Chapter 3

THE COLONIAL COLLEGE

1755-1779

THE BUILDINGS

In the tangle of warehouses, shops, and passageways that now cover the site of the colonial College at Fourth and Arch streets can still be recognized sufficient landmarks to give a sense of reality to the contemporary descriptions and sketches that have come down to us. After the original acquisition of May 1740, the purchase of additional lots to the south and north in 1750 and 1751, and extension of its property somewhat later to Arch Street, the College started its adult life in a tract extending some two hundred and eighty feet along Fourth Street and approximately two hundred feet back to the wall of Christ Church burying ground, whose memorial use and venerated occupancy keep it still undisturbed in the midst of change. Almost in the center of this lot stood the original New Building, now to be known indiscriminately as the Academy or the College. It was set far enough back from Fourth Street to have a short but dignified approach from a gateway in the brick wall that separated the grounds from the street, much as the older Friends' meetinghouses are regularly set back from the roadway.

The main doorway was in the middle of its long side directly opposite the gateway. The alteration of the building from its original form, that of a large auditorium, to College, Academy, and Charity School uses had involved dividing it into two stories and subdividing the first to provide a room for each of the "schools." From the entrance door small rooms opened to the right and left; a passageway led back to the large main room and,
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turning to the left, gave access to a stairway to the second floor. A doorway opened to the back yard—the "campus" of those primitive times, whose quarter-acre of ground represented the only provision for the "running, leaping, wrestling and swimming" Franklin had recommended in the Proposals. We are told that the students made free use of the adjacent streets for the first of those exercises, and they doubtless went for the last to the nearby river, as we know their elders did. The second floor was a single hall of really fine proportions, approximately ninety feet long by seventy wide. Around three sides a continuous gallery, ceiled underneath, was built in 1755 and a dais was arranged at the north end sufficiently large to accommodate the rostrum and seats for Trustees, Faculty, distinguished guests, and student participants in academic exercises. In 1760 an organ was placed in the gallery at the south end of the room. The hall was well lighted by sixteen windows.

Notwithstanding the facilities both for living at home and for boarding available in a large city, difficulties existed connected with the high cost of living and with the unsupervised behavior of such students as were not living at home. Both Princeton and the college in New York offered examples of "a collegiate way of living." These difficulties and the attraction of living together applied especially to students from the country districts, from other provinces and from the West Indies. A proposal was made in March 1761 for the erection of one or more additional buildings "for lodging and dieting a number of students." The project was advocated with vigor by Alexander Stedman, a recent immigrant to Pennsylvania and a newly elected Trustee, a wealthy man, with an adventurous career behind him as a prisoner at Culloden and ahead of him as a successful lawyer, landholder, and judge, and ultimately, at the Revolution, an attainted Tory.

There was sufficient land, but the expense of entering upon a further building enterprise presented an obstacle. The natural recourse was a lottery, the habitual method at that time by which churches and schools raised funds for special needs. The conditions seemed favorable as the city was just then full of officers and strangers, during a lull in the French and Indian War, who might be expected to subscribe readily to a lottery for such a use-
ful purpose. A lottery was therefore initiated, and we hear that twenty thousand tickets had been sold by July of 1761. The two hundred not yet disposed of were drawn in the name of the Academy itself. But there had been considerable delay in settling the accounts of recent lotteries, and there was rising opposition to them. A committee appointed to consider the matter of new buildings approved the project but deplored the use of lotteries as "precarious and attended with much trouble to individuals," since some of the Trustees would be expected to take charge. They took occasion to propose placing the College "on a permanent and respectable footing for the Advancement of Learning forever," the continual aspiration of generations of college administrators, by appealing to the generosity of the public both in Pennsylvania and in England. This appeal led to an interesting series of events that will be discussed later.

In the meantime the Trustees entered cautiously upon the erection of the proposed residence building. The two principal professors visited Princeton to study the arrangements of Nassau Hall, the number of students it accommodated and the rates they paid. A year later the building was begun, to the north of the main building. In January 1765 public announcement was made that it was finished, already occupied by some of the older students and ready to admit others, "being ten or twelve years of age or upwards." Two rooms downstairs were allotted to the boys' Free School, and one to the girls; another was a kitchen, another a dining room. The two upper stories contained sixteen rooms in which fifty boarders could be accommodated "without being more crowded than in the Jersey College." One of the Faculty, Professor Kinnersley, acted as steward; there was a cook and his assistant. The charges for tuition, for the rooms, and certain fees were fixed; other expenses, "commons" etc., were to be proportioned among the occupants of the dormitory. Altogether it was anticipated that under these arrangements the total college expenses of youths in Philadelphia, living four in a room, would not much exceed £30, equivalent to about $100 a year apiece.

Although this building was looked upon as a beginning only, no other dormitory or students' residence building was put up
during the colonial period. This one proved no great success. There were the usual, although apparently unjust, complaints of unsatisfactory food, unswept rooms, and insufficient care of the cleanliness of the smaller boys, "who could not be trusted by themselves." On the other hand it was stated that Mrs. Kinnersley sent for the younger boys twice a week, "to have their heads combed," and once a week to bring their dirty linen to be given out for washing. The effort to introduce the "collegiate way of living" in a large city presented difficulties that did not exist in a small town, and this venture came little by little to be no more than a supervised boarding home, a constant source of difficulty and expense to the Trustees. It was ultimately rented at a set sum to an outsider who made his own terms with the student boarders. In 1765 the Trustees purchased two small houses fronting on Fourth Street which had long been felt to be an intrusion on what was otherwise an unbroken College tract, and gave the use of them to two of the professors as an addition to their small salaries.

In 1774 Provost Smith was approaching the twentieth year of his service to the College. He lived at the Falls of Schuylkill and found going to and fro, often, as he says, five or six times a day, burdensome, as well he might; it was a matter of three miles or more. His family was growing; he had seven children, and the costs of living were rising. His salary of £350 was exiguous to say the least, and he had never asked for an increase, though he claims to have been instrumental in securing altogether some £14,000 for the College. He was convinced that "in any other liberal program" his financial situation would by this time be easy. He asks the Trustees therefore to build him a house on the College grounds, free occupancy of which with his salary will put him, as he says with some irony, "at least nearly on an equal footing with gentlemen in like station in neighboring seminaries." As to the means at the disposal of the Trustees, he remarks, with undoubted truth, though not perhaps with relevancy, referring to his own rising literary reputation: "In this growing country more resources will be always opening to us if we preserve the reputation of this Seminary as a Place of Letters." The Trustees by unanimous vote agreed to his proposal,
selected the corner of Fourth and Arch streets as the location, and ordered the erection of a brick house of respectable size and design, with three stories and semi-detached kitchen in the usual style of Philadelphia houses of moderate pretensions at that time. It was finished two years later. Part of its back bay window is still visible. It became our first “Provost’s House.” Dr. Smith moved in promptly; the colorful story of his ejection a few years later is part of Revolutionary history. In the meantime around the two College buildings and the three dwelling houses of the professors, forming a compact group, the life of the colonial College revolved.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Even after paying for the alteration of the New Building for its educational uses and the purchase of the original equipment of books and apparatus, expenses went steadily on, as is their way. In addition to the salaries of professors and tutors, multitudinous small costs had to be met. The students were expected to pay for the firewood that kept them and the masters warm, but it had to be hauled and cut, and its use necessitated frequent sweeping of the chimneys, all of which the authorities had to pay for. There was constant expenditure for broken windows—responsibility for which, then as now, was hard to fix. In the early days several pounds a year were paid one of the professors for the service of his Negro servant in ringing the college bell twice a day. The ground rents on which the College land had been bought seemed small, but piled up steadily and were frequently in arrears. Expenditures were evidently watched carefully, for a proportionate deduction of the rent was made for the eleven days dropped from the year 1752 when the reformation of the calendar was made. No amount of care, however, could prevent the need for meeting ordinary academic expenses. Payments for quills and ink, which were furnished the students gratis, amounted to astonishing sums, although one of the tutors in the English school had the special duty of preparing the pens. In 1763 the treasurer’s account shows “for quilles and ink” £19. 16s.; in 1764, “for Quilles and Ink,” £17. 17s. 6d. After the
original purchase of equipment in London in 1750 money is spent from time to time on books and appliances; as in 1755, £150 sterling on "apparatus for exhibiting Philosophical Experiments"; in 1773, £500 is paid to the widow of Professor Kinnersley for his collection of electrical apparatus. Payments for printing theses and for binding grammars appear later; a payment in 1774 of £24 for fourteen hogsheads of rum imported remains a mystery.

It was of course the salaries of masters and tutors that made the heaviest drain on the finances. These were certainly not excessive; they were nevertheless substantial. There were: £200 for the Provost, rising to £300 by 1770, £200 for the Latin master, £150 each for the English and mathematical masters, payments of various sums to six or seven tutors or ushers in the various schools, and £30 a year for the master of the Boys' and the same for the mistress of the Girls' Charity School. The salary list came therefore to between £1,200 and £1,500 a year. Altogether the annual expenses of the College amounted to about £2,000. Usually there was some new building in progress.

What income could be counted on to meet these expenses? The stream of special contributions which had flowed so freely for the first few years had soon run dry, and there were only isolated and infrequent gifts, such as the £300 given by a tradesman of the city in 1759, the income of which was to be paid to him as an annuity during his lifetime, the principal to go to the College on his death. There were also one or two earmarked sums, the interest of which was to be given to students as prizes. The Trustees were for the most part successful merchants, but there was one great difference between carrying on their mercantile affairs and administering the affairs of the College. Expenditure for the former was reimbursed by sales in at least an equal, normally in a greater amount; expenditure for the College brought no such returns. It was doubtless due to the impression this fact made upon them that the treasurer's accounts during the colonial period give no single instance, after the first five years, of a money contribution from any member of the

1 Dr. Smith received an extra payment of £50 from the Proprietaries.
2 Minutes, 14 Dec. 1759, Jan. 8, 1760.
Board of Trustees. They evidently did not suffer as did their successors, long afterward, described by a witty Trustee as emerging from a Board meeting “like Marco Bozzaris, bleeding at every vein.”

With as yet no income-producing investments, the Trustees began their administration, after the exhaustion of the initial contributions, with only the fees of the students and such casual sources of funds as they could discover, or such devices as they could invent, to meet the expenses of the College, Academy, and Charity School. The dictum of Adam Smith, the great contemporary economist, a friend of Franklin, that higher education is one activity of society that can never pay for itself but must always be subsidized, was justified here as it has been elsewhere. The entrance and tuition fees of students had been set at £4 a year. From a group of somewhat less than two hundred paying students, and the number never rose appreciably above this, there would be obtained somewhere between £500 and £800 a year. In 1757 an attempt was made to raise the tuition in the upper classes to £10 a year, but this was found to be £6 higher than the charge in rival colleges, and six months later the old rate was restored.

The one-hundred-odd pupils of the Charity School by the terms of the trust paid nothing. On the other hand there was much popular sympathy with that particular dependency of the College. The collections from a sermon preached by Mr. Peters in favor of this School in 1752, and from two sermons by Whitefield in 1754 and 1764, the proceeds of an entertainment at which the pupils of the Free School sang, given by the students of the Academy and their friends in 1765, and a sum of a hundred pounds somewhat hesitatingly accepted by the Trustees in 1754 from a company of comedians who had on their own initiative acted a play for the benefit of the Charity School, went far to meet its expenses. At the Commencement of 1764 Provost Smith made an appeal to the audience for this charitable object, and after the exercises two of the Trustees stood at the gate to

---

1 In the year 1757 the fees amounted to £543. 10s.; for 1758 to £746. 10d.; for 1761 £769. 15s. 10d.; Treasurer’s Accounts.
2 Pennsylvania Gazette, April 4 and April 11, 1765.
receive "the free-will offerings of pious and well-disposed persons." The collection produced £40.

The Trustees estimated in 1762 that the expenses of the whole institution amounted to about £700 more than its regular income. There seemed no possibility of balancing its budget from regular sources. The familiar recourse at this time, as already remarked, was to a lottery. It was an age of lotteries, especially for churches, schools, and public works. Presumably those who purchased tickets felt that they were making a contribution to a pious cause and might at the same time have the satisfaction of getting their contribution back with an augmentation. In 1746 a provincial act was passed in New York authorizing a lottery for a future college, a sort of prenatal provision for Columbia's ultimate support. In 1747, when war was anticipated, the funds for constructing the earthworks to defend Philadelphia were raised by a lottery. In 1752 the vestry of Christ Church appointed twelve of their members to manage a lottery for building the towers of the church and buying the bells and a clock. Later both St. Peter's and the Second Presbyterian church were completed with lottery funds. In 1750 Yale put up a new building with the proceeds of a lottery; in 1772 Harvard secured funds for building Stoughton Hall, and long afterward for Holworthy by the same means. Philadelphia was especially given to lotteries; even those for the benefit of institutions in other places were often floated in Philadelphia, probably because of its numerous and well-to-do population and because during war times the city was a military base and drew together a spendthrift population. In 1750 the young college of Princeton floated a lottery in Philadelphia, and in 1759 another is advertised there to build a church in New Brunswick. Similarly lotteries were utilized to build bridges, improve navigation, pave streets. Many of the Trustees of the College and Academy had been trusted officers in these lotteries.

It is therefore not a matter of surprise that in 1757, when finances pinched, the Trustees began a course of obtaining money in this way. Two lotteries were successively launched in that year, and when their accounts were closed proved to have produced nearly £4,000 currency. Afterward there was no year till
1764 that did not see the drawing of a lottery for the College. There were in all seven drawings, covering the years from 1757 to 1764, and they netted a total of more than £9,000. There was nevertheless objection to the practice on moral grounds. There had been frequent legislation against it, but the laws were either disallowed in England or became a dead letter in the province. In 1759 there were many petitions to the Assembly to prohibit lotteries, and although it was generally supposed that these emanated from persons hostile to the College, since it drew its support from that source, a law was passed "For more effectual Suppressing and Preventing of Lotteries and Plays," and for the moment the College withdrew its announcement. But this law also was abrogated by the King, and the College continued this profitable if dubious policy for five more years.¹

In 1761 another and less questionable means of raising funds was suggested by Provost Smith. This was that the Provost should be sent to England and Scotland to seek contributions for the College and Academy. This was as characteristic of the times as were the lotteries, and more respectable. The faith of the colonials in the willingness of the mother country to aid them, from its wealth, in religious and charitable ways was profound, and largely justified. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was supporting many missions in America, four within the immediate vicinity of Philadelphia, and had given assistance to the two Anglican churches in the city in their early needs. The young Academy had already received some aid from charitable Englishmen, as well as from the Penn family. The committee on ways and means of 1761 approved the Provost's proposal and expressed the belief that "there are thousands that want nothing more than opportunities of showing their beneficence and good will to anything calculated for the Benefit of these Colonies."

The plan seemed the more promising in that Dr. Smith already had so many valuable contacts in England. At the very beginning of his career when, as a young man of twenty-six, he had gone to England to be ordained, he became well known to the Arch-

bishop of Canterbury and was by him introduced to Thomas Penn, the elder of the two brothers who now constituted the Proprietary government of Pennsylvania. During the eight months he had spent there on a second visit, in 1758, he had gained scholastic promotion and enjoyed social recognition. At the request of Dr. Chandler, principal of his own University of Aberdeen, and now the leader of the Dissenting body in Scotland and England, that University gave him the degree of Doctor of Divinity and, on the recommendation of the Archbishop of Canterbury and other bishops, he was given the same degree by Oxford. Several of his sermons delivered on public occasions and already printed in America were gathered in a volume and issued in London. They received some mild complimentary notice from English critical journals. He wrote home that he had a promise in London of £1,000 for the College. He had repeated interviews with Thomas Penn and the Archbishop of Canterbury and with the prominent people, ecclesiastical and lay, who made up the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. He was also an adviser to the newly organized body of Trustees for the establishment of schools among the German settlers in Pennsylvania, designed to protect them from Popery and French influence, a plan as respectable in England as it was unpopular in America.

It might fairly be anticipated therefore that an appeal in England for help for the College and Academy would be an effective one. The Provost was thereupon provided with written authority to make collections and with formal instructions by the Trustees and, leaving his wife of six months expecting a child, and his newly built house at Falls of Schuylkill, he set sail for the third time for England. It may be remarked here how common was the going to and fro between England and Pennsylvania, and doubtless the same was true of the other colonies. Two of the Trustees of the College were in England at the time, and another was to go over the next year; a recent graduate visited the Provost in London and at least two were at the time in Edinburgh studying medicine. The Provost left Philadelphia in January 1762 and was away for two years and a half, returning in May 1764. Except for a short visit to his father and his old university in Scotland and six months in Ireland, most of which
time he was ill, his whole time during this long period was occupied with the collection of funds. He moved among aristocratic people. Thomas Penn was his constant friend. With Lady Juliana his wife, Penn came to Ireland after Smith's illness and took him home to recuperate. He saw much of the two archbishops, of several of the bishops, and of Dr. Chandler. He met many of the statesmen of the day, Bute and Pitt, members of the Privy Council and officials of the counties and towns, and of the universities. By Penn, along with John Inglis, the Trustee, and Samuel Powell, the recent graduate already referred to, he was presented to the young King, George III, who treated them pleasantly, asked about the College and the progress of the collection and ordered a donation of £200 to the fund.

Early in the progress of the campaign the Provost was met by two disappointments. One was the appearance of a rival in the field in the person of James Jay of New York, who called on him in his lodgings in London to say that as he was visiting England on some personal business the trustees of his college, King's of New York, had commissioned him to make a collection of funds for it in Great Britain. Dr. Smith's annoyance was not diminished by the remembrance that he had talked about the object of his mission when he had passed through New York six months before, and a suspicion that the trustees of the New York institution had borrowed the idea from him. However there was nothing to do except agree to work in common. Rivalry in their appeal would be fatal to both, and neither was willing to divide the country into spheres of influence.

The second disappointment was the urgency of his English friends that he should proceed in the collection by way of what was called a royal brief. He would have much preferred to go directly to the people of influence whom he knew and to those to whom these would give him introductions, relying on his own persuasiveness and the excellence of his cause; but he could not disregard the advice of the Archbishop and Thomas Penn. In order to regularize public subscriptions for charitable and religious purposes a law had been passed in the reign of Queen Anne, providing for the issue by the King, on the advice of the Privy Council, of a royal brief, a document under the great seal,
directed to every clergyman in England, requiring him to ask contributions from his parishioners and to pay over the resulting sums to the possessors of the brief. This had become a frequent, indeed for the prospects of any one collection, only too frequent a proceeding, and seldom now produced more than a thousand pounds.

Under the circumstances, the only practicable policy was for Dr. Smith to join forces with Mr. Jay and apply to the King in Council for a joint brief. This was readily obtained, the Archbishop taking the happy opportunity of a meeting of the Privy Council with the King on the occasion of the birth of his son, the future George IV, to urge the president of the Council to recommend the grant, which the King readily acceded to. The brief involved all the formalities and delays and expenses usually accompanying official action, but eventually eleven thousand five hundred copies, sealed and placed in the hands of "brief-layers" accompanied by a letter of appeal from Dr. Smith were distributed to that number of parishes in England. A chance copy still lies among the University archives. The division of proceeds between the two colleges was to be equal; the only concession Smith obtained was that his institution, as the older, was always to be named first. As an offset to this the King's gift to Mr. Jay's fund was £400, twice what he had given Dr. Smith, on the ground that the Philadelphia college had a generous patron in Mr. Penn, while the New York institution had no patron but himself. To the collection by brief the Provost had been perforce converted, but he complained of its preventing him and Jay from appealing directly to "the middling rank of people," since they would be the natural contributors through the parish clergy and must not therefore be approached. It was a grand scheme from the publicity point of view, and the colleges in Philadelphia and New York became, certainly for a while, better known in England than they have ever been since.

If the sodden mass of English poverty was necessarily unproductive and the middle classes were covered by the brief, it was still possible for Smith and Jay to appeal directly to the wealthy. This they did with considerable success. In addition to the King's gift they received from the two Proprietaries £500. Lady Curzon,
after listening to one of Dr. Smith's eloquent sermons in May­fair Chapel, gave £100. The Princess Dowager of Wales gave another £100, a Mr. Dawkins gave £50, the Duke of Newcastle, Mr. Pitt, and several of the Oxford colleges, various sums. The long list of these and of the parish contributions that was duly sent home and still lies among the College papers testifies to the widespread interest and willingness to subscribe even in small sums to the distant colonial colleges whose claims were put with so much force and ingenuity by its Provost and his colleague. Among subscribers are Baptist and Methodist congregations, but no Quaker meetings, doubtless a reflection of the contests in the far-off colony. Mr. Garrick offered the free use of Drury Lane Theatre for an evening, and Beard of Covent Garden, with a group of his performers and the boys from the Royal Chapel, volunteered to give a benefit oratorio. The opening of Vauxhall for the season was postponed so as not to interfere with this performance. Of course Dr. Smith had the usual experience with wealthy prospective givers, finding that they were "so harassed with an infinity of appeals" that even after an introduction had been obtained they had to be visited "twenty times" before a gift was actually secured.

As the collection proceeded a more subtle difficulty arose. In the original discussion concerning an appeal to England it had been the hope of the Trustees, indeed their expressed intention, though it was not mentioned in Dr. Smith's instructions or in his own public appeal for funds, that the sums collected should be an endowment, the income of which, with the fees of the students, would pay the regular expenses of the College. This intention was seized upon by the managers of the brief and insisted upon by the authorities in England on all occasions, and Dr. Smith accepted it. On the other hand the College Trustees, confronted with an empty treasury, harried by debts, burdened with the building costs of the new dormitory and subjected to the delays of distance and procrastination, showed signs of an intention to use the proceeds of the collection, as they came in, for immediate purposes. A year after Dr. Smith's departure they wrote him describing their bad financial condition, complaining of the slow returns from the last lottery, and asking him how
much they might draw and how soon from his collections. Dr.
Smith's reminder that the money he is collecting is only to be
used "to raise a capital" they resent, with virtuous indignation
that they should be accused of failing to keep their promise,
and they declare that the £1,500 they have up to this time re-
ceived has been duly lent on bond and mortgage at six per cent.
But the suspicion of the English donors evidently still continues,
for a dozen letters of reminder and defense are sent to and fro,
and Dr. Smith complains that he has a difficult part to play be-
tween the Trustees and those with whom he is working in Eng-
land. Thomas Penn writes in April 1764, shortly before Smith's
return, that the £500 subscribed by the Proprietaries, as well
as all other sums collected in England, should "be secured so as
always to remain a fund the interest of which only, or the prod-
ue of land purchased with that money, may be applied to the
support of the College." The issue came to be confused with
the question whether or not new buildings were to be considered
an investment in this sense, and remained long unsettled. In
1778 the Trustees declared that the principal donors were satis-
fied with the methods that were taken to lay out and preserve
the money, but long afterwards the Trustees still found it neces-
sary to insist that "Dr. Smith's collection had been treated as a
capital fund." There were suspicions in Pennsylvania, probably
quite unjustifiable, that the English church authorities were
planning to use their money power to alter the non-sectarian
character of the College.

The division of the collections with Jay through the brief gave
to each of the participants £5,936. 10s. 6d., a quite unprece-
dented sum to be derived from such a source. With the special
gifts, the total product of Dr. Smith's campaign in England
amounted to £6,921. 7s. 6d. sterling, about £12,000 Pennsyl-
vania currency. There were some necessary deductions, and it
was long before the accounts were all cleared up. This was
by far the largest sum received by the College at any one time,
a considerably greater amount than that obtained from the series
of lotteries between 1757 and 1764. Successful as the collection
was, however, in the estimation of the time and in later tradition,
it may be doubted whether in the long run it was a benefit to
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the College. It bound more firmly the bonds that connected the College with the Proprietors and therefore with the Proprietary party in Pennsylvania; it drew it closer to England and so weakened it for the day when loyalty to the Crown was to become disloyalty to the new state and nation. Franklin is said to have expressed the opinion that the College could have secured sufficient support in Pennsylvania if it had not been so subservient to the Proprietors. Nor did the product of the collection relieve the institution from its necessities, for the years immediately following Dr. Smith's return in 1764 were apparently no less years of scarcity than those that had preceded them, and one of the criticisms made of the College fifteen years later was its hopeless financial condition. If the £12,000 reported by Dr. Smith could have been kept intact and safely invested at the prevailing rate of six per cent interest it would have just covered the annual deficit in running expenses as reported by the Trustees in 1760, but neither of these conditions, prompt investment or safety, was an actuality.

The plan of seeking support from other parts of the British Empire had, nevertheless, shown its possibilities. There were close commercial and social relations between Philadelphia and Charleston, the wealthiest city of the South, where Franklin had established one of his branch printing houses. These relations were made the basis of a collecting trip by Dr. Smith in 1771. The initial obstacle of an empty College treasury was overcome by a loan of £50 from one of the Trustees to meet the Provost's expenses on the trip. Unexpected difficulties disclosed themselves on his arrival. One was that the South Carolinians had at the time a proposal before their Provincial Council to establish a college of their own. Their plan was to put up the buildings by private subscription and provide for salaries and other running expenses by a tax. People in Charleston assured him that they "love Philadelphia as a place they have chief connection with on this continent," and if there had been any great catastrophe there or had the College been burnt or blown down they would be the most benevolent of neighbors; but they could not see the propriety of giving away money to another place which they wanted to use for the same purpose for themselves. Their plan
for a college did not as a matter of fact materialize; if it had, it would have been the pioneer of all the state universities, which have usually been established on a similar half-private, half-public basis. The Provost also discovered, to his surprise, that he had come at the wrong season of the year. The South Carolina aristocracy gathered at Charleston in the summer. In November, December, and January, when he was there, they were scattered on their country estates. Nevertheless he was well received. He was soon able to report that he had collected £700 sterling, and in February took home with him, mostly in commercial bills of exchange, more than £1,000 colonial currency.

The West Indies were the wealthiest part of the Empire, and with them also Philadelphia was in constant contact. Vessels arriving from or clearing for Jamaica, Barbadoes, St. Kitts and elsewhere were reported in every issue of the city newspapers. Evidence of an interest in the Philadelphia institution is found in a letter from Antigua dated 1756, making inquiry about the College from a gentleman of that place who plans to send his two sons there. "From the character he has heard of" the Philadelphia Academy he considers it "much preferable to the English schools as he believes they will be brought on faster and not learn the vices that our young Creoles bring with them from England." ¹ It may have been knowledge of such an attitude in the West Indies which, soon after Dr. Smith's return from North Carolina, led the Trustees to seek a representative who might make a journey to the islands to collect funds. They found him in Dr. John Morgan, the restless founder of the medical courses of the College, who informed them that he was willing to make the trip. From Jamaica, his first port of call, he sent back a surprising proposal. This was that the Trustees should dispose of their old group of buildings and start a new college. He had found much interest in the recently founded medical courses, and some of the donors asked especially to have their subscriptions used for that school. He was sure he could obtain larger sums of money for a new and larger institution. The Trustees replied declaring that they felt themselves bound by their announced use of such funds as should be collected to carry on the

present foundation both in a material and a scholarly sense. Morgan wrote that he had hardly expected them to approve the plan. The proposal was thereupon dropped. The collection was proceeding reasonably well when, in the fall of 1772, a typical Caribbean hurricane swept through the West Indies, sparing Jamaica, it is true, but causing such losses through the other islands that the Trustees called Dr. Morgan home as soon as he could find passage, considering it improper to solicit funds from a community whose losses had been so great that they were themselves forced to ask for aid. Nevertheless Dr. Morgan was able to bring back with him when he returned in 1773 some £860.

The Trustees of this period showed an unwonted confidence in local generosity, for at the time they sent Morgan to the West Indies, they also appointed a committee to solicit funds in Philadelphia itself, and an appeal for the purpose was inserted in the newspapers. This action may have been suggested by the receipt of £100 in March 1772 from a Philadelphia merchant, Thomas Robeson, one of the few individual gifts received after the first subscriptions.

Some of the fresh funds were spent in 1771 in building a handsome wall around the College grounds, with an iron gate, to correspond to those which still give protection and entrance to the adjoining graveyard. The next year £320 of the £1,000 Dr. Smith had collected in South Carolina was devoted to the already mentioned purchase of two houses for the use of masters. Another part was invested in some lands and mills known as "Norriton," taking their name, as did the neighboring village of Norristown, from Isaac Norris, an extensive landowner in that neighborhood.

There was another piece of property which wanders like a wraith through fifty years and more of the history of the College and University. When Dr. Smith returned from his English trip in 1758 he brought back with him, as a gift from Thomas Penn, a deed for one-quarter of the Manor of Perkasie. The Penn family, it will be remembered, were not only the governors of Pennsylvania, they were by grant of the Crown owners of its soil. It was part of their land policy to reserve from immediate sale certain large tracts to be disposed of at a later time. These were
the so-called "manors," though no judicial organization was given them and they remained mere tracts of land to be sold or rented as occasion offered. By bequest and subdivision among the sons of William Penn, the ownership of one-quarter of Perkasie, containing about 2,500 acres, had fallen to Thomas Penn. It was a pleasant farming region in Berks County, some thirty miles from Philadelphia, through which the Perkiomen Creek still winds its tree-bordered way. Of this Penn in 1758 made a gift to the College, at the same time discontinuing the £50 annual allowance he had made since the grant of the first charter. It was not an unrestricted gift, for when the Trustees sent two of their members up to examine it and they advised that it be sold and the money invested in some other way, Penn objected and insisted on its retention. Familiar as he was with the unearned increment on land that had enriched the Cambridge and Oxford colleges, the London gilds and other English corporations, he conceived, naturally, of the same possibility in Pennsylvania. Yet considered as an investment it was at that time a doubtful asset. The arrival of British troops in the province on their way to the frontier, where the French and Indian War was in progress, had made money plentiful; if sold at once the tract might sell for £3,000, which invested would bring in more than three times the annual grant of £50 which it superseded; if retained as an investment by the College it was likely to be, as proved to be the case, a source of constant trouble. The Penns continued their opposition to its sale for two generations. It remained in the hands of the Trustees for more than fifty years; almost a hundred entries on their minutes are devoted to the troubles of Perkasie Manor from squatters, mortgages in arrears and foreclosed, unpaid rents and broken leases, which testify to the disappointment and the time lost in administering an unprofitable possession. In 1778 the income from it was but £134. 5s. in depreciated colonial currency.

In the year 1778 a formal statement of the financial affairs of the Academy and College was demanded by the Provincial Assembly. It was an unfortunate moment, when the depreciation of the currency due to the war was already bearing hard on all bodies with fixed incomes. Many of the mortgages held by the
College had recently been paid off in the depreciated money, and it was difficult to reinvest it safely. In any case the financial record of the College was a poor one. After some fifty years of corporate existence it could show, as real estate, only the group of College buildings, dwellings, and dormitories, and some properties rented but bringing in only some £225 a year, against which were ground rents of £64; the Manor of Perkasie, which, as stated above, was supposed to bring in £134 a year, and the Norristown land and mills which were rented for five hundred bushels of wheat a year. Money at interest was scarcely over £5,000, bringing in £300; the tuition from the students was estimated at £2,000 annually, and for the last three years about £1,200 a year had been paid or promised as contributions. The College was not bankrupt, but its finances were far from that hoped-for and always receding state when its income from investments would, along with the students' fees, cover its expenses. Instead it closed its colonial history with a deficit.

THE CURRICULUM

It is often forgotten in college histories that the object of a college is to educate its students. The author of this work does not wish to become so involved in origins and buildings and finances and other matters of antiquarian interest that he fails to give the history of education at Pennsylvania. Yet its records are singularly scanty. We know more about what went on elsewhere than about what went on in the classrooms. We hear more about all the other activities of Trustees, professors, and students than about the scholastic equipment provided, the textbooks they used, the lectures they gave or listened to, the books they read, what, if anything, the students actually learned. The story has to be put together from quite inadequate material. Even the nomenclature of academic life in the eighteenth century is remote and confused and the picture blurred. The College was a three years' course of advanced studies, making up the "Philosophical School," superimposed upon a group of other "schools" making up the Academy. A "school" was primarily a room in which a master or professor of a given subject and his assistants,
when he had any, taught the students who were enrolled in his “school” and such students as were sent to him for instruction from other “schools.” The students were always listed separately in one or other of the “schools.” A list in 1757 names twelve students in the Philosophical School, that is to say in the College, sixty in the Latin School, thirty-one in the English School, and twenty-two in the Mathematical School. A somewhat later list gives thirty-three in the Philosophical School, twenty-one in the Latin School, twenty-six in the English School, and forty-six in the Mathematical School. There were besides, the Writing School, and, occasionally and for various periods, schools for the modern languages, for drawing, for natural history and for other subjects; and there were of course the Boys’ and Girls’ Charity or Free Schools.

A school was, as has been said, a room. The Trustees order that a stove be placed in each school, that the schools be swept out regularly, that the students of other schools go by some regular arrangement to the Writing School for instruction in penmanship; they lend the Latin School to a Mr. Prefontaine to teach French. This is the sense in which the term is used for the Divinity Schools at Oxford, the rooms in which examinations are held. When the Trustees adjourn a meeting to visit the Philosophical School or the English School or the Writing School, they gather in that room to observe the teaching or the physical condition of the school or perhaps to look over the students’ notebooks in the subject taught there, or to listen to their recitations. One of the early Trustees speaks of the institution as “a collection of schools under one roof and the inspection of the Trustees,” and at another time as “this academical collection of schools.”

The word, however, gradually loses this material sense and becomes synonymous with department or field of study, as we still speak of the Law School, the Medical School, or the Wharton School, though each may have a number not only of rooms but of buildings and a score or more of professors. It was in the Philosophical School in the former sense that the College led its existence, for it was in Dr. Smith’s room in the early days that the older students gathered, were enrolled and were instructed
by him and his assistants in philosophy and in their other higher subjects of study. They received their classical and mathematical instruction in the respective schools or rooms devoted to those subjects or, in some cases, in their own by visiting masters from the other schools. It is with this Philosophical School or department that we have specially to deal, for it was the College and it was by accretions to it that the University came into being.

Except for the inseparable admixture of the affairs of Academy and College during colonial times and for some time afterward, our attention might be directed solely to the Philosophical School and its development; but for the sake of clarity a few words must first be given to the schools below the College, that is, to the Academy. The Latin or Classical or Grammar School, for it was called by all these terms indiscriminately, and the English School were rivals from the beginning. The former hardly represented the ideas of Franklin, so deeply was it modified by his concessions to his classically educated colleagues; the latter represented ideas more purely his own. The Latin School became, under the influence of the Provost, its successive masters and tutors, and with the sympathy of the most influential Trustees, more and more completely a classical course. It was under the general charge of Dr. Alison, the Vice-Provost, until increasing duties in the College demanded all his time. After this two successive professors of Latin, John Beveridge till 1768, and James Davidson till 1779, with one or more tutors, taught the school and gave some assistance in the classics to students in the College.

The tutors or ushers in the Latin School were of more than passing interest. They were usually well qualified; according to the observation of one of their pupils, Alexander Graydon, often better fitted for their work than the master of the school. They showed, however, a strong tendency to abandon their laborious work and exiguous salary for better positions as schoolmasters or to become clergymen or to study law or to turn to "other business," as one of them expresses it. They were apt to be recent graduates of the College or even students in their senior year. The very earliest of these tutors, serving from the beginning to 1755, was Charles Thomson, the lifelong friend and correspondent of Franklin, Secretary of Congress from 1774 to the end of
the war, and of the Constitutional Convention of 1787. He became a well-known literary personage in Philadelphia, and in his old age made a complete translation of the Bible. Another destined to greatness was James Wilson, the later Justice. Others attained local prominence: Jacob Duché, as Rector of Christ Church and Chaplain of Congress, and others.

Of the two successive masters, Beveridge was a Scotchman with a strong accent, who had taught school in Edinburgh and in Wales before coming to this country, a good Latinist in prose and verse, but a poor disciplinarian; quick with the rattan and ferule, undignified in manner, and unable apparently to gain either the respect or the affection of his pupils. As there were at one time eighty-four boys in his school, with but one tutor, disorder was inevitable. In 1762 he appealed to the Trustees, saying that his difficulties were largely due to two causes: one that there were no rules for the government of his school, the other that no proper Latin grammar book was available. Two members of the Board were thereupon appointed to arrange with the Faculty for the choice of a Latin grammar and its publication. It was an unfortunate experiment. Whittenhall's Latin Grammar was chosen as the basis of the new book with alterations and additions arranged by Mr. Peters of the Trustees and Professor Beveridge himself. An edition of five hundred copies was produced by a local printer. The book was, however, so full of typographical errors that a devoted but fun-loving alumnus, Francis Hopkinson, whose name has appeared and will appear in many connections in this work, published Errata, or the Art of Printing Incorrectly, which purported to be a key to the Grammar, pointing out 151 blunders in 137 pages and claiming sarcastically that Errata was a specimen of a new kind of literature.

Professor Davidson's career was more successful if less picturesque than that of his predecessor, and carries the history of his school down to and indeed beyond the Revolution. The Latin School became practically a classical school preparing for entrance to the College, much like the Boston Latin School and other contemporary schools of the same type. It provided most of the recruits for the College, though of course many entered
from other places. One of the few intimate glimpses we get of the Latin School, apart from the usual stories of schoolboy mischief, is far from inspiring; as it comes from one who was himself dissatisfied, it may be unfair. Alexander Graydon, who was fourteen when he left, says of the latter part of his time there,

We were to a great degree impatient of the restraints of a school. . . . One boy thought he had Latin enough, as he was not designed for a learned profession. . . . Another was of opinion that he might be much better employed in a counting house . . . he cheerfully renounced the learned professions for the sake of the supposed liberty that would be the consequence. We were all, therefore, to be merchants, as to be mechanics would be too humiliating, and accordingly when the question was proposed which of us would enter upon the study of Greek, the grammar of which tongue was about to be put into our hands, there were but two or three who declared for it . . . I was thoroughly tired of books and confinement.

Notwithstanding his mother's advice and even entreaties Graydon refused to go on into the College, "to my lasting regret." Many boys spent some time at the Academy and then, like Graydon, left before entering college classes. Of several of those usually counted "Pennsylvania men," this is true. The lines between school and college and between college years were less clearly marked than now. A boy who did pass on to the higher grade, "Neddy" Burd of Lancaster, writing April 28, 1765, describes his alarm at being summoned according to the custom of the time to be examined for promotion before the Trustees. "We were conducted to the Electricity room, where the Rev. Mr. Duché, Mr. Stedman, Dr. Alison, & Mr. Beveridge were assembled . . . we were examined in Horace & lastly in Homer." After some further formalities they are the next day informed that "On account of your yesterday's extraordinary performance ye are admitted into Colledge." He evidently matured rapidly under college conditions, because but two years later he is giving his opinions on the theatre, dancing, and the races; he is fonder of Mr. Allyn than Mr. Hallam although the common opinion places the latter higher, and he tells his sister that his friend Jemmy Willing (they are both sixteen) is "almost tired" of the Assembly "because the Girls are so little."
Of the two lower schools the Latin School was undoubtedly the favored child of the Trustees; the English School but their stepchild. Even more distinctly than the Latin School it lay below the College; it was merely a branch of the Academy. Yet it represented not only the original ideas of Franklin, as expressed in his *Idea of an English School* of 1750 but, with some extensions, what he would willingly have had the whole College—a high-grade training school for citizenship, based on studies in the English language. But, as he tells us, he was outvoted in the Board of Trustees, and it remained a mere dependency, undervalued by most of them, while Franklin himself, absent in Europe almost continuously after 1757, was not in a position to insist on its proper support and the encouragement it needed.

At the outset of the career of the English School the Trustees were met by a problem that has faced them many times since, what to do about a member of the Faculty of undoubted ability, usefulness, and popularity, who would not conform to their requirements. There had arrived in Philadelphia from England, in 1750, where he had long kept a school at Chichester in Sussex, a man of parts, David James Dove. Hearing of the Academy just being formed he offered himself as head of the English School. He was appointed, at first on trial, then permanently, though with a salary of only £150 a year, whereas the head of the Latin School received £200, a discrimination which was characteristic and of which Franklin long afterward complained. Dove was a great success. He had a certain knack of teaching, reading a well-selected piece of good English literature with the greatest care as to pronunciation and emphasis, then requiring each pupil in turn to imitate his manner of reading. Parents of the boys came to hear their children perform, and he soon had ninety pupils in the school and was granted two assistants.

Poorly paid and of restless activity, he opened, in addition to his work at the Academy, a girls' school, at first apparently in one of the rooms in the New Building, afterwards in his own house. It soon appeared that he was leaving the Academy in the morning at eleven and in the afternoon at four. The Trustees insisted that he give the Academy its full hours. Each side was firm, so in 1753 he resigned and opened a private school for boys
and girls in Vidal's Alley, a popular location for private schools. The Trustees never again found so good a teacher. Later he taught in the newly opened Germantown Academy, but had somewhat similar differences with its trustees, so again resigned and built and opened in the neighborhood a school of his own where he took boarding as well as day scholars. He had—unusual for a schoolmaster—a flair for making good investments, and as a speculation bought ground and built two small houses on Fourth Street south of the Academy. Years afterward the Trustees felt themselves, as already told, obliged to buy these houses at the high price he demanded. He also took an active part in the political conflicts of the day, as will later appear.

Dove's successor was Franklin's neighbor and friend Ebenezer Kinnersley, a local schoolmaster, a Baptist clergyman, "a large, venerable looking man," as one of his pupils describes him, a native of Gloucester, England, who had come as a child with his father to Pennsylvania. He was self-educated, or at least home-educated, but intelligent and well read. He became interested, like so many ingenious men of the time, in electricity, lectured on its phenomena in Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and Newport, and is much better known as a colleague and correspondent, perhaps a rival, of Franklin in this field than as a teacher of the English language. Though his title was Professor of English it was on the ground of his scientific acquirements that he was given the honorary degree of M.A. by the College in 1757 and was elected to the American Philosophical Society in 1758. His suggestion that houses might be protected from lightning by iron rods and Franklin's experiment with the kite were only three months apart, in March and June respectively of the year 1752.

There is no evidence of any jealous feeling between them. Franklin's eminence in other respects and his many opportunities for publication gave disproportionate prominence to his discoveries, and the cudgels have been taken up for Kinnersley by various champions of the priority of his observations. But he himself wrote a letter to the newspapers protesting against the charges of unfairness brought against Franklin. Kinnersley made a valuable collection of electrical instruments, "perhaps
equal to any apparatus of the kind in the world,” according to David Rittenhouse, a good judge, which it will be remembered the College bought from his widow. Whether because of his ill health or other interests, or lack of energy, or, as Franklin believed, of the systematic neglect of the English School by the Trustees and the diversion of his work from that school to the teaching of English in the Latin School and the College, the English School certainly did not flourish under his direction. It dragged along with but few students and little recognition. The early interest of the community in its public exercises and demonstrations of the “elegances of the English language,” followed by the complaints of parents that these were suspended and that their sons were not being taught what had been promised made the condition of the school a frequent subject of discussion and half-hearted attempts at reform. In 1769 it was seriously proposed by the Trustees to discontinue it, but on examination of their charters and constitution they found they were unable to do so.

Professor Kinnersley's health became more and more insecure, and although two assistants were provided for him in 1768, at £25 each per annum “to be paid out of a fund to be raised by some public performance for the benefit of the College,” yet in 1773 his resignation was accepted and his death followed five years later. His widow was allowed to occupy their rooms in the dormitory rent-free for six months.

Arrangements were made for James Wilson, the future jurist, already, as has been noted, a tutor in the Latin School, to take temporary charge of the English School at an additional salary of £60. In 1779 the Trustees loaned the English School for a few weeks to the managers of the state lottery of that year, the English scholars being taught in the Latin School till their numbers proved to be so great that there was no room for the intruders and the managers of the lottery had to be asked to vacate. Later in that year John Heffernan was engaged to take charge of the English, Mathematical, and Writing schools. But the end of the English School, as of the rest of the College and Academy in their colonial form, was then approaching and no arrangements were permanent.
The Mathematical School owed its prominence to the large part that subject played in the curriculum of the College, to the general interest of the time in mathematics, pure and applied, and in allied subjects, and to the excellence of its masters. The first in the series was Theophilus Grew, a well-known city schoolmaster, who had attracted attention by publishing a description of the approaching eclipse of the sun. He was elected Mathematical Professor in 1750 and remained master of the school, giving instruction also in the College, for nine years. He wrote a textbook on the Use of the Globe for the use of students in the Academy and College. He was known in the city and took an active part in its scientific interests. Students were in early times separately enrolled in this as in the Latin and English schools; in 1757 there were twenty-two and in 1760 there were twenty, but later it was joined sometimes with the English, sometimes with the Writing School without a group of students of its own. Hugh Williamson of the first graduating class spent three years of his varied and distinguished career as teacher, clergyman, physician, astronomer, scientist, and participant in most of the events of the Revolution, acting as master of the Mathematical School. In fact the elementary and pure mathematics taught in this school merged so readily into the "natural philosophy" beloved of Dr. Smith, into the electricity of Kinnersley and the applied mathematics of such a genius as Rittenhouse or Godfrey and later of Patterson that there was a general flavor of mathematics about the institution quite apart from the formal requirements, though even these were accentuated in the college curriculum.¹

The Writing School was subsidiary, though the Trustees paid much attention to good chirography. No scholars were separately entered in this school; it was little more than the room to which students from other schools went to be trained in penmanship. There were occasionally an independent writing master and tutors, though for most of the time the school was in charge of a professor and tutors properly belonging to other schools. One of the tutors in the English School, as has been remarked, was

¹ Florian Cajori, The Teaching and History of Mathematics in the United States, pp. 36–42.
detailed to use his early morning and after-school hours in making quill pens for use in the Writing School.

We turn at last to the teaching in the College. The activity of Dr. Smith must be recalled to mind. His restlessness, vigor, distinctive personality, and ideas have already come repeatedly into this story and will continue to do so as long as it deals with the colonial College. The Provost and the College were indistinguishable. His colleague, Vice-Provost Alison, was, although less conspicuous, scarcely less influential in the internal affairs of the institution. His career was not dissimilar to that of the Provost. Like him he was a Scotchman, or at least an Ulster Scotch-Irishman; he was educated first in Donegal, later at the University of Glasgow. He came to America as a young man of thirty as tutor in the family of a man of position in Maryland, was ordained a Presbyterian minister and became preacher and schoolmaster at New London, Pennsylvania. His school, partly supported by the Presbyterian Church, became famous for the later prominence of its pupils. They included three signers of the Declaration of Independence, besides Charles Thomson, whose career has already been described, Dr. Ewing of Princeton and Philadelphia, James Latta and Hugh Williamson, both later prominent in the history of the University, the state, and the nation.

Alison was one of those local schoolmasters from whom the earliest Faculty of the Academy was recruited, and when its full-fledged College charter was given he was named Vice-Provost and Professor of the Higher Classics, Logic, Metaphysics and Geography. When the multifarious possibilities under this title did not occupy him sufficiently he was authorized by the Trustees to lecture on “any other of the Arts and Sciences that he may judge himself qualified to teach.” When Dr. Smith taught the subjects enumerated above, Dr. Alison might use the surplus of his time to teach Latin and Greek in the Grammar School. He was, incidentally, assistant minister of the influential First Presbyterian Church. He was a good scholar and was given the honorary degree of M.A. by Yale in 1755 and Princeton in 1756, and D.D. by Glasgow, his own university, in 1758. He took as much part in Presbyterian as Dr. Smith did in Episcopal affairs, and visited
more than once both New and Old England. He spent twenty-seven years in the service of the College and died in 1779. He is said to have had an easily aroused but readily placated temper, and he left a kindly impression on a whole generation of students.

It was not to be supposed that Provost Smith, brimful of ideas of what a college education ought to be, now provided with material on which to work and aided by an enlightened and sympathetic colleague, would neglect this opportunity to organize an ideal college course. He had already, while a young man in Scotland, been occupied in devising plans for the better education and more liberal payment of parish schoolmasters. The year 1753, when he was in England and Scotland for ordination, was the year of the introduction of the "New Regulations" of King's College in the University of Aberdeen, his old university, and he may readily have seen a transcript of these when there; a manuscript copy is now in the University of Pennsylvania Library. He had scarcely landed in the New World when he wrote and published in a New York newspaper an essay on education, and the next year, 1753, he drew up and published "at the desire of some gentlemen of New York who were appointed to receive proposals relative to the establishment of a college in that province" his Idea of the College of Mirania already adverted to. When this had been exchanged with Franklin for his Idea of an English School and Proposals, his election to the Academy and College in Philadelphia soon followed.

It was a day of college planning. The advertisement in the New York Gazette, May 1754, of the opening of the New York College, according to what Dr. Smith calls "Dr. Johnson's odd plan" showed, it is true, little effect of the suggestions made the year before by the author of the College of Mirania, and was somewhat vague. It was nevertheless a formal declaration of what things a college should teach. President Burr of Princeton was to issue a more general statement of educational policy in 1764, only a decade later. The Scheme of a Liberal Education of Dr. Smith of 1754 was the most notable of these plans. Although it is attributed to the Faculty and was, no doubt, approved by his colleagues, it echoes the voice of the Provost. Indeed, in addition to being spread in full on the Trustees' minutes and
published at their request in the Philadelphia Gazette, three months later, and in the American Magazine in 1758, it was published by Dr. Smith in England in the volume of his Discourses.

The English School and the other more practical schools are not mentioned in the Scheme, not being considered parts of a liberal education, but a curriculum for the Latin School, preparatory to the College, was an essential part of the plan. This preparatory course was intended for boys from nine or ten to fourteen or fifteen. It consists entirely of Latin and a little Greek, except for some geography and chronology in the third year, arithmetic begun late in the last year, training in penmanship and “Writing and Reading of English to be continued if necessary”; “continued” presumably beyond what they had learned in a still more elementary school, or at home. This preparatory course might take three, four, or five years.

It is the content and the organization of the College course proper, however, that gives this plan its significance. It was the earliest systematic arrangement, in America, of a group of college studies not following medieval tradition and not having a specifically religious object. It corresponds in originality, though far removed in ideal, to Franklin's stillborn conception of a purely English college education. Although professedly introduced as an experiment to be tried for three years, it remained the curriculum of the College through the whole colonial period, and indeed until far into the nineteenth century. It was a three-year course, the students being ranked successively as freshmen, juniors, and seniors: a sophomore year was insinuated into the course only long afterward. There were three terms in each college year.

Latin and Greek, of course, continued through the whole course, all afternoons being devoted to the reading of classic authors; some twenty being named, with variations allowed for. They ranged from Horace and Juvenal to Longinus and Grotius' De Jure Belli et Pacis. As the last-named work suggests, there was an attempt to arrange the authors not only in the order of the difficulty of their language but of the maturity required to understand them and the applicability of the matter with which they
deal to the general course. As Dr. Smith says in his explanation, the students

. . . shall never drop their acquaintance with the classic sages. They are every day called to converse with some one of the ancients who at the same time that he charms with all the beauties of his language is generally illustrating that particular branch of philosophy or science to which the other hours of the day are devoted.

However impracticable such an ideal may be, as every experienced teacher knows, the effort to make the course a unit is none the less evident and laudable. With this object in view the first half of the college course is devoted to what the author of the scheme calls "Instrumental Philosophy," suited to strengthening the mental faculties which will be used in the latter part of the course. The student is "to be led through a scale of easy ascent till finally rendered capable of Thinking, Writing and Acting well, which is the grand aim of a liberal education"—an absolutely impeccable aspiration.

Mathematics and natural science are notably prominent in the course, occupying all the later morning hours, and the earlier morning hours of at least one teacher. Just as one-third of the college course was devoted to the classics, so another third was devoted to mathematics and science. The former included geometry, trigonometry, and conic sections, the latter physics, astronomy, chemistry, botany, and zoology. The remaining third of the student's time was devoted to logic, ethics, metaphysics, and training in oratory. As opportunity offered, provision was made for declamation, disputation, and oration, forms of training approved alike by Franklin and Smith. Of course the study of the large subjects named in the Scheme must have touched only their high points. "Surveying and dialling, navigation, conic sections and fluxions," to be treated in thirty lectures, and astronomy, the natural history of vegetables and animals, and "chemistry, fossils and agriculture" all given in one hour daily in senior year, can have been little more than a series of definitions.

We have indeed Dr. Smith's own testimony to the amount of time that should be given to these several subjects. Mr. Martin,
who had brought him to America as tutor to his two sons, now pupils in the College, was in 1754 planning to transfer the boys to King’s College about to be opened in New York, so that they might be nearer home. In July Dr. Smith wrote in protest. He says they have already begun moral philosophy and would finish it in October; from October to February or March they would read critically some ancient writers on rhetoric, with English imitations of the works of the great Greek and Roman orators. In the spring, for five or six weeks they would be shown experiments in natural philosophy, that is to say in physics, and the summer they would spend on the “Elements of civil Law, the reading of History and the study of the Ends and Uses of Society, the different Forms of Government, etc. etc.” During all this time they would regularly spend two hours every day with mathematics, and they would also read Greek and Latin “during proper hours.” Thus all that these college students were to have in the way of instruction in advanced mathematics, physics, history, politics, economics, and public law, with a running accompaniment of steady reading of the classics and exercises in the preparation of set orations, would fall within the space of fifteen months.

The Faculty were careful to point out that this curriculum was subject to modification according to “Sentiments of men of learning,” and that its principal value would be as a foundation for study and reading, subsequent to graduation, for which presumably it would have given the students a liking. To encourage such “manly perseverance in private study” the proposed curriculum was accompanied by an extensive list of the most serious authors in each field. The list, however unlikely to be followed by the generality of college graduates, is no mean testimony to eighteenth-century knowledge and its accessibility in a distant provincial capital. A considerable number of the books listed were already in the College library, and some of the very copies they used are still standing on the shelves among the host of subsequent acquisitions.

The authors of the curriculum acknowledge their doubt concerning its completion in so short a period as three years, but believe it can be mastered in that time by “a middling genius,
with ordinary application"; and state the conviction, so con-
stantly reached anew by their successors, that where both applica-
tion and genius are wanting, "no time will be found sufficient" for a college education. Local conditions had also to be recog-
nized. In the provinces, according to Dr. Smith, genius seems to be sooner ripe, also "a more easy settlement and opportunities for genteel employment are more available for young men of parts than in European countries. They will therefore be more im-
patient to complete their courses, and unwilling to spend more than three years in college study. In this curriculum the College was evidently striving to free itself from mere tradition. True to the circumstances of the origin of the College, it was quite free from sectarianism and indeed from any form of theological limitation. It paid more than usual respect to mathematics and gave its students at least a glimpse of contemporary physical and natural science, and even of those subjects which have been later grouped as the social sciences.

Notwithstanding this modern character, the curriculum of this, like other contemporary colleges, showed more than a trace of that scholasticism which has been through the centuries the subject of so much praise and so much blame, and is due now in some directions for a revival. Among the eighteenth-century archives of this and the other colonial colleges are to be found a somewhat puzzling series of printed sheets. They are usually "broadsides," of twenty by twenty-five inches, evidently intended to be handed around among the audience at Commencement along with the regular Commencement programs. They are worded much alike, whether printed and used at Philadelphia, Yale, Harvard, Brown, or Princeton, each of these institutions having a more or less extended series. Those of Pennsylvania are for the years 1761, 1762, and 1763. Brown has thirty, Princeton four. They are in Latin, dedicated in the names of the members of the graduating class to the civil authorities, at Philadelphia in 1763, to Thomas and Richard Penn, Governor Hamilton, and the Trustees, Provost, Vice-Provost, and professors, all by name and with many expressions of respect. The main body of each paper is a series of propositions, statements, or theses, classified under various academic heads—metaphysics, ethics, mathema-
tics, grammar, and others—which presumably the graduating students were willing to defend against any assertions to the contrary. The similarity among these documents points toward a common origin, and this is obviously to be found in the practice of medieval universities. The *trivium* and *quadriovium* are clearly reflected in the classification under seven main heads of the ninety statements that the nine prospective graduates at Pennsylvania at the Commencement of 1763 announced themselves as ready to defend. The same is true of the sixty-three theses arranged under nine groups which the nine graduates of Princeton of the class of 1751 announce themselves as ready to prove. As to subject they range all the way from "All the perfections of God are essentials of his nature" to "The rights of the people are as divine as those of their rulers," which last was surely a good proposition to defend in preparation for the Declaration of Independence which was to come so few years later. On the whole, however, the theses were statements that had been discussed a thousand times before, and some of them for a thousand years and more.

It is obvious that these Latin discussions or proposed discussions are to be grouped with the degrees, the hoods, the processions, and the use of Latin itself as among the practices that even yet mark colleges and universities as the most conservative institutions in modern society, so far at least as concerns outward forms. How far were these offers to debate in Latin, against opponents using the same language, made by the boys of fourteen to eighteen who were getting their A.B. degrees, genuinely representative of their abilities, their interests and their training; how far were they only a "solemn farce," as a later Provost, in a moment of vexation, called the public examination of the students which was required by the statutes? The answer must depend on the critical habits of mind of the reader. It is to be remembered, however, that the students had given more than one-third of their school and college time to the reading of Latin and Greek authors, that they had heard frequent lectures on the classics and on classical subjects by the Provost and Vice-Provost during their last two years. As to discussion, stress was constantly laid upon the practice of disputation. The Commencement pro-
grams frequently announce "forensic disputations" in Latin between two or more of the graduating class. "Scholasticism" may have occupied an appreciably large part of the student's course.

On the other hand it is quite possible that such Latin speech as was used at Commencement may have been, as the Greek and Latin salutatories were long afterward, carefully written out beforehand, corrected and reconstructed under the eye of the professors, and committed to memory by the students concerned. The preparation of English Commencement addresses by some one other than the one who delivered them was, as we know, only too familiar.¹

Such, with all their internal and external limitations, were the educational ideals and plan of the College. How far they achieved their object there is no way of testing. There is none in our own time. Education is largely a matter of faith. Many excellent men, however, graduated from the colonial College, and we can only believe that the curriculum followed was conducive to the clear thinking, informed judgment, and convincing speech that were unusually widespread in later colonial and early national Philadelphia.

**COLLEGE LIFE**

A considerable part of college life presumably consisted in studying textbooks, listening to lectures, and reading. Another part consisted in the individual and group social life of the students, with the traditional merrymaking, mischief, and, for some of the older among them, dissipation. But there was another side of college life especially characteristic of provincial Philadelphia. This was the frequent appearance of the students before the general public. Provost Smith had no mean powers as a showman, and from the very beginning of his administration he took every occasion possible to exhibit to the admiring citizens of Philadelphia and visitors to the city the abilities of his students in oratory, debating, plays, and other means of entertaining an audience.

When the Academy was advanced to the status of a college

¹ This subject has been studied and more favorable conclusions reached by James J. Walsh, *Education of the Founding Fathers*, N.Y., 1933.
the great hall which formerly provided only for the seating of graduates, Faculty, Trustees, and guests of honor was altered to accommodate considerable gatherings of the general public. From that time forward there was seldom a period of many weeks or months without some function. Audiences were always available, and they were often of distinguished composition. Social opportunities in colonial times were none too numerous; so these academic occasions were gatherings of the wealth, distinction, and even fashion of the city. They were "a crowded audience," "a learned, polite and very brilliant Assembly," "Every part of the public Hall was crowded with Spectators," "a vast concourse of people of all Ranks." Such are contemporary newspaper reports. There is mention of the attendance of notable persons. "The Honorable the Governor, several officers of the Army, a great many Gentlemen of this and the other Colonies and a number of Ladies and Citizens were pleased to favor us with their Presence," is said of a later Commencement. At one time Lord Loudon, Commander of all the British forces in America, is present; at another the Governor and an ex-Governor of Pennsylvania, and the Governor of Providence, attend with, as usual, "a large audience of ladies and gentlemen." In 1767 the music is furnished by the band of the Royal Irish Regiment then quartered in Philadelphia.

Even the public examinations, which seniors were then required to undergo before they could take their degrees, and to which all citizens must by college statute be invited, had their interested and attentive audience. Sometimes the college function was a formal reception to a new governor or to a famous visitor to the city. In 1759 as a part of a celebration at the College of the arrival in the province of Governor James Hamilton he was addressed by an Academy boy with the same family name as his own, "Billy" Hamilton, in an invocation beginning

O Friend to Science, Liberty and Truth,
Patron of Virtue, Arts and rising Youth.

This boy was the William Hamilton who became owner of "Woodlands," adjacent to the present University campus, and although later exiled as a Tory, he still looks out from a canvas
painted by Benjamin West of the class of 1757 on meetings of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania not so very different in character from that at which he officiated in person in 1759.

Professors and students alike dropped readily into verse in those days; Provost Smith was always ready with a metrical production, Professor Beveridge published poems in Latin, Dove dealt in satirical verse, and pupils of both the Academy and the College had from the beginning expressed themselves in poetic form. It was a characteristic of the age. There was a steady flow of verse in the periodicals of the time, much of it more or less easy and graceful, though hardly poetic, much completely vapid, some mere doggerel.

For the most part it was at the formal annual Commencements that the College Faculty and students appeared before the public. There was a public ceremony for the granting of degrees in every year except one, from 1757 until the gathering American troops of 1775 and 1776, the British army of occupation of 1777 and 1778, and finally the hostile state legislature of 1779, brought the series temporarily to an end.

Some of the Commencements were of special interest. At the Commencement of 1765, Whitefield appeared in the building originally erected for his use, speaking to the students of the College as he had spoken to his congregation there twenty-five years before. He came now at the invitation of Provost Smith, who read the prayers at the service, and of the Trustees, who subsequently thanked him for his address and for thus "countenancing the institution." He saw the A.B. degree conferred on William White, the future first bishop of the Episcopal Church in the United States, and on John Andrews, future Provost of the University. He must also have listened to the address of Dr. John Morgan, who had just been appointed to the first professorship of the Theory and Practice of Medicine in America, and laid down in this address the firm foundation of medical study at Pennsylvania and in America generally. The Commencement of 1766 was perhaps more typical than that of 1765. According to the Gazette "it was rendered very splendid by the Great Number of Persons present." It was opened by a salutatory oration in Latin, a practice that has been abandoned only within the last
half-century; then came an English oration, then a Latin “Syllogistic Disputation ‘utrum praescientia deorum tollit Libertatem agendi’,” followed by another oration in English. The afternoon session opened with another debate, this time in English; four of the graduating class threshing out, rather late in their academic career, the question, “Whether Ease be the Chief Good.” There followed the valedictory, and another dialogue, “In Honor of the Friends of America,” after which “the two Master Banksons,” boys in the Latin School, sang odes on “Liberty” and “Patriotism” written by Thomas Hopkinson, one of the graduating class. The accompaniment on the organ seems to have been played by Francis Hopkinson, older brother of the author of the odes. One of the odes contained a pleasant compliment to Colonel Barré, who had recently visited the College and was now in high favor in America because of his opposition to the Stamp Act. The political tinge of this Commencement was doubtless due to the excitement concerning that act which had stirred Philadelphia to its political depths, and news of the repeal of which had reached the city only the day before Commencement.

The graduates of this year, of whom there were twelve, obtained rather less distinction than most classes. Four became Episcopal clergymen and three Presbyterian ministers, one of them a future President of Delaware College. Three became lawyers and one a physician. When the great time of decision came, a disproportionate number took the Royalist side: three retired to England, though one of these came back to Philadelphia after the Revolution as British Consul General. Two recipients of honorary degrees were of special interest. In addition to the Master’s Degree regularly conferred according to the English practice three years after the A.B., the custom of giving the M.A., as an honorary degree was becoming an almost invariable part of the Commencement exercises. The College had some years before begun to confer the M.A. upon “Ministers and Gentlemen of this and the neighboring Colonies who were of distinguished character for their Usefulness and Learning.” They had in 1760 granted the degree to the President of Princeton and to six Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Maryland clergy-
men. The Faculty, who usually selected the recipients of degrees on their own initiative, recommended them so liberally that in 1762 the Trustees passed a resolution restricting the practice on the ground that "the College must lose Reputation by Confer­ring too many Honorary Degrees."

James Wilson and Joseph Reed, who received the honorary degree of A.M. in 1766, would, however, have reflected honor on any institution. Wilson, who had been a student successively in the Scotch universities, St. Andrews, Edinburgh, and Glasgow, though he had not taken a degree in one of them, was now a tutor in the College. Between this year when he was given the M.A., and 1790 when he was given the degree of LL.D., there were few forms of public service and distinction he had not passed through; member of the Provincial Council and the Constitu­tional Convention of Pennsylvania and of the Continental Congress, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, a member of the Constitutional Convention, appointed by Washington Justice of the Supreme Court, through his whole career he re­mained interested in the College, as tutor, as Master of the Eng­lish School, as Trustee, as Professor of Law. In this last capacity we shall meet with him again in this narrative. Reed, the other recipient of the honorary degree this year, was scarcely less emi­nent and scarcely less closely connected with the College, though in strangely contrasted relationships, which will likewise appear later. He was an A.B. of Princeton and had been a student at the Middle Temple in London; he was later a member of the Con­tinental Congress, Adjutant General of the American Army, Aide-de-Camp to Washington, and President of the Supreme Executive Council of Pennsylvania.

In a small city with a still smaller social class, at College Com­mencements the Provost was glad to draw in outside particip­ants, especially when, as so generally occurred, there were musical events for which as chorus the young men and young women of the city were needed. At the Commencements of 1760 and 1761, for instance, odes successively of mourning for the death of George II and congratulation over the accession of George III were set to music by Francis Hopkinson, and sung by "a sett of Ladies and Gentlemen" who "kindly employed their agreeable
talents to do Honour to the occasion.” Hopkinson both as student and alumnus was frequently the author of the words as well as the composer of the music for these productions, and indeed frequently accompanied them and gave other performances on the organ. This gifted young man, member of the first graduating class, who received his A.B. in 1757 and his M.A. at Philadelphia in 1760 and at Princeton in 1763, son of a Trustee, himself later a Trustee and ancestor of honored Trustees through four generations, gave to the early Commencements of the College a musical significance unique among American colonial colleges.

The most ambitious literary and musical undertaking of the College students during this period was, however, not given in connection with Commencement but in the Christmas holidays. This was a performance of a play, *The Masque of Alfred the Great*, given in Christmas week of 1756 and subsequent weeks. The play had been written in England sixteen years before and played by Garrick at Covent Garden. A number of changes and additions were made by the Provost, as it was thought best to leave out all women’s parts, though some young ladies volunteered to sing the songs; the Epilogue was spoken by Jacob Duché, then a senior, and other parts by other students; Hopkinson composed a song, “sung by two nimble spirits.”

The students were even counted on by the Trustees in the winter of 1768 to give a performance for the benefit of the College, to make possible the engagement of two additional tutors. In 1759 the Prologue and Epilogue of *Tamerlane*, played by the regular theatrical company in Philadelphia, were written by Hopkinson, and in return their last performance of the season was a benefit for the purchase of an organ for College Hall and to pay for the expense of teaching the children of the Charity School to sing hymns and church music, “in order to render the Entertainment of the Town more complete at Commencements and other public occasions in our College.”

The tradition of play-writing and play-acting continued among students and graduates of the College. In 1767 a “Son of Philadelphia College” is declared by a Princeton man to be

the author of *The Disappointment*, a somewhat scurrilous play, the acting of which at the theatre in the city was forbidden. The critic on hearing it read “thinks Princeton poets as good as their neighbors.” Thomas Godfrey, author of *The Prince of Parthia*, the first play to be written and acted in America, was one of that little coterie of three friends, Francis Hopkinson, Benjamin West, and Thomas Godfrey, who were all aided in their artistic careers by Provost Smith, the first two as students in the College, the last by personal influence.

Apart from their appearance at Commencement exercises and occasional dramatic shows, and required attendance in the classroom, the picture of the life of the students in the colonial college is a shadowy one. Occasionally one emerges as an individual, thanks to some casual record. In October 1775 young William Temple Franklin, son of William Franklin and grandson of Benjamin, entered college. Promptly he writes to his father: “Dear Sir, I have the pleasure to inform you that I entered the College the 14th of this month without any difficulty, and according to your desire in your letter of October 9th I shall inform you of the studies I am engaged in.” He proceeds with a circumstantial if somewhat recklessly spelled account of his studies, the hours of preparation and recitation, the assembly and calling of the roll at eight o’clock every morning, “and whoever is absent has a cross put to his name for which he pays a fine of two coppers,” though the younger boys are “allowed the privilege of choosing whether they will pay the fine or be ferruled.” There is much turning of Latin into English and English into Latin—they are reading and construing Livy—some writing of English themes and turning them into Latin; three times a week they are taught geography, and Dr. Smith instructs them in mathematics. He sees little time ahead for fencing or dancing, which his father seems to have prescribed, but thinks he could go to dancing school Saturday afternoons if Dr. Ellison,¹ Professor of Greek and Latin would excuse him from his Saturday’s Latin, “as I don’t think I shall be able to dance with so much spirit when the thought of making a Latin Theme before I go to Bed is sticking in my stom-

¹ Francis Alison.
ach.” He closes by the frank admission that “I am greatly at a loss for want of Livy’s Roman History in English, that I might look over the Lesson the night before I am to say it as the rest of the class do.” His grandfather, curiously enough, has no copy, he has inquired at every bookseller’s shop in Philadelphia, and it is not to be had. He would be greatly obliged, if his father does not have it, if he would write to New York for it, “That I may get it if it is to be got.” Young Franklin’s college career was a short one. The next year his grandfather went to Europe; he went with him as companion and secretary, and never returned to this country.¹

There is little to be learned from contemporary records concerning the physical activities and lighter amusements of the students. The recommendation of Franklin in the Proposals that a site should be chosen for the Academy and College that would permit running, swimming, wrestling, etc., was abandoned when the New Building with its city location and restricted playing grounds was bought. Athletics in the modern sense were unknown. Such information as we get is about the Academy pupils rather than the older students in the College. Alexander Graydon, for instance, who has left a vivacious account of student recreations, attended the Academy between 1762 and 1766, from the time he was ten until he had just turned fourteen, but did not enter the College. He tells of the spirited races around the block bounded by Arch, Fifth, Market, and Fourth streets, a distance of nearly half a mile. One of his friends, a boy from Virginia who boarded at his mother’s house on Arch Street, achieved such reputation as a runner that competitors were sought from Penn Charter and other schools, but none could beat him.

Graydon has much to say about swimming, rowing, sailing, and skating on the Delaware. Although among the boys running “was all the rage” as he says, skating was the popular sport for their elders. There was a local style of skating superior, according to the chronicler, to that of either New England, Hol-

land, or Great Britain. Winters seem to have been colder in the eighteenth century than in more recent times. The long, cold winters of which we hear, when the College cordwood was hauled by horses and oxen across the Delaware on the ice, have no modern equivalent.

Much mere mischief was chargeable to the younger boys. Not only were there frequent complaints that students did not show proper respect to the professors, but anecdotes have been preserved showing the survival of familiar childish tricks, such as the twitching off of Professor Beveridge's wig, and the closing of the shutters from the outside so that in the dark the professor might be made the target for textbooks and blackboard erasers. The constant expense of broken windows is suggestive. There were the familiar complaints that students were absent from classes, and charges, more characteristic of the time, that they did not attend any public worship on Sundays.

Unfortunately the few glimpses we get of the behavior of the older students are still more unfavorable. In one of the very earliest years of the College there was a disciplinary quarrel between Dr. Smith and one of the sons of William Allen, a Trustee. In 1769 there was complaint of special lack of discipline and it was decided that three, on account of their bad behavior and evil example, should no longer be continued in the College, although one of the three had been entered by Dr. Alison and another was under the guardianship of Mr. Hopkinson, Trustee. In 1770 a student was called before the Board on the charge that he had stayed out from his lodging till one o'clock in the morning and then broken open the window shutters of one of the tutors because he would not admit the roysterer "at that unseasonable hour"; he was expelled. When Dr. Morgan went to Jamaica in 1772 he was commissioned to advise a certain planter there to withdraw his son from the College, as he was wasting £200 a year, or more.

But these instances of dissipation and bad behavior must not be taken too seriously. In the records of college discipline

The evil that men do lives after them,
The good is oft interred with their bones.
There is little occasion for recording good behavior or describing a faultless character. There are some instances even of the latter. The two young Martins to whom Dr. Smith in his youth had been tutor both died early, William in 1754 in Philadelphia during his college course, Josiah in 1762 in the island of Antigua, his father's home. Provost Smith preached an eloquent sermon at Christ Church on the death and character of the former. This was published soon afterward, accompanied by a group of verses by four of Martin's classmates and a tutor, all laudatory of his character and appreciative of Dr. Smith's praise of him. He is spoken of as

\[ \ldots \text{late the fairest plant in virtue's plain} \\
\ldots \text{The brightest youth in wisdom's rising train.} \]

More natural characteristics are perhaps commemorated in some further lines:

\[ \text{For we remember well his matchless power} \\
\text{To steal upon the heart and cheer the social hour.} \]

Francis Hopkinson long afterward wrote an elegy on the death of his former classmate, the second of the two brothers.

**FOUNDATION OF THE MEDICAL SCHOOL**

The addition of the medical courses to the Philosophical School was not only important in itself but justified calling the College afterwards a university. It was in 1765 that the actual introduction of the medical courses took place; in 1771, six years afterward, the Provost declared that the institution was now "entitled not merely to the name of a College but of an University"; in 1772 Dr. John Morgan, traveling in Jamaica, speaks of it as "the University of Philadelphia." On its reorganization in 1779 the term was formally adopted.

Dr. John Morgan, the original proponent of the introduction of medical courses into the College, and the first medical professor, was a colorful character. His early life exemplified many of the conditions we have adverted to as characteristic of co-
colonial Philadelphia and its College. His grandfather, a Welsh merchant, was one of those immigrants who obtained wealth through commerce in Philadelphia. His father was one of the original contributors to the Academy, a friend and near neighbor of Franklin. Young Morgan received a good classical education in one of those schools kept by a Presbyterian minister in the vicinity of Philadelphia that furnished much the best education available before the establishment of the Academy. His preceptor was Dr. Finley, afterward President of Princeton. Morgan entered the College of Philadelphia at its opening and graduated with its first class, in 1757, when he was in his twenty-second year. Few men have entered on their life work with better training. Even while he was doing his college work he was apprenticed to Dr. Redman, a prominent Philadelphia physician who had received his M.D. degree at Leyden in 1748. While under this instruction he served for a year as apothecary in the newly established Pennsylvania Hospital in compounding medicine for the six physicians who served there. He completed the terms of his apprenticeship with Dr. Redman just in time to obtain a military medical commission and to gain some surgical experience with the provincial troops in the campaign of 1759.

In 1760, when twenty-five years old, like other ambitious and well-to-do young Philadelphians preparing for a profession, he went to England, where he had the valuable patronage of Franklin, then living in London as agent for Pennsylvania and other colonies. A year of medical study and observation in London hospitals under such famous physicians as John Fothergill, John and William Hunter, and William Hewson was an opportunity such as could not possibly have been obtained in the colonies. But Edinburgh was then probably the most famous place for medical education in Europe, certainly for English-speaking students. Some twenty years earlier a group of Scotch physicians, several of them graduates of Leyden, had introduced medical courses in the University at Edinburgh, and its recognition as a center of medical training had been rising ever since. In 1761 Morgan entered there, carrying a warm letter of introduction from Franklin to Lord Kames, Chancellor of the Uni-
versity, which guaranteed him the interest of the medical professors. It was in Edinburgh that the foundation was laid for what proved to be the beginning of medical teaching at Philadelphia. Morgan met there an old fellow student at Dr. Finley's Academy, William Shippen, Jr., son of a Trustee of the Philadelphia College but himself a graduate, probably because of his Presbyterian connection, of Princeton. The two discussed a plan of giving courses of medical lectures in Philadelphia after their return, but there is no indication that they proposed at this time to connect these with the College. A difference of opinion on this matter was a grievance in the mind of Shippen long afterward and was not without influence on the medical history of the Revolution, when a bitter dispute occurred between the two, who were appointed successively medical heads of the American army. Shippen obtained his degree at Edinburgh in 1762, went directly back to Philadelphia and proceeded to offer a course in anatomy in an outbuilding of his father's house on Fourth Street, the first formal medical lectures given in the English colonies.

Morgan stayed on at Edinburgh for a second year, receiving his degree in 1763 and writing a Latin thesis which was printed and received considerable attention. Well-to-do young Americans, like the same class of Englishmen, were apt to make "the grand tour" when they finished their formal education. So Morgan with his friend Samuel Powell of Philadelphia, a graduate of the College class following his, a young man of wealth and influence whom the Provost had taken with him and presented to King George in 1762, set out for a journey of several months. They visited Holland, France, Switzerland, and Italy. At Paris, Morgan perfected himself in a method of injecting anatomical specimens with wax that he made effective use of afterward. They passed through the south of France, then on to Rome, Venice, Florence, Turin, Geneva, and so through France back to Paris. On the way they were presented to the Pope, the Duke of York, then living in Rome, and the King of Sardinia. They visited Voltaire at Ferney and found the philosopher in his most exuberant mood, speaking English with them, though not very readily, declaring his admiration for Franklin, about whose elec-
trical experiments he knew, trying to draw them into a dispute on religion, and expressing the greatest admiration for everything English. The whole journey seems to have been one of enlightenment. Morgan heard Torreziani lecture to a group of medical students at Parma and had a long conversation with Professor Morgagni at Padua, still writing and teaching at eighty-two years of age. He visited the famous hospital at Milan, with its ten physicians in attendance in the morning and fifteen in the afternoon, ten surgeons and some seventy young internes acting as their assistants. He may well have been struck with the difference between the medical equipment of the old world and the new. In the meantime he had been elected Fellow of the Colleges of Physicians of Edinburgh and London and of the French Royal Society of Surgery, and was soon afterward made Fellow of the Royal Society. If he wanted other honors he must create them for himself in new surroundings.

Returning to London after his three years' absence, he was forced by the lateness of the season to spend a few impatient months before returning to his own country. He had by this time developed a well-defined scheme for introducing formal medical education into America, somewhat along the lines he had seen in existence in Europe, and connecting it with his own College in Philadelphia, just as medical instruction had been introduced from Leyden into the University of Edinburgh twenty years before. To discussion and preparation for this project he seems to have given his remaining time in London. He wrote most of the address he proposed to deliver as soon as he had opportunity in explanation of his plan, and secured the approval and written recommendation of Thomas Penn, Franklin, Mr. Peters who was then in London, Dr. Fothergill, and Dr. Cullen, one of his most valued advisers at the University of Edinburgh. When he returned to Philadelphia, therefore, he was well primed with his plans.

His native city was no less ready, furnished with a group of excellent physicians, possessing a hospital in which six of these physicians gave free service, an almshouse which was also a hospital, and public lectures on anatomy already initiated by a colleague. The College was sure to be responsive to his proposals;
little would be needed beyond the formality of presentation and acceptance of his project. This was accomplished at a special meeting of the Board of Trustees May 3, 1765. Penn had written directly to the Trustees in advocacy of the plan, and Morgan himself presented a letter of recommendation for himself and for the project from the two Trustees of the College then in London. The result was the unanimous election of Morgan as “Professor of the Theory and Practice of Physick.” Two weeks later the Commencement of the year 1765 was made to gather largely around this addition to the work of the College. On two successive hot days, the thirtieth and thirty-first of May, the two sections of Dr. Morgan’s “Discourse Upon the Institution of Medical Schools in America” were read in their fullness as part of the group of literary productions of the occasion. The “Discourse” was subsequently printed and has, because of its logical structure, its judicious definitions, and its wise suggestions and warnings, become a classic.¹

It is to be noted that Morgan used the word “schools” in the plural. His own course on theory and practice would be one, others should follow. This extension occurred promptly. William Shippen had already in the years 1762–65 given privately three successive courses in anatomy. These courses attracted much attention, the opening lecture being given in the State House. They received general approval, except from the mob, suspicious of his practice of dissection. His dissecting room was at one time invaded and he himself roughly handled. He found it necessary after his second course of lectures to publish in the newspapers a denial of the charges by “some evil-minded persons, either wantonly or maliciously,” that he had taken up bodies from the church burying ground, and gave assurance that the bodies he dissected were suicides or executed criminals or, occasionally, paupers whose death was due to some peculiar or unusual disease.

Shippen had suggested in his address at the opening of his first course of lectures, in 1762, the desirability of having all branches of medicine taught in the city, but had made no move

¹ In addition to various accounts of these events there is a brief narrative in some early hand in the earliest minute book of the Medical Faculty.
to connect them with the College, although his father was a Trustee and was himself a physician. In fact Dr. Fothergill, his English adviser, seems at first to have contemplated their organization and support by the Provincial Legislature. Now, however, in the fall succeeding Morgan’s election, Shippen, not without some indication of vexation at having been neglected in Morgan’s proposal, offered himself as Professor of Anatomy and Surgery, declaring that he had thought of the plan for seven years and mentioned it three years before. He was immediately elected, September 25, 1765.

The careers of the two men had been similar in many ways. They sprang alike from well-to-do mercantile families who could well afford to give them a prolonged education. The Shippen House on Second Street, the residence of Edward Shippen, Chief Justice of Pennsylvania, young Shippen’s uncle, was said to be the largest dwelling house in Philadelphia and was famous for its lawn and gardens. His own home on Fourth Street was scarcely less spacious, and had a more distinguished later history. It is still impressive. After their school days Shippen had gone to Princeton, of which his uncle was one of the founders just as his father had been of the College at Philadelphia, and was graduated there three years before Morgan received his A.B. from Philadelphia. Like Morgan he studied in London and then in Edinburgh. He had even gone, like Morgan, on a visit to the Continent. On being elected to the College he suspended his private anatomical lectures, and he and Morgan made a joint announcement of two courses, Morgan’s on “Materia Medica,” Shippen’s on “Anatomy, the Parts of the Human Body and their Diseases,” with dissections and the principal operations in surgery.

The list of lecturers and courses was soon extended. Dr. Adam Kuhn, the next recruit, was the son of a German physician, given a classical education at his home in Lancaster, then some training as apprentice to his father in Germantown. Like the others he went abroad for study, obtaining distinction by studying natural history with Linnaeus in Sweden; later he went to Edinburgh where he received his M.D. in 1767, four years after Morgan, six years after Shippen. Returning to Philadelphia he was appointed
Professor of Materia Medica and Botany in the College, in February 1768. Following much the same career as his three predecessors, Benjamin Rush, a somewhat younger man, a pupil at Dr. Finley's Academy, then a graduate in Arts at Princeton in 1765, like Morgan an apprentice of Dr. Redman, and, like all three, receiving his M.D. at Edinburgh where he was graduated in 1768, was destined to have the longest and most distinguished career of any of the group. He was elected Professor of Chemistry, which was then considered as a medical subject, in August 1769, in time for the opening of the fall term of that year. This completed the original staff of medical teachers in the College. They were a remarkable group. All born in the same decade, between 1735 and 1745, the oldest scarcely more than thirty years of age, the youngest but twenty-five, all Bachelors of Arts, all trained abroad, all with the M.D. degree from Edinburgh, all men of culture, and all successful in the private practice they carried on in addition to their teaching duties.

The opportunity for observation and experience in the Pennsylvania Hospital had long been recognized as of great value, and shortly after the first medical courses in the College were opened, Dr. Thomas Bond began a course of clinical lectures in the hospital to which the medical students were admitted. Provost Smith also delivered a series of lectures on natural philosophy especially for the medical students. By 1769 what was practically a separate medical faculty had been established in the College, and in the fall of that year a joint announcement of five courses, so arranged that they could all be taken without conflict, was put in the newspapers. So the Medical School was established. Its imitation of the University of Edinburgh is evident. It is even closer than the dependence of the College proper on Aberdeen.

The plan of giving medical instruction in the College was an immediate success. A number of students enrolled, many from regions outside of Philadelphia. In the third year from the opening of medical courses rules were drawn up by those Trustees who were physicians, in consultation with the Provost and the medical professors, for the grant of appropriate degrees. The requirements were high. Considerable general equipment was de-
manded in preparation for entrance on the course: an A.B. degree must be presented or obtained as an accompaniment of the medical courses. After taking a certain number of those courses, showing a satisfactory knowledge of the Latin language, of mathematics, and of "Natural and Experimental Philosophy," serving an apprenticeship to some reputable physician, and attending the practice of the Pennsylvania Hospital for one year, a student was admitted to a private and then to a public examination. If he was successful he was given the degree of Bachelor of Physic or of Medicine. The subsequent passage of three years, the writing, printing, and publishing of a satisfactory thesis and its oral defense in public, and the attainment of twenty-four years of age entitled a Bachelor of Medicine to the degree of M.D. It goes without saying that these high standards were not permanent. They remained nevertheless the colonial practice.

In June 1768 a medical Commencement was held separate from the rest of the College, at which, with much Latin disputation, many orations by the prospective graduates, and much good advice by the Provost and Vice-Provost, medical professors and Trustees, ten young men were given the degree of Bachelor of Physic, the first medical degrees given in America. "An elegant Valedictory Oration" stating the advantages of obtaining a general liberal education before entering upon medical studies was delivered by Jonathan Potts, one of the graduates, who had studied, like his predecessors, at Edinburgh, and later became in succession to two of his preceptors Physician-in-Chief of the American troops during the Revolution.

The severe requirements for the M.D. degree and the possibility of building up a practice on a mere Bachelor's degree limited the number of those reaching the full stature of Doctors of Medicine. Medical Commencements were held in 1769, 1770, 1771, and perhaps later. But the time was rapidly approaching when the confusions of the Revolution put an end for a while to all degree giving and taking. However, four of the ten who took their first degree in 1768 conformed to the requirements and were given the degree of M.D. in June 1771, the only recipients of the full degree before the reorganization of the old College
in 1779. There were twenty-eight who took the degree of Bachelor of Physic during this period, and some ninety before the abolition of that degree in 1790.

The conception of a university as due to the addition of other courses to those of the College is Scotch, not English; it leads back in the case of the Medical School to Edinburgh and the Continent, not to Oxford or Cambridge. A university in America has come to be considered a combination of two or more faculties, not a union of several semi-independent colleges, as in England. The establishment of medical courses in a large city, in connection with hospitals and under the auspices of an educational institution, was wholesome; it gave a guarantee alike of observation of actual disease and its proper treatment and of the preservation of academic standards. In this respect also the tradition of the Medical School leads back to medical training on the Continent and to London hospitals rather than to Oxford and Cambridge, where such study was necessarily more bookish and abstract.

THE POLITICAL HISTORY OF THE COLLEGE

It would be a satisfaction to record that the College of Philadelphia lived its life in the serene detachment from contemporary politics that is the happy lot of the modern University. But that was not the case. Its patronage by the Penn family, the devotion of its politically minded Provost to their interest, the inclinations of its wealthy and aristocratic Trustees all tended to bind it to one party in the government and to one class in the community. It would have been difficult for any man to devote himself at that time to the problems of education alone; for Provost Smith it was impossible.

He began teaching in Philadelphia in May 1754; by the early months of 1755 he was in the thick of Pennsylvania politics. Pennsylvania politics in the middle years of the eighteenth century are far too complicated a subject to explain here, but it may be said, in the words and according to the interpretation of Franklin, perhaps not quite a fair one, that the two principal parties represented respectively "Proprietary Interest and Power,
and Popular Liberty." He distinguished them later as "the Proprietary side" and "the friends of the people." The Provost unquestionably belonged to the former. His intimacy with the Penns, his Anglicanism, his conservative temperament, his very freedom from local entanglements made him an aggressive supporter of the "Governor's party" as against the local Assembly.

In the year 1755 he wrote two pamphlets and had them printed and distributed in England. The first was *A Brief State of the Province of Pennsylvania, etc.*, the second *A Brief View of the Conduct of Pennsylvania for the year 1755, etc.* In these he deplored the existence of an almost purely republican government in the province and charged its failure to protect its borders and other shortcomings to the Quaker majority in the Assembly and their supporters among the Germans. He recommended requiring an oath of allegiance from all members of the Assembly, which of course would exclude the Quakers; withholding the suffrage from the Germans till they had learned the English language, which would disfranchise them at least for the moment; and the use of English alone in all legal documents. He proposed also that English Protestant schools should be established among the Germans to resist supposed Catholic propaganda, and that newspapers should all be in English or in two parallel columns, English and German. By other controversial articles Dr. Smith put himself clearly in opposition to the majority in the Assembly and to their supporters in Philadelphia. Braddock's defeat and the sad record of Indian atrocities on the border during the summer of 1755 seemed to justify Smith's position and gave added bitterness to the verbal attacks on the majority by the Proprietary party who were in the minority in the Assembly. The stronger Popular party based their continued refusal to make appropriations on the conditions insisted upon by the Governor. In conformity with his instructions, he vetoed every measure that required the Proprietors' estates to be taxed. On the other hand, the Popular party insisted on this taxation and charged the Governor's party, to which Smith belonged, with willingness to sell out their local liberties.

An anecdote of this time describes a group of gentlemen, of whom Smith was one, sitting in the coffee house at Front and
Market streets discussing political questions when one of them, a Mr. Roberdeau, remarked to Smith that he was “sorry a gentleman of his cloth had intermeddled in party affairs.” Dr. Smith was said to have replied that he was not of one party more than another and that he only dressed the sentiments of the Proprietary side in proper language, that he was not excessively devoted to that party and would do the same for the other party if they needed it. He denied these words afterward and a controversy arose which drew into it members of the vestry of Christ Church, prominent Presbyterians, and some seventy leading citizens, including at least three of the College Trustees. It was a petty matter, but the Provost did not deny having shared in a discussion on current politics at the public coffee house. A letter writer in the Journal who signs himself Humphrey Scourge writes for the benefit of “a certain Parson,” “I could wish for thy own sake and the sake of those under thy care that thee would behave more prudently and give less occasion of offense to the People.”

Whether or not the Provost considered himself to be of one party more than another, others considered him partisan, for in the same year 1756 the Trustees found themselves forced to take cognizance of newspaper attacks charging him with using his position as a teacher to impress upon his students doctrines inconsistent with the constitution and the rights of the province. Fearing that such insinuations might do harm to the institution, a committee of the Board inquired into the matter but reported that there was no possibility of harm coming to the College and Academy from his behavior since the Trustees themselves had it constantly under observation. They described Dr. Smith’s conduct as “becoming and satisfactory to us.” Six students in the junior class also testified and proved by exhibiting their note-books that the Provost had not taught them any partisan principles. The Trustees offered their report justifying him, for publication in the Gazette, their usual outlet for matters of interest to the College and the public; but David Hall, its publisher, supposedly under Franklin’s influence, declined to print it on the ground that the original insinuations had not appeared in his paper, and that the matter savored of existing disputes, which he wanted to avoid.
Somewhat later, in 1758, the Provost was involved still more deeply in a political struggle, this time with the Assembly, then in a militant mood. Judge Moore of Moore Hall, a Chester County magistrate, had been charged with various offenses, principally of a political nature, by several petitioners who asked the Assembly to remove him from office. This the Assembly could not do, as his position was appointive, but after some investigation, it sent an address to the Governor asking him by his authority to remove Moore from all his public positions. This address, couched in terms of vigorous condemnation, was published in the newspapers. Moore waited for the adjournment of the Assembly, then published an equally vigorous attack upon that body. Smith, whose political opinions were the same as those of the Judge, was suspected of aiding in the composition of this offensive document and securing its publication in a German newspaper with which he had influence.

On the reassembly of the Legislature in January 1758, both Moore and Smith were ordered to appear at its bar on a charge of contempt. Moore was remanded to jail on the old complaint. Smith was charged with "promoting and publishing a false, scandalous, virulent and seditious libel against the late House of Assembly of this Province," but was offered release on apology and retraction. He refused to acknowledge guilt and was committed to jail along with Judge Moore. His efforts for release by interposition of the courts and the Governor failed, and he remained in prison for the next three months. He and his students joined in a request that during that time he be allowed to give his lectures as usual, even though they must be given in the jail; this was acceded to by the Board of Trustees. As there were but twelve students in Dr. Smith's classes at this time, even the limited accommodations of the old jail at Sixth and Walnut streets were sufficient, and so we have the picturesque incident of the Provost and Professor of Moral Philosophy giving his course of lectures in limbo.

The summer adjournment saw his release, but when the Assembly met in September, by a sort of cat and mouse procedure he was again placed in confinement and, on their dissolution, again released; the new Assembly that would meet in November
threatened his re-arrest. It was evident he would not be able to fulfill his college duties during the winter term and at his desire the Trustees gave him leave to go to England for six months to press an appeal from the Assembly to the Crown. The journey was to be made at his own expense, and his salary, at his suggestion, was to be paid to Reverend Mr. Ewing, a recent graduate from Princeton, who would teach his classes during his absence. The Trustees took this opportunity to compliment the Provost on his "great abilities and the satisfaction he had given them in the faithful discharge of his duties." When the sergeant at arms of the Assembly came to seek him he could not be found, and on December 12, 1758, he quietly sailed for England.

His appeal against the Assembly was successful, the Attorney-General advised the Privy Council in his favor, and the Council on his appearance before them placed in his hands a sharp rebuke to be presented to the Assembly, declaring the King's displeasure at their assuming to themselves powers which did not belong to them and invading at the same time the royal prerogative and the liberties of the subject, attributing to themselves for Pennsylvania the powers that Parliament claimed, somewhat questionably, for the whole empire. This declaration, on his return to Pennsylvania, Dr. Smith put in the hands of the Governor, who laid it without comment before the Assembly. It was a genuine but hollow victory for the Provost. It had no effect on the claims or practice of the Legislature and he received no damages.

Dr. Smith may, however, be considered to have won another and more substantial personal victory from this series of incidents, for at its close he married the daughter of his fellow prisoner of 1758, Judge Moore. Her sister had already married Dr. Bond, one of the Trustees, adding another to that group of family compacts which punctuates and complicates the history of the colonial College. There are some indications that, notwithstanding their resolutions complimenting him on the performance of his academic duties, the Trustees were not any too well pleased by the Provost's political activities. Chief Justice William Allen, who had refused to give him the writ of habeas corpus
for which he had asked, was a Trustee, and three others were members of the Assembly he had attacked.

It was in this period, apparently, that strained relations between Dr. Smith and Franklin developed. They could hardly have been avoided. Franklin was passing from a position of conciliator between parties to the recognized position of principal supporter of colonial as against Proprietary claims. He was no longer President of the Board of Trustees of the College, having yielded that position to Mr. Peters in May 1756, and shortly thereafter gone to England in the service of the Assembly. Even before he left America he had practically lost contact with the College. In a letter written from London, July 28, 1759, to his friend and colleague Professor Kinnersley, he remarks:

Before I left Philadelphia everything to be done in the Academy was privately preconcerted in a cabal, without my knowledge or participation, and accordingly carried into execution. The scheme of public parties made it seem requisite to lessen my influence wherever it could be lessened. The Trustees had reaped the full advantage of my head, hands, heart and purse in getting through the first difficulties of the design, and when they thought they could do without me they laid me aside.

After this time he was much abroad and seldom attended Trustees' meetings when he was at home. Only once was he present at a Commencement, and the almost complete Latinity of that occasion must have given little comfort to his rugged preference for the vernacular. His great services to the College were almost all given in the first eight years of its existence. Although he and Dr. Smith were both in England in 1759 and both had interviews with the Penns, Smith's warm and friendly, Franklin's cold and formal, they did not meet and Smith returned more definitely than ever a supporter of the Proprietary claims. In the exchange of abusive correspondence in the newspapers characteristic of the time, a letter dated April 15, 1756, usually attributed to Smith, referred to "the aspiring views of a certain mighty politician who expects that every person would fall down and worship the Golden Calf." That this refers to Franklin is
indicated by a reply to it the next week describing it as the work of "an infamous hireling against an absent person." An ill-natured attack upon Franklin appeared in the *American Magazine*, of which Smith was in control, charging him with claiming as his work electrical inventions that should rightly be ascribed to Kinnersley. Kinnersley himself, as already mentioned, wrote in protest against this charge, pointing out the difficulty of ascribing relative credit in joint observations. The same intimation that Franklin was dishonest or at least unfair to his coworker in their scientific interests is repeated in a prospectus of the College issued in 1758.

When Dr. Smith went to England for the collection of funds in 1764 he heard from a gossiping visitor, whom he describes as "an eminent Dissenter," a long and scarcely credible story of vilification of the College by Franklin and efforts by him to prevent the success of the Provost's mission. Neither the truth of the unnamed visitor's statement nor the fairness of Dr. Smith's report of it can be verified. Franklin left among his books a caustic inscription written on the fly-leaf of a pamphlet by Smith, and there was certainly no love lost between them, but such personal hostility as existed between these two eminent men had little influence on the fortunes of the College.

Those fortunes on the other hand were deeply affected by the continuing disputes between the Penns and the Assembly. Antagonism to the Proprietors lies at the basis of unexpected hostility to the College which developed at this time. It will be remembered that between 1757 and 1764 the College was principally supported by a series of lotteries. In 1758 there began to appear in what might be called, from the College point of view, the "opposition" newspaper, that is the *Journal*, a series of articles signed "Pennsylvanius," sharply criticizing the prevailing practice of lotteries. A controversialist soon appeared who not only disputed these arguments but charged the author of them with having the ulterior purpose of attacking the lottery-supported College. "Pennsylvanius" acknowledges that this is so and asserts that the College is an enemy to the liberties of the province, and that, so long as it can be supported by lotteries it will continue to act as an abettor of Proprietary tyranny. He claims that
its charter was drawn up by Richard Peters, an agent of the Proprietaries, and was granted by Thomas and Richard Penn without provision for any local influence on the membership of its Board of Trustees, just so that it might remain an adjunct of tyrannical control by the Proprietary family. In fact “Pennsylvania” declared that if the lotteries could be made to fail and the Penn-patronized College be thus sufficiently impoverished, another college, based on local interests, loyal to the people’s cause and supported by the public, could and would be established—almost a prophecy of what happened twenty years later.

All these charges, inflated as they were, were denied, reasserted, and discussed in endless columns of small print in the newspapers. In January 1759 the Faculty, stung apparently by some of the charges, called the attention of the Trustees to their unfairness and asked liberty to reply to them. The Trustees, however, by unanimous action, asked the professors not to make any reply, since the persons making the criticisms were “some low creatures who wrote from Passion and Resentment,” and neither their arguments nor their calumnies could hurt the College or its teachers or administrators.

These disputes were all long ago, and on whose side truth and justice lay is of little importance to us now, even if it were discoverable. What is of significance is that the College was not able to pursue its quiet way as an educational institution and to seek support from all classes, but was, rightly or wrongly, subjected to suspicion and antagonism as the protégé and instrument of one party and the opponent of another. In these conflicts lay the greatest obstacle to the current success and the future fortunes of the College.

The year 1764 saw a culmination of the long struggle between the Assembly and the Proprietaries. The Assembly, unable, as it felt, to make good its claims to self-government as against the Proprietors, in May 1764 appealed to the King to take the government of the province directly into his hands. It was appealing from a nearer to a more distant master, hoping to receive better consideration. Such transfer of government from the Proprietary family to the King had been in turn projected and approved at one time by William Penn, at another by the royal
government itself, and now by the Provincial Assembly. Franklin, who as a member of the Assembly had been active in securing the passage of the proposed act of surrender, was now chosen to go to England to present it to the King. His selection as agent seemed to give new bitterness to the internal party struggle in Pennsylvania. He himself published, early in the year, *Cool Thoughts on the Present Situation of our Public Affairs*. They were not too cool, however, to bring as rejoinders at least two pamphlets, *The Plain Dealer* and *What is Sauce for the Goose is also Sauce for a Gander*, by Hugh Williamson, Professor of Mathematics in the College.

It is to be remembered in noting these attacks on Franklin that he had not yet performed those great national services which made all Americans grateful to him and gave him almost complete immunity from criticism. Moreover the popular party in Pennsylvania, of which he was supposed to be the leader, was so heterogeneous that no one man, not even a Franklin, could give unity to its aims. Party conflict was then of a bitterness and abusiveness unknown in modern times. Scurrility in verse and satire in prose load the columns of the provincial newspapers. A protest against the choice of Franklin was issued in October 1764 which declared him unsuitable on many grounds, claiming that "his selection is so disagreeable to many in Pennsylvania that it will inflame the resentments and embitter the hearts of the good people of the Province." ¹ The war of pamphlets which broke out seemed to justify this prophecy.

Political pamphlets rained from the printing presses. Several of them involved the College. Four of the Trustees signed the protest. Vice-Provost Alison and Professor Ewing were among the signers of a protest of leading Presbyterians and Baptists against the petition to the Crown; Provost Smith arrived home from his two years of collecting funds in England just in time

¹ In 1763 William Allen, Chief Justice of Pennsylvania and one of the Trustees, said of Franklin in a company in York, England, including some Americans and some British, "I can assure you that he is a man so turbulent and such a plotter as to be able to embroil the three kingdoms if he ever have an opportunity." Perhaps, fifteen years later when Allen was in exile in England as a Tory and Franklin was American minister in France, he felt even more sure of his estimate of the man.
to add a preface and new bitterness to a published speech of John Dickinson condemning the opposition to the Proprietors and depreciating the influence of Franklin. The popular leader Gallo­way published a reply, to which Franklin in his turn added a preface which is one of the most pungent of his political writings. He pays his respects to his colleagues among the Trustees and to the Provost by observing “for the Comfort of old Sinners that in Politics as well as in Religion Repentance and Amendment though late shall obtain Forgiveness . . . and P[eters] should preach your funeral Sermon and S[mith], the Poisoner of other’s characters, embalm your Memory.” He also published Remarks on a late Protest, hinting that the real author of the Protest was Smith, “the dear delight and constant employment” of whose life it has been “to murder all reputations that stand in his way.” However, he concludes this pamphlet, as he leaves home in 1764 for what proved to be a seven-year mission, on a somewhat ironic note of forgiveness: “I am now to take leave, perhaps last leave, of the country I love and in which I have spent the greatest part of my life. Esto perpetua. I wish every kind of prosperity to my friends; and I forgive my enemies.”

These differences among serious-minded men were differences concerning politics, not concerning the College, which suffered from them only indirectly. There were publications by others that were scarcely so loyal. Isaac Hunt was a student from Barbados who was graduated in 1763; he was for some months after graduation a tutor in the Latin School, then studied law in a desultory way in Philadelphia. In 1764 he published a pamphlet attack on the Proprietaries, A Letter from a Gentleman in Transilvania to his Friend in America, described at the time as “highly reflecting on the Government of this Province.” The next year he published A Humble Attempt at Scurrility; In Imitation of Those Great Masters of the Art, the Rev. Dr. S—th, the Rev. Dr. Al—n, and the Rev. Mr. Ew—n—, a really scurrilous attack on his College. This was followed by a series of papers, professedly emanating from the College, which he described as Exercises in Scurrility Hall. In 1766 he had the effrontery to apply for his degree of M.A., which would normally be given him in that year. The Trustees, however, after keeping him waiting for their de-
cision in an outer room, sent out word that they considered him unworthy of further honors from a seminary that he had maligned in writings "unworthy of a good man or Person of Education."

Hunt was much aggrieved and wrote to his patron, Franklin, protesting; the Trustees, however, eventually withdrew their objection and gave him his degree in 1771. Hunt was an inveterate if not always a consistent participant in political discussions, and his part in those of a decade later, on the eve of the Revolution, when he was on the conservative side, led to his seizure by a Philadelphia mob which took him through the streets in a cart and threatened to tar and feather him. By judicious good humor he carried the affair off without actual violence. However, before independence was declared he left the country, went back to Barbados for a time, then to England, where he was ordained against the protest of Dr. Smith and other American Anglicans. In 1778 and 1779 he was reputed to be the author of a bitter attack on Dr. Smith published in the Philadelphia newspapers, which led to a long defense by Dr. Smith. He was the father of Leigh Hunt, who in his literary rebellion against authority followed the parental example.

The College was occasionally made use of by some of those enlightened Englishmen who, in the early stages of the growing alienation between the mother country and the colonies, thought it still possible to come to satisfactory terms. In 1762 an English merchant and member of Parliament, John Sargent, approached Franklin in London and expressed a wish to provide two gold medals to be offered by the College, one, no doubt for the sake of the proprieties, for the best production on classical lines, the other for the best essay on the great subject of the day, "The Reciprocal Advantages arising from a Perpetual Union between Great Britain and her American Colonies." Mr. Sargent's political objects were evident, notwithstanding his claim that the prizes were intended merely to show his good will to the College, in his desire that the decision should be made by Franklin, agent for Pennsylvania, Isaac Norris, Speaker of the Assembly, and some third person whom they should choose.

Franklin, not desiring to be held responsible for this over-
ture, and Norris, already doubtful of the desirability of such a perpetual union, hastened to turn the whole matter over to the Board of Trustees. In their hands it lay dormant for three years. In the spring of 1766, when the Stamp Act controversy had brought the whole question into prominence, the medal for the political essay was offered, to be competed for by anyone who held a degree from the College, and the offer was published in the Philadelphia newspapers. Nine essays were presented, under assumed names. A group of the Trustees assisted by some of the professors gave the whole of a long May day to their examination and three proved to be of unusual excellence. They were all by holders of the degree of M.A. from the College. The best was declared to be that of Dr. John Morgan, the recently appointed Professor of Medicine. At the succeeding Commencement he was given the gold medal with flattering ceremonies and read his essay as part of the exercises. The three chosen essays, with a fourth, by Francis Hopkinson, on the same subject but not submitted in the competition, were printed in a volume that is now a collector's prize. They would justify recapitulation here as an indication of the political views of the time, if space were more abundant.

In the increasing tension between the British and the colonial governments the College was unavoidably involved. In the opposition to the Stamp Act and in the successive meetings of Committees of Correspondence and of Safety, from 1771 to 1776, Dr. Smith, members of the Board of Trustees, and alumni were constantly represented. There were too many men in Pennsylvania who held degrees from the College or were connected with it by office or by kinship with its Trustees or graduates to make it possible that it should remain entirely outside such stirring events; the names of Smith, Mifflin, Clymer, Willing, Morris, Franklin, and others familiar in College annals appear constantly in connection with the active political movements of the day.

Revolution was in the air, and soon the volunteer bands of soldiers intruded upon the routine of scholastic life. As the provincial troops began to gather, the hall, the classrooms, and the College yard offered irresistible attraction to the officers who had to provide for the accommodation of these men. In 1775
troops from Chester County were billeted on the College. In December 1776 the Trustees hold no meeting, “the Schools being broke up by public alarms.” In January 1777 the Provost, Vice-Provost, and professors join in an appeal to the Council of Safety, the highest military authority in Philadelphia, for consideration, declaring that troops have been repeatedly placed in the College, that rooms have been broken into and used, that the College firewood has been burnt, and “before we could well clear away the Dirt and Filth left by one Set of Soldiers and meet again in our places another set has been forced upon us.” At the time they are writing there are about one hundred and fifty soldiers occupying the premises, and the yard is crowded with horses and wagons.¹ In February Vice-Provost Alison expects that the College will soon have to be broken up “as in the Jerseys.”

Six months later, in June 1777, they gave up the effort to hold classes and the College was closed. September 1777 the British occupied the city. They used the College buildings for one of their military hospitals, and for the next four months an average of forty sick or wounded were treated there. The British Hospital Board of three physicians and six citizens held their regular weekly meetings there. In April 1778, on appeal from Provost Smith, they evacuated two of the rooms, and in June the British troops were withdrawn from the city.

It may be remarked that the Revolution was having much the same effect on all American colleges. War periods are no time for academic prosperity; togae cedunt armis. In New York the buildings of King’s College were taken over for military purposes by the American troops April 6, 1776, and continued to be occupied by them, and by the British after they captured the city a few weeks later, until the British troops abandoned them in 1783. Although there was a semblance of academic life carried on in a private house, the College was practically in abeyance till its reorganization by an act of the Legislature May 12, 1784, similar to the Pennsylvania act of 1779, “for granting certain privileges to the college heretofore called King’s College, for altering the name and charter thereof, and erecting an Univer-

sity within the state." In Providence the building of the institution which was to become Brown University was taken over December 1776 for the use first of the American then of the French troops, and restored to academic use only in June 1782. At Harvard, as might have been expected, military interference with college life began early, but lasted, so far as the use of its buildings was concerned, but a short time. In May 1775 the provincial troops commandeered the four buildings of the College and quartered some 1,600 soldiers in them, while the President and professors and a handful of students migrated to Concord. But in April 1776, the British withdrew from Boston, the American troops were transferred elsewhere, and the President, tutors, and students returned to their old quarters. The interior woodwork of the buildings had been defaced and brass doorknobs and locks had disappeared, half a ton of lead from the roofs had been melted into bullets, and the bad condition of one of the buildings had been made so much worse that it was never rebuilt. Through the remainder of the Revolution Harvard was under a cloud, an average of less than a hundred and fifty professors, tutors, students, and servitors being in Cambridge at any one time, and the number of graduates falling off to less than thirty a year. Even those who were there were inferior to their predecessors.

In Philadelphia, after the retirement of the British, the Provost and the few remaining professors and tutors gathered the students together as best they could for the remainder of 1778; January 9, 1779, it was announced that "The different Schools of the College and Academy . . . are open for the education of Youth upon the usual plan." The Trustees and Faculty were preparing to hold a Commencement in June when an intimation from the new government of the state that a serious change in the status of the College was in contemplation by the Legislature made any such attempt to resume the former tenor of events evidently impracticable.

If the Revolutionary troubles of the College had been only a matter of injury to its buildings, interruption to its teaching, and even the defection of a certain number of Tory Trustees, on

the restoration of peace its buildings might have been cleaned up, its classes gathered, and its administration resumed under the remaining Trustees. But in Pennsylvania there had been not merely an external but an internal revolution. In securing independence and arming for war, a new political party and a lower social class had come into control of the affairs of the state.

This party, although led chiefly by men of position and ability, had as its supporters many uneducated but not unthinking radicals, who had had no adequate and legitimate means of expressing themselves. They were to be found among the tens of thousands who had gathered a generation before to listen to Whitefield, and among the half-million who bought and thrilled at edition after edition of Paine's *Common Sense*. They made up a part of the four or more thousands that filled Chestnut Street and the adjacent squares in response to the call of the City Committee in the mass meeting of May 1776, and thronged the space in front of Carpenter's Hall in June of the same year. They made a substantial element among the crowds that had turned back the *Charming Polly* and destroyed the cargo of tea on the *Polly Ayres* in the Delaware in the days following the news of the Stamp Act; they formed the crowds that urged on the hesitating steps by which their more moderate leaders advanced to ultimate revolution and independence. These elements of the population of Philadelphia had had no share or interest in the Academy and College, except possibly in the Charity School, the annals of which are unfortunately non-existent. The leaders of the party which now controlled the government of the new state and carried through its first constitution, that of 1776, represented the ideas of these classes as well as their own. Pennsylvania had been an aristocracy; it became now, for a time at least, a democracy.

The College, if it be considered as represented by all who were connected with it as Trustees, as professors, as graduate or as having studied in the Academy or the College, had played by no means an obscure or inglorious part in the Revolution. Twenty were members of the Continental Congress and nine had signed the Declaration of Independence. Major General Mifflin, Major Philemon Dickson, General Muhlenberg, Major Gene
Lambert Cadwalader, Anthony Wayne, Colonel Tilghman, and Colonel Morris were only the most distinguished of a crowd of Philadelphia Academy and College men who were conspicuous in the Continental army or in the military forces of one or other of the states. John Morgan of the first graduating class and the founder of the Medical School was the first Director-General of Hospitals and Physician-in-Chief of the American army, and when, as a result of misunderstanding, jealousies, and inability to cope with a hopeless situation, he was removed from office, it was only to be superseded by Dr. Shippen, his coadjutor in the Medical School; the medical officer in the army with perhaps on the whole the most distinguished permanent record was Dr. Jonathan Potts of the medical class of 1768. Indeed the priority of establishment of the Medical School placed upon its graduates of the preceding decade almost the whole responsibility of filling the higher medical positions not only in the Continental army but in the various bodies of state militia.

But there was another side to the record of patriotism. Some members of the Board of Trustees were actual Tories and withdrew to the British lines or to Great Britain itself. In the final vote on independence in the Continental Congress, of the three Trustees who were members, one voted for it, one against it, one refrained from voting. Others were of doubtful attachment to the new government, and they and members of their families had remained on pleasant terms with the British army of occupation in Philadelphia in 1777 and 1778. Jacob Duché of the Faculty lost heart for the contest and wrote Washington advising surrender. Many who had at first been warm defenders of American rights had held back when it came to separation from the mother country. Of such was Provost Smith; he had avoided any share in the movement for actual independence and had been allowed after the break-up of the College to go into retirement at his country place at the Falls of Schuylkill.

The politics of Revolutionary Pennsylvania are as complicated as those of colonial times, and there is no occasion to discuss them here, further than to trace their influence upon the College. The party already described which was now in power, the "Constitutional" party, the party which had been most vig-
orous in carrying through the Revolution and had secured the adoption of the radical constitution of Pennsylvania of 1776, the most democratic of all the new state constitutions, was not satisfied with the College. Its loyalist tinge, its half-hearted support of the Revolution, its Anglican and aristocratic connections, the Toryism of some of its Trustees, the conservative party position of others, the questionable patriotism of its Provost, were all repugnant to the radical party now in control of the state government. It is therefore not a matter of surprise that the leaders of this dominant party felt and soon expressed hostility to the College. The first outcome of this was the passage by the state Legislature, January 2, 1778, when it was sitting at Lancaster during the British occupation of Philadelphia, of an act “For suspending the powers of the Trustees of the College and Academy of Philadelphia for a limited time.” The Legislature complained that whereas the Vice-Provost, the professors, and some of the Trustees had left the city as the British entered it, others had remained and thereby voluntarily put themselves under the power of the British enemy; some had even joined the British forces. The act provided that no action of the Trustees should be valid as long as the British remained in possession of the city and for three months afterwards.¹

The British evacuated the city June 18, 1778. On September 25, immediately upon the expiration of the period of suspension of their powers, the Trustees met and with the Faculty, as before observed, began the restoration of the College. Their efforts were futile. In the newspapers appeared letters charging Provost Smith with being a Tory, and his long replies in defense of his actions did nothing to win popular sympathy. When the Legislature met again in Philadelphia President Reed recommended anew to its consideration the question of the College. The constitution makers of 1776, in the exuberance of independence, had written into the constitution the proviso that there should be “one or more state universities,” and now they proceeded to transform the old College to conform to their ideals.

On February 23, 1779, a committee was appointed to inquire into the state of the College and Academy, its rise, funds, etc.,

and to report back to the Assembly. When the Board of Trustees at their meeting of March 1, a week later, were informed of this action, a committee was appointed to assemble the necessary information, to meet the committee of the Legislature and to obtain if possible a hearing before the whole Assembly. Provost Smith was of course asked to assist the committee, and with his usual skill and assiduity prepared the case for the College; in fact he had already prepared the material in anticipation of some such action, so that within a week the two committees met in the old College hall at Fourth and Arch streets and the case of the College was presented to the committee of the Assembly. This committee was not in itself a hostile one. Joseph Reed, President of the Assembly, who had suggested the action and made the appointment, was an honorary Master of Arts of the College, and George Clymer, the committee chairman, was about to be elected one of the Trustees. In the Assembly itself were several Trustees of the College.

The account of the origin, growth, ideals, and achievements of the College during the thirty years covered by the report was a dignified and a not unfair statement, although naturally somewhat exaggerated. The description of its present condition, being truthful, was not too pleasing. The number of students was less than at some former periods. There were in the three classes of the College twenty-two students, besides some forty medical students and some special attendants from the army on Dr. Smith’s lectures on experimental philosophy. In the Academy there were fifty-seven scholars in the Grammar School and twenty-four in the English and Mathematical schools. Fifty-seven beside were enrolled in the Charity Schools. Some two hundred pupils under instruction at a time of such confusion was not an unworthy showing. The financial condition of the institution, due, as the Trustees claimed, to the “calamities of the times,” was more unsatisfactory. By much calculation and careful estimation their budget was made to seem balanced, but they acknowledged that on account of the depreciation of the currency they had had to double the salaries of some of the teachers and would have soon to do the same for the rest; they would have to meet other increased costs. It would have been
hard at any time in the history of the College, except perhaps under the régime of lotteries, to have given a favorable report on its finances.

However, probably nothing that the report could have shown would have made much difference in the action of the legislators. They were determined to reconstruct the College. It was an institution of a past age, controlled by men representing ideas and a party distasteful to the majority of them. They wished to build a more democratic institution.

An adverse report of the legislative committee was a foregone conclusion. It was made, and a law in conformity with its recommendations was passed. Three principal complaints were made the basis for the adoption of the law; first, that the Trustees had by a resolution passed in 1764 narrowed the "plan of free and unlimited catholicism" on which the College had been founded; secondly, that the charter required Trustees and professors and all connected with the College to take oaths of allegiance to the British Crown, which was evidently inconsistent with the independence of the state of Pennsylvania; that there was always danger in leaving institutions of learning "in the hands of dangerous and disaffected men"; and thirdly that the funds of the College were inadequate to the needs of proper education.

As to the first of these claims, about 1760 certain Anglican clergymen in Pennsylvania had become panicky about the advance of Presbyterianism, and had begun to fear that Presbyterians might come to control the College which, although founded on complete toleration, was through the Provost and the majority of the Board of Trustees under Church of England influences. By letters home they had conveyed their fear to the Archbishop of Canterbury and to Richard Penn, now a high Anglican. The appeals for funds that Dr. Smith was then mak-

---


2 The Archbishop in a letter from Lambeth dated September 16, 1763, addressed to Rev. Jacob Duché in Philadelphia, says that he has had a letter from Rev. Hugh Neill, Anglican minister at Oxford, Pa., complaining that "the College of Philadelphia is dwindling away... into a mere Presbyterian Faction, that the number of Presbyterians among the Trustees increases, that of fifteen Teachers in the College all are Presbyterians except Dr. Smith and that they are endeavoring to destroy his influence and worm him out."—Historical Collec-
ing in England were based on the nonsectarianism of the College, but interested especially those who looked upon it as supporting the Church and providing capable Anglican teachers and missionaries. The Archbishop and Mr. Penn and Dr. Chandler, the latitudinarian representative of the Dissenters, thereupon despatched a letter to the Trustees urging them to make a rule that no party should be “put upon a worse footing” than they were at that time. The Trustees willingly passed such a regulation, which they all signed and which every new Trustee or other officer was required to sign on his election. Since notwithstanding the fears of the local clergy, at the time of the resolution, 1764, the Provost, Dr. Smith, was an Anglican, the Vice-Provost, Dr. Alison, a Presbyterian, and Professor Kinnersley a Baptist, the regulation seemed and was, a fair one, though the incentive was doubtless defense of the Anglican element, and the preponderance of churchmen on the Board of Trustees continued. In hostile eyes, however, it was a device of the aristocratic Anglican rulers of the College for their own protection; or the complaint may have simply been a specious excuse of those who wished to enact the law. The same may well be true of the complaint about the oaths and about the dangers to the peace of society and the stability of government if the College continued in the hands of men the majority party did not like.

The act proceeds to ratify and confirm to the College, excluding the by-law of 1764 mentioned above, its charters and all its estates and powers. It grants to the institution, in addition to its old property, a fund made up of confiscated estates which will produce an income of not more than £1,500 a year. It alters its old title from the College of Philadelphia to the University of the State of Pennsylvania. This change of title, or the creation of institutions with the title of “university,” was widespread in the legislation and constitution-making of this time. That of Harvard in 1780 and Columbia in 1784 have just been mentioned; there was evident propriety in its use for the transformed institution in Pennsylvania. The old oaths to the Crown were now to be superseded, and those already prescribed for officeholders relative to the American Colonial Church, ed. by W. S. Perry, Hartford, 1870, II, 389–90.
cials under the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania were required to be taken by all connected with the University. Rules and ordinances past or prospective were to be conformable not to British law but to the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Finally, and doubtless as the gist of the whole matter, the old Board of Trustees and Faculty were dissolved and deprived of all possession, control, or administration of the property and functions of the institution, and these were put into the hands of a new group of Trustees specified in the law.

The same number of Trustees, twenty-four, were to be appointed. Six of them were ex-officio, including the great state officers, the President and Vice-President of the Supreme Executive Council, the Attorney-General, certain judges, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The University was thus to be a state institution closely united with the government; six of the new Trustees were to be the senior members of each of the principal religious denominations of the city, including the Roman Catholic. Narrowing of the foundation would thus be prevented forever. Then there were twelve eminent citizens, named in the statute: Benjamin Franklin, of course, as the best-known man in the state, Shippen, Muhlenberg, and Searl, delegates at the time in Congress, but not appointed ex-officio, Timothy Matlack, Secretary, and David Rittenhouse, Treasurer of the state; but, again, appointed rather as citizens than as officers; five well-known judges and lawyers, and two physicians. The Board thus organized should have power to fill vacancies as they arose, in so far as these were not ex-officio, and with the provision that the state government had the power, if exercised within six months, of disallowing any such choice.

It has become customary to speak of this act of 1779 as an "abrogation of the charters." This is an incorrect expression and an unfortunate one, for its use has led to the erroneous impression that there was a break in the continuity of the institution. It was not the charter but the Trustees and Faculty that were, if one may use the term, "abrogated." The very title of the law as it stands on the statute book, "An Act to Confirm the estates and interests of the college, academy and charitable school of the city of Philadelphia, and to amend and alter the chart
THE COLONIAL COLLEGE

thereof, etc." makes this clear. The act of 1779 removed one set of Trustees and put another set in their place; it changed the name of the institution from College to University, the appropriateness of which title had been pointed out long before, and provided it with additional income; it substituted the name of the state for that of the city, and it required new oaths to the new government. In all this there was no breach of continuity. The old group of Trustees, unwillingly enough, it is true, and perhaps not legally, as a later Legislature declared, were deprived of their powers and privileges. A new group of men were given charge of the institution and some changes were made; but the charters were still intact. There was no "abrogation." The procedure, except for the involuntary character of one party's action, was somewhat like that by which the property and trusts of the Trustees of 1740 were handed over to those of 1749. The Board named in the act of 1779 may be looked upon as our third group of Trustees.

Though the transition from College to University in 1779 was one of unbroken continuity, the statute of that year nevertheless represents the close of the life of the old colonial College. It marked the end of an era. The Revolution was a social as well as a political revolution. It was not merely the connection with the British Crown or with the Penn family or the reign of Provost Smith that had come to an end, it was colonial life. A new world had come into being in which the University would have to play its part.

The period from 1740 to 1779 can be looked back upon as a whole. In it the College, Academy, and Charitable School had no insignificant position. The preceding narrative has chronicled frankly its weakness as well as its strength. The rule "nothing extenuate, nor set down aught in malice," has perhaps been even too strictly applied; but it requires no apologist or partial judge or over-loyal alumnus to state fairly the prominent part the College played in the life of the colonial city and adjacent region, in the training of influential men, and in the scientific, the literary, and artistic life of the city. It is doubtful whether it has at any time since been relatively so conspicuous or so influential in its immediate community.