kenneth R.R. Gros Louis, Chairman, 1973-.
Doctoral Dissertations, 1914-1972
Department of English
Indiana University
Bloomington

Unless otherwise indicated university and school affiliations are in the Department of English and are the latest-known academic addresses.

1914

Brownfield, Lilian B. "A Study in the Thought of Addison, Johnson, and Burke" (Howe).

1929


1930


1931

Moore, Earl A.: Professor Emeritus, Western Kentucky State University. "The Epitaph as a Literary Form in England and America" (Moore).


1933


1936

Osborne, Clifford Haehl. "Emerson's Reading" (Davidson).

1938

Klipple, May Augusta. "African Folk Tales with Foreign Analogues" (Thompson).

1940
Deen, Floyd Harrison: Emeritus, Indiana University, South Bend. "William Gilmore Sims, Novelist, Romanticist, and Short Prose Fictionist" (Davidson).

1942
Hastings, Louise: Ohio Northern University, Ada, Ohio. "Emerson's Journal at the West 1850-1853" (Davidson).

1943
Hubach, Robert R.: Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio. "Walt Whitman and the West" (Davidson).
Sherwood, Daniel Guthrie: "Emerson's Attitude toward the Drama and the Theatre from 1803 through 1850" (Davidson).

1947
McClure, Charles R. "Devices in English Plays of 1600-1607, with Particular Reference to Hamlet" (Mills).

1948
Halpert, Herbert N.: Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada. "Folktales and Legends from the New Jersey Pines: A Collection and a Study" (Thompson).

1949
Haille, Virginia Augusta: North Texas State University, Denton, Texas. "The Dramas and Dramatic Criticism of St. John Greer Ervine" (Frenz).
Westerfield, Hargis: Mount Union College, Alliance, Ohio. "Walt Whitman's Reading" (Davidson).

1950
Himelick, Raymond: Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana. "Samuel Daniel's Musophilus, Containing a General Defense of All Learning" (Judson).
Huff, Lloyd D., "Place-Names in Chaucer" (Carter-Richmond).


1951

Bartel, Roland: University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon. "Anti-War Sentiment in the Late Eighteenth Century" (Noyes).


Rubenstein, Gilbert M. "The Shakespearean Criticism of William Winter: An Analysis" (Frenz).


Wycoco, Renmedios S. "Types of the Folk-Tale as Found among the North American Indian" (Thompson).

1952

Flowers, Helen L.: Harris Teachers College, St. Louis, Missouri. "A Classification of the Folktale of the West Indies by Types and Motifs" (Thompson).


1953


1954


Briggs, Fred-A. "Didactic Literature in America, 1825-1850" (Davidson).


Hagemann, Edward R.: University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky. "J.W. DeForest and the American Scene: An Analysis of His Life and Novels" (Piercy).


Raben, Joseph: Queens College, City University of New York, Flushing, New York. "Proverbs in the Waverley Novels of Sir Walter Scott" (Richmond).

1955

Clark, H. Edward: Suffolk University, Boston, Massachusetts. "Fenimore Cooper's Leatherstocking Tales: A Problem in Race" (Davidson).

Cox, James M.: Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire. "Mark Twain, a Study in Nostalgia" (Davidson).


Williams, Luster J.: Long Beach State College, Long Beach, California. "Figurative Imagery in The Ring and the Book: A Study in Browning's Poetic Technique" (Smalley).

1956

Kaula, David C. "The Moral Vision of Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida" (Battenhouse).


1957


Rader, Ralph W.: University of California, Berkeley, California. "Idea and Structure in Fielding's Novels" (Work).


Sleator, Mary D. "Phonology and Morphology of an American English Dialect" (Whitehall).
Woodward, Robert H.: San Jose State College, San Jose, California. “Harold Frederic, a Study of His Novels, Short Stories, and Plays” (Davidson).

1958
Ober, Warren U.: University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada. “Lake Poet and Laureate: Southey’s Significance to His Own Generation” (Noyes).

1959
Hillger, Martin E. "Albion W. Tourgee: Critic of Society" (Davidson-Dickason).
Shapiro, Charles K.: Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island. “A Critical Study of the Novels of Theodore Dreiser” (Martin).
Shields, Jean L.: C.W. Post College, Long Island University, Greenvale, New York. “Shaw’s Women Characters: An Analysis and a Survey of Influences from Life” (Ralph Collins).

1960


Olsen, Frederick Bruce: Briarcliff College, Briarcliff Manor, New York. "Hawthorne’s Integration of Methods and Materials" (Davidson-Martin).

Taaffe, James G.: Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio. "Milton, the Boyles, and Their Circle" (Parker).


1961


Bennett, Kenneth C.: Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Illinois. "George Bernard Shaw’s Philosophy of Art" (Ralph Collins).


Gerhard, George B.: Iowa Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant, Iowa. "Editing and Preparing for Publication a Manuscript Entitled ‘A Dictionary of Middle English Musical Terms’ by Henry Holland Carter, late Professor of English at Indiana University" (Mitchner).


Herold, Curtis P.: "The Morphology of King Alfred’s Translation of Orosius" (Whitehall).


1962

Blaydes, Sophia E.: West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia. "Christopher Smart as a Poet of His Time, A Re-appraisal" (Daghlian).

Brewster, Elizabeth. "The Literary Friendships of George Crabbe" (Noyes).

Cox, Lee Sheridan: Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. "Structural and Thematic Imagery in Samson Agonistes and Paradise Regained" (Parker).

Gold, Joel J.: University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas. "Samuel Johnson's 'Epitomizing' of Lobo's Voyage to Abyssinia" (Daghlian).


1963

Carlisle, E. Fred: Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan. "Leaves of Grass: Whitman's Epic Drama of The Soul and I" (Cady).


1964

Alexander, Charlotte A. "The Emancipation of Lambert Strether" (Stallknecht).


Goldfarb, Clare R.: Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan. "Journey to Altruria: William Dean Howell's Use of Tolstoy" (Cady).


McGinnis, Paul J. "Integrity in the Story: A Study of Ben Jonson's Tragedies" (Battenhouse).

Oruch, Jack B.: University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas. "Topography in the Prose and Poetry of the English Renaissance 1540-1640" (Gottfried).

Seright, Orin Dale: University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California. “Syntactic Structures in Keats’ Poetry”. (Whitall).


Cox, Robert S., Jr.: University of the Pacific, Stockton, California. “The Old English Dics of Cato and Others” (Rowland Collins).


Duff, Diane. “Materials toward a Biography of Mary Delariviere Manley” (Wikelund).

Durstine, Joan Marie: Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas. “William Blake’s Theory of Art and Its Application to His Poetry” (Noyes).

Ensor, Allison R.: University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee. “Mark Twain and the Bible” (Cady).


Jones, James H.: Northern Michigan University, Marquette, Michigan. “Shakespeare’s Transformation of His Sources in King Lear” (Battenhouse).


Shapiro, Arnold: Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. “A Study in the Development of Art and Ideas in Charlotte Bronte’s Fiction” (Gray-Levine).


Stricker, Margery: University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota. “Romantic Aspiration in the Poetry of Matthew Arnold” (Madden).


DeSaint Victor, Carol Sue: University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa. "The Unplanned Novels of Charles Dickens: A Portrait of the Artist" (Hollingsworth).


Hard, Frederick P.: Reed College, Portland, Oregon. "William Lambarde's A Perambulation of Kent" (Gottfried).


Badessa, Richard P.: University of Kentucky, Louisville, Kentucky. "Literary Conventions of Courtly Love" (David).


Casagrande, Peter J.: University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas. "Conflict and Pattern in the Novels of Thomas Hardy" (Hollingsworth).


Farrell, John P.: University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas. "Matthew Arnold's Uses of the Past" (Madden).
Foote, Janet A. "Gissing and Schopenhauer: A Study of Literary Influence" (Hollingsworth).


Kelly, Robert E.: University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa. "The Early Biographies of Samuel Johnson 1784-1791" (Daghlian).

Michael, Robert: St. Lawrence University, Canton, New York. "The Bokes of the Histories of Ireland: by Edmund Campion" (Gottfried).

Phillips, Emma: "Mysticism in the Poetry of Emily Dickinson" (Dickason).

Remley, David: University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico. "The Correspondence of H.L. Mencken and Upton Sinclair: An Illustration of How Not to Agree" (Justus).


1968


Carpenter, Mary E. "Walter Bagehot's Theory and Use of Types" (Madden).


Goforth, David S. "Melville's Shorter Poems: The Substance and the Significance" (Dickason).

Knight, William J.: Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut. "Julius Caesar and Revenge Structures" (Battenhouse).

Kolb, Harold H.: University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia. "The Illusion of Life: Realism in Twain, James, and Howells in the Mid-1880's" (Cady).


Spelsky, Ellen: University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico. "Old English Lyric: Poetry" (Lass).


Warrick, Catherine M.: University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota. "The Two Translators of the Old English Boethius" (Richmond).

1969

Adamowski, Thomas: Erindale College, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. "The Dickens World and Yoknapatawpha County: Character and Society in Dickens' Faulkner" (Justus).


Daiker, Donald A.: Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. "The Motif of the Quest in the Writings of Herman Melville" (Martin).


Gilbert, Miriam: University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa. "The Role-Playing of Women in Shakespeare's Comedies" (Forker).


Irving, Donald C.: Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa. "James Fenimore Cooper's Alternatives to the Leatherstocking Hero in the Frontier Romances" (Cok).


Mann, David D.: Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. "A Concordance to the Complete Plays of William Congreve" (Wikelund).

Middleton, John: Georgia State College, Atlanta, Georgia. "Shark-Talk: The Uses of Dialogue in Moby-Dick" (Gross).


Rhome, Frances Dodson: Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis. "Variations of Festive Revel in Four English Comedies 1595-1605" (H. Heffner).


1970


Crowley, John W.: Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York. "The Education of George Cabot Lodge: A Literary Biography" (Cady).


Dixon, Terrell: Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas. "Thackeray's Novels: The Search for Love" (Gray).


Golden, Arline: New York State University-College, Buffalo, New York. "Victorian Renascence: The Amatory Sonnet Sequence in the Late Nineteenth Century" (Gray).


Griffin, Barbara. "Naming as a Literary Device in the Novels of Charles Dickens" (Gray).


Jones, Macbelle L. "The Terrible Choice: Knowledge and Judgment in Robert Browning's The Ring and the Book" (Gray).


Miller, John Herman: Central College, Pella, Iowa. "E.A. Robinson's Changing Beliefs about Living in the World" (Cady).


Reed, Barbara: University of California, Irvine, California. "James Fenimore Cooper: Experiments Within Form" (Justus).


Rounds, Stephen R.: Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minnesota. "George Eliot's Progressive Alienation from English Life" (Gray).


Thomas, F. Richard: Purdue University, Hammond, Indiana. "The Literary Admirers of Alfred Stieglitz, Photographer" (Smith).
Weiser, David K. "The Prose Style of John Jewel, 1522-1571" (Edelen).


1971

Bachman, Lyle F.: University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii. "The Acquisition of English: Description in Relief" (Thomas).


Bidney, Martin P.: State University of New York, Binghamton, New York. "Ruskin's Uses of Dante" (Gray).


Brewster, John E.: Miles College, Birmingham, Alabama. "Virtuous Heroes of the English Novel" (Lawlis).


Cohen, Joan Mandel. "Varieties of Form and Realism in Six Novels of Anthony Trollope's Middle Period" (Levine).

Conroy, Marilyn A., S.C.: Youngstown State University, Youngstown, Ohio. "Browning's Use of Art Objects" (Gray).


Freiden, Robert A.: Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana. "Interpretive Semantics and the Syntax of English Complement Constructions" (Lass).

Green, Martin: Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison, New Jersey. "Man, Time, and Apocalypse in Old English Literature" (David).

Hartzer, Sara K.: Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana. "Marriage as Theme and Structure in Jane Austen's Novels" (Madden).

Hill, David: Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois. “Emerson’s Search for the Universal Symbol” (Williams).


Nims, Irene: California State College, Fullerton, California. “Tone in the Poetry of Emily Dickinson—A Linguistic Analysis with Pedagogical Reflections” (Thomas).

Oakman, Robert L., III: University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina. “Syntax in the Prose Style of Thomas Carlyle: A Quantitative, Linguistic Analysis” (Gray).


Remley, Brenda: University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico. “Edgar Allan Poe: Paradox and Ambivalence as a Narrative Technique” (Gross).


Rowe, Karen: University of California, Los Angeles, California. “Puritan Typology and Allegory as Metaphor and Conceit in Edward Taylor’s Preparatory Meditations” (Williams).


Campbell, Thomas P.: University of California, Davis, California. "The Nativity in the Medieval Liturgy and the Middle English Mystery Cycles" (Strohm).

Caron, Julie: University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota. "The Linguist and Literature: A Critical Examination of Contemporary Theories of Stylistics in America" (Thomas).

Duggar, Margaret: Chicago State Teachers’ College, Chicago, Illinois. "Walt Whitman’s Theory of His Own Poetry as Revealed in the Prefaces of 1855, 1872, 1876, 1888" (Robbins).

Dvorak, Wilfred P.: University of Rhode Island, Providence, Rhode Island. "Dickens and Money: Our Mutual Friend in the Context of Victorian Monetary Attitudes and All the Year Round" (Gray).

Dyer, Calvin: Rose-Hulman Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute, Indiana. "Setting and the Search for Justice in Four Waverley Novels of Sir Walter Scott" (Gray).

Gallick, Susan: University of Maryland, College-Park, Maryland. "Medieval Rhetoric and the Chaucer’s Nun’s Priest’s Tale" (Lewis).

Garland, Barbara: University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina. "Comic Form in Nineteenth-Century English Fiction" (Gray).

Gaskins, Avery F.: University of West Virginia, Morgantown, West Virginia. "His Gifted Ken: Coleridge’s Criticism and Poetry as Used by Certain Critics and Poets, 1817-1850" (Gray).


Griffin, Claudius W.: Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia. "The Prose Style of Sir Thomas Browne’s Religio Medici: A Transformational Analysis" (Edelen).

Hackos, JoAnn Torre. "Defoe’s Tour and the English Travel Narrative" (Smith).

Harris, Earle Glenn. "Bond and Free: Robert Frost’s Early Poetry, 1913-1923” (Miller).


Kappel, Lawrence: University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin. "Emily Dickinson and the Private Vision" (Gross).


Phillips, William H. “St. John Hankin and the Drama of the Stage Society and the Court Theatre” (Geduld).

Sanderson, Catherine. “Ruskin’s Social Criticism: A Rhetorical Analysis” (Gray).


Shaughnessy, Edward L. “Santayana and the American Question” (Cady).


Vajana, Mary Estelle: University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah. “A Study in the Dialect of the Southern Counties of Scotland” (Lass).

Wang, Mason Yu-heng. “Burlesque and Irony in The Two Gentlemen of Verona” (Battenhouse).


DIRECTORS OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

Ashton, John W.: Blount (1968)

Barnett, George L.: Runzo (1971)

Burgan, Mary Alice: Wilt (1972)


Carter, Henry Holland: Plunkett (1931), Rose (1933), Huff (1950)

Collins, Ralph L.: Shields (1959), Bennett (1961)

Collins, Rowland L.: Chickering (1965), Cox (1965), Hurt (1965), Ramsey (1965)


Edel, Leon: Powers (1955)

Edelen, George: Weiser (1970), Griffin (1972)


Ehrenpreis, Irvin: Huseboe (1963), Stern (1965)

Frenz, Horst: Halte (1949), Rubenstein (1951), Risley (1958), Bailey (1961), McNicholas (1972)

Geduld, Harry M.: Phillips (1972), Sanders (1972)


Hale, Will T.: Parsons (1954)

Heffner, Hubert: Rhone (1969), Rogers (1969), Burnett (1972)


Howe, Will D.: Brownfield (1914)

Judson, Alexander C.: Himelick (1950)


Leible, Arthur B.: Yoder (1938), Robins (1950), Carroll (1951)


Kelly, Robert E.: Voorhees (1958), Aithal (1972)


Miller, Lewis H.: Harris (1972)

Mills, Laurens J.: McClure (1947)

Mitchner, Robert W.: Gerhard (1961), Peck (1963)

Moore, John Robert: Smith (1929), Wilson (1930), Moore (1931), Weeke (1956), Merrill (1957)


Parker, William Riley: Taaffe (1960), Cox (1962)

Percy, Josephine: Sandberg (1951), Hagemann (1954)


Smalley, Donald: Parsons (1954), Williams (1955), Blinderman (1957), Seid (1957), Millet (1958), Barnett (1959), Garrett (1960)

Smith, David E.: Veach (1967), Thomas (1970), Hackos (1972)
Sperry, Stuart M.: Zimansky (1972)
Stallknecht, Newton P.: Alexander (1964), Rupp (1964)
Strohm, Paul: Campbell (1972)
Sutherland, James: Haig (1954)
Thomas, Owen P.: Bachman (1971), Nims (1971), Carson (1972), Schap (1972), Wright (1972)
Thompson, Stith: Klipple (1938), Halpert (1948), Jansen (1949), Wycoco (1951), Flowers (1952), Baughman (1953)
Wertheim, Albert: Leonard (1972)
Wolff, Michael: Bennett (1966)
Zietlow, Paul N.: Bader (1969)