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DIVISION AND REUNION

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, FROM 1779 TO THE REINSTatement OF THE OLD TRUSTEES IN 1789

The history of this period has been much neglected and even more misunderstood. Led by their sympathy with the displaced Provost, Trustees, and Faculty, and by their interest in the colonial College, by a mistaken reading of the law of 1779, and perhaps by their own political affiliations, earlier historians of the University have treated the decade from 1779 to 1789 as a lull in its activities, and have hastened on to the anticipated but, as it proved, abortive restoration of the old Provost, Trustees, and Faculty. The career of the University of the State was, however, of much interest, of devotion to their task on the part of the Trustees, and of intelligent efforts to broaden the curriculum and to make this, the earliest of all American state universities, worthy of its name.

The new Trustees lost no time in taking up their duties. Little more than a week elapsed between the last meeting of the old Board, November 22, and the first meeting of the new, December 5. The new Trustees met in the same hall as the old, in the building at Fourth and Arch streets. Nineteen of the twenty-four were present. They were a notable assembly, including many of the men who had made the Revolution in Pennsylvania and were now, for the time at least, in control of the destinies of the state. Joseph Reed, President of the Executive Council of the state, who, as has been indicated, had recommended the legislation which had resulted in the expulsion of the Board of Trustees of the College, was hardly a newcomer into its affairs. He had been a student there for two years and, after he had ob-
tained his A.B. at Princeton, received from it in 1766 the degree of M.A. He was elected President of the new Board and attended its meetings with regularity. William Moore, Vice-President of the state; Timothy Matlack, Secretary; John Bayard, Speaker of the Assembly; John Dickinson, Attorney-General; and Chief Justice McKean, Trustees ex officio, were all men of much political influence and at least two of them—Dickinson and McKean—among the ablest men Pennsylvania has produced.

It was a curious fate that made Francis Hopkinson, first in the list of graduates of the old College, bound to it by a score of ties and recently elected one of its Trustees, a Trustee of the University by virtue of his office as Judge of the Admiralty. Similarly Rev. William White, who was a graduate and M.A. of the College and had been one of its Trustees since 1774, was now as the leading Episcopal clergyman of the city, a Trustee of the University. Thomas Willing and Dr. Thomas Bond, named Trustees of the University as prominent citizens in the act of 1779, had also been members of the old Board.

The requirement of the law that the leading clergymen of the principal denominations should be on the Board led to the membership of Dr. White for the Episcopalians, Dr. Ewing for the Presbyterians, Dr. Kunze and Dr. Weiberg for the two branches of the Lutherans, and Father Farmer for the Roman Catholics. It was a far cry from 1756, when Dr. Smith had written to an English clerical correspondent that of the twenty-four Trustees of the College, fourteen or fifteen were regular churchmen and that “the church by soft and easy means daily gains ground in it.” It was remarkable also that in Quaker Philadelphia the Friends, because they had no ministers, had no representation on the Board, while the Roman Catholics, who had previous to the Revolution possessed no legal status, were now represented there. Franklin, whose name had as a matter of course been placed among the Trustees as an eminent citizen, was not in America at the time and did not take his seat on the Board even after his return.

No doubt that the University was a state institution was allowed to exist. In accordance with the requirement of the law, in addition to the oaths of allegiance and of fidelity to the state
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government, the Trustees took a third oath, as state officials, for the faithful performance of their duties as Trustees. A new minute book was begun and duly adorned with a list of signatures as interesting and as impressive as those of 1749, though very different in significance. The claim made for the old Board that it comprised "the pick of the representative men of the old families of Philadelphia" could not have been made of their successors because they were mostly new men and their prominence was largely based on their politics. Their second meeting was held in the State House, as if to accentuate their position as a state body, and subsequent meetings were frequently held there. The lesser seal of the state was declared for the time to be the seal of the University. The names of the new Trustees as they came to be elected were laid before the Legislature for confirmation or, if the power was exercised within six months, rejection. The Trustees also looked forward hopefully to the financial support to which the law according to which they held their office entitled them.

The first consideration of the new Trustees was necessarily an examination of the past. The charters of 1753 and 1755 upon which their fundamental powers were based were extracted from the archives and read aloud at one of their meetings. The old minute books were obtained from Dr. Smith and a committee was appointed to examine the formerly approved plan of education, to indicate which portions should be continued, which altered, and which abandoned. They were to find the names and the rates of pay of the former professors and the number of students in the College and lower schools. The old Faculty had been dissolved along with the Board of Trustees; Vice-Provost Alison had died November 28, 1779, and Provost Smith was intentionally disregarded as representing all to which the new administration was opposed; the other professors of the College—Davidson, Oliphant, and Heffernan—and the medical professors were asked to continue with their work for the time. Notices were to be given that tutors for the Latin, English, and Mathematical schools would be wanted.

To wrest the institution immediately from the long-accustomed hands of Dr. Smith was no light matter. He made no
objection to handing over the charters and the minute books and the use of the buildings, but when he was asked to deliver the seal and the keys of the College he procrastinated. Neither the accounts of the College nor his own charges were, he declared, yet settled. When he was informed that his successor was asking for the occupancy of the Provost's house, he resolutely declined to yield possession. It was not until after repeated demands, and until almost a year had passed, and actual legal process for his expulsion had been served upon him that he gave way, appeared before the Board in person and signed an agreement to hand over all the keys and move from his dwelling on a certain date. At the same time he asked for an advance of money on his unsettled accounts. This was declined, though only by a tie vote. Soon the finance committee could report that all the keys of the buildings and all the securities of the old College were in their hands and that Dr. Ewing, the head of the University, was occupying the Provost's house.

It was not till many years later, however, that Dr. Smith's accounts were finally settled. He was then allowed a pension for life of £100 per year in currency, in acknowledgment of the old grant of half that sum in sterling made to him by the Trustees in 1764 when he returned triumphantly from collecting money in England. Certain other unsettled claims were included.

It was at an early meeting of the Board that Professor Ewing was elected Provost. President Reed of the Trustees and some others would have preferred to conciliate the more conservative elements by electing some other Episcopalian in Dr. Smith's place, perhaps Dr. Johnson of Columbia, but party feeling was too strong, so this learned Presbyterian minister-scientist was elected the institution's second Provost. He was appointed also Professor of Natural and Experimental Philosophy, though the Provost had traditionally lectured on moral not natural philosophy. As a result of this election as Professor and Provost he ceased to be a member of the Board of Trustees.

The Trustees had great ambitions. They created immediately two new professorships, one in astronomy, a popular interest of the day, to which David Rittenhouse was elected, the other in the classics to be taught in German. This was a recognition that
the University was a Pennsylvania, not merely a Philadelphia, institution, and a concession to the large part of the population of the state outside of the city which knew no other language. A "German School," where German-speaking boys could be prepared for the higher studies and where others could be taught German, was added to the earlier lower schools. Dr. J. C. Kunze, a Lutheran clergyman, a graduate of Halle, was elected Professor of German and Oriental Languages, and, after he was drawn away to New York, a Dr. Helmuth was elected. Rittenhouse was elected Vice-Provost.

Rittenhouse was now in the midst of his great career, already famous for his reports on the transits of Mercury and Venus, for his success in determining the boundaries between four pairs of states, and for the construction of the orreries for Princeton and Philadelphia. He was an honorary Master of Arts of Philadelphia, of Princeton, and of William and Mary. He was also prominent at the Philosophical Society, where he succeeded Franklin as President; but he was not good material for a professor or a Vice-Provost. He was not interested in teaching or administration, and soon resigned to become again a Trustee; but his massive knowledge, his ingenuity, and his interest remained at the disposal of the University. Soon afterward Robert Patterson began his long and interesting career by offering a course of lectures on electricity, where would be exhibited "New and interesting experiments never yet exhibited at any public lectures in this city." The lectures were given three times a week at eleven in the morning and repeated at six o'clock in the evening. He also taught undergraduates.

The ambitions of the Trustees extended beyond individual replacements or extensions. One of the earliest of their committees was appointed to propose a plan for a "University education" and a "Faculty of the University." The successive reports of this committee gave occasion for repeated "cool and impartial examination" of the question and for many proposals by individual members. Dr. White would have added a professor of divinity to the Faculty, but this, like many other proposals, was laid on the table.

More than two years later the Board "after mature delibera-
tion" July 2, 1782, accepted the recommendation of the committee. It was an interesting and enlightened plan of college education. It provided for seven professorships; in natural philosophy, moral philosophy including metaphysics and logic, the Latin and Greek classics, the Oriental and German languages, history, mathematics, English, and oratory. Appointees were named or confirmed to each of these, Provost Ewing to the first, the Vice-Provost to the second. Provost Ewing was already giving the course of lectures on what he called "natural experimental philosophy," that he continued to give yearly, and which was ultimately edited and printed by his colleague Robert Patterson. It was this interest that led him to give his patronage a few years afterward to John Fitch, whose experiments on the steamboat led to his short period of successful voyaging on the Delaware in 1790 and 1791. When Rittenhouse resigned his professorship and the Vice-Provostship, Reverend Samuel Magaw, a graduate of the class of 1757 and Rector of St. Paul's Church, a more adequate teacher though a much less distinguished man, was elected to that position. James Davidson, who had long been professor in the College, continued to teach the classics. The "Oriental languages" which Dr. Kunze was appointed to teach no doubt stood for Hebrew, to be taught to those preparing to be clergymen. Dr. Kunze was also to take charge of the German School, a flourishing department at the time. Robert Patterson, Professor of Mathematics, was to have charge also of the school teaching "practical mathematics," arithmetic, and bookkeeping. Archibald Gamble, who had recently been elected Professor of English and Oratory, was also to be Master of the Grammar School, in which would be taught "the English, Latin and Greek Languages, with such others as the Trustees might appoint," evidently the old English School now merged in the general preparatory school for the College. The professorship of history, to be filled by Robert Davidson, brother of the Professor of the Classics, who was also to teach chronology and geography, was an innovation; so far as appears in our own history and that of other colleges it was perhaps an isolated instance of the treatment of history as a separate subject for more than half a century.

That which was most distinctive of this plan, however, was
its replacement of the old “Philosophical School” by four parallel groups of studies, an anticipation of the modern elective system. If a student after complying with somewhat simple entrance requirements, which included some Latin and Greek, ability to “read English with propriety,” and to write a fair hand, remained in any one of these groups four years he would obtain his Bachelor’s degree. The Grammar School would prepare for all four of the parallel courses. Provision was made for special students, who would get no degree, and for students transferred from other colleges. The group of professors was to be an organized Faculty, to meet from time to time, to keep minutes in a “bound book,” and to exercise certain rather circumscribed powers under the general control of the Board of Trustees. These rules were extended five years later into a regular code of “Laws and Rules for the good government and discipline of the students and Schools in the University of Pennsylvania”; minute rules for attendance, fines and other punishments were introduced, with reservation of the right to appeal from the Faculty to the Trustees. These rules were to be read aloud every three months, and 150 copies were printed for distribution. These seem to be the first set of the frequently amended by-laws of the University.

It is not to be supposed that this ambitious plan came fully into existence at the University. It was rather an ideal which poverty, politics, and shortness of time doomed to remain unfulfilled. Its interest lies largely in its ideals and proposals, so much more extensive than the College curriculum. Yet for some years education was carried on more or less in conformity with this system and under these instructors.

The reorganization of the medical courses was more difficult than that of the College. The effect of the Revolution on these courses had been more destructive; all who could do medical service had been, indeed in 1779 still were, in the army. The Trustees promptly after their organization appointed a committee made up of their members who were physicians “to inquire into the state of the late Medical School as it stood in the late College.” They went further and asked their committee to look into the position of medical teaching in foreign universities and
to digest a plan for the consideration of the Board "for establishing the school on the most respectable footing." This resolution, adopted at the meeting of December 1779, is apparently the first time the group of medical courses is spoken of as a "School" distinct from the other courses given in the College. Some months later this committee is again urged to report its plan for the establishment of a medical school. The conception of the medical courses as a separate department of the University was evidently by this time a familiar one. To get it organized was not so easy.

Old personal and political jealousies still survived. When Dr. Shippen was re-elected, or rather retained, both Dr. Morgan and Dr. Rush refused to serve. A bitter exchange of angry charges in the newspapers, in which such appellations as "Hell-cat" and "Dr. Spitfire" were used by the principals or their supporters, extended through the years 1780 and 1781. Dr. Hutchinson and Dr. Tilton successively declined the vacant chair of chemistry. However, Dr. Rush finally yielded and began again to lecture, Dr. Shippen included surgery and midwifery in his anatomy and physiology, Dr. Bond added theory and practice to his clinical lectures, and so with some changes of title the old group was by 1783 reconstructed. Notwithstanding some informality of position and title, teaching, examinations, and the granting of degrees continued through the whole period. There is no reason to believe that any student was given a medical degree without proof of a reasonable amount of professional preparation, nor was there any break in the continuity of the institution, so far as its medical work was concerned. The long-delayed plan for the organization of a new medical school on advanced lines and with more formal requirements for the grant of degrees in medicine was laid before the Trustees in March 1788, but that was, as will be seen, a difficult time in the history of the University, and the whole proposal was laid on the table.

The Medical School and the Department of Arts were brought together by their common dependence on the action of the Board of Trustees, though the Medical School possessed a certain degree of independence. During this period the two departments had joint Commencements. In 1779, as will be re-
membered, the College, due to official interposition, held no Commencement, but in 1780 the University gave appropriate degrees to the students who had been examined for their degrees in 1779 and had completed their work under either the College or the University. There proved to be eight receiving A.B., the same number M.A., two bachelors and one doctor of medicine, besides seven who were granted honorary degrees. Among the latter it is interesting to find the name of Thomas Paine given the degree of M.A. by unanimous vote of the Trustees at a meeting at which four clergymen were present. Common Sense had been published and had done its effective work for the success of the American Revolution; the Rights of Man and the Age of Reason had not yet been written or issued, to scandalize state and church. The next year six degrees were given in arts, eight in medicine, and there were six honorary degrees.

The average number of students, old and young, of Academy and College and Medical School, who gathered daily in the old building on Fourth Street during this decade was about 250; in 1784, the climax of this period, it ran up to four hundred. Of these some thirty-five or forty were in the college proper, from which an average of eight or nine took their degree of A.B. each year; it was the day of small things. There were usually six or eight Masters of Arts, and some honorary degrees were given. It seems impracticable, from the nature of their registration, to find from the records how many students were taking work with the medical professors, but in March 1784 there were said to be sixty medical students in attendance, and at the next Commencement eight took the degree of Bachelor of Medicine. This was about the average of those who each year took medical degrees, either as Bachelors or Doctors.

Without quite the éclat of colonial occasions, Commencements and other University functions were by no means without attraction to the public; sometimes they offered excitement. At the Commencement of July 4, 1781, for instance, although it was "on the Anniversary of our Glorious Revolution," as one of the newspapers describes it, and attended by the President and members of Congress, the President and Executive Council of the State, the family of the Minister of France, officers of the army,
and other persons of distinction, proceedings were suddenly halted while one of the students, Francis Murray, was in the midst of an address the announced subject of which was Major André. The Provost and the Trustees who were present went into an adjoining room where it was explained by the Provost that the speaker was using certain expressions about Major André that he had been strictly forbidden by the Faculty to use. The Board immediately withdrew his name from the list of those who were to receive their degrees. He was subsequently called before them but was recalcitrant, insisting that he said what he did because he thought he ought to say it, although he acknowledged that it had been forbidden. A year later, however, he had changed his mind and petitioned for his degree, stating that his action had been due to the "indiscretion of unreflecting youth." The Trustees committed the matter to a special committee and to the Faculty, and it was only after several months that all concerned were placated. Murray's name appears as an A.B. of 1781 though he never appeared again at Commencement and he did not receive the automatically bestowed M.A. till a year later than the rest of his class. It would be interesting to know what Mr. Murray said about Major André; whether it was unpatriotically favorable, due to the pleasant impression that young English officer had left in Philadelphia during the occupation three years before, or whether, echoing the anger caused by Arnold's treason of the previous year in which André was the intermediary, it was unduly harsh, gloating over a fallen and unfortunate foe, is not told. Unfortunately official minutes are barren soil for the growth of human interest.

This was a year of excitement in civic and University circles. In 1781 Philadelphia was the capital of the country as well as its largest city. It was here that Congress was sitting and here that the representatives of foreign alliances were stationed. The public theatre was closed by act of Congress, but the University students did what they could to fill the void. Early in March, although in February there had been a prohibition by the Trustees of any plays to be given without previous permission, the students produced *Gustavus Vasa, the Deliverer of His Country*. This was a patriotic play written in England fifty years before,
its performance at that time forbidden by the censor, presumably because of its glorification of rebellion. Now it was given in the old hall at Fourth and Arch, attended by "thousands," according to ex-Provost Smith, who went to hear it and came away sore in body from the crowding, vexed in spirit at the shouting and ill-behavior of the populace, "like a bull-baiting," he says, and, we may believe, ill pleased to see others occupying his house and in control of what he still calls "the College."

We have a spirited account of the occasion from a southern lady, Martha Blaine, daughter of a member of Congress from Virginia and a friend of Nancy Shippen, whom she is visiting. She writes that she has been enjoying the "Gay Scenes" of Philadelphia, attending the balls and "oratorios" given by the French minister. She has gone to a play given by the students, "Where there was the greatest crowd I ever saw." With Nancy Shippen, Mr. Otto, and Chevalier Marbois of the French legation and Don Francisco of Spain they drove to the University at five o'clock but found several hundred people in the yard watching for the opening of the doors. After driving around a few blocks they returned to find the doors open but people climbing up the walls and over the heads of the others "as if Garrick had been there." Her party formed a line by holding hands to get through the crowd and through the passage and up the stairs, but had to give up and retire to one of the classrooms "until the hurly-burly was over." 1 Could there have been any connection between this Gustavus Vasa, and the "Gustavus," used as a pseudonym by Arnold in his treasonable correspondence with General Gates? And had Francis Murray, the defiant orator of July 1781, taken part in the play four months before? There are unfortunately no answers.

When the news of Yorktown came to Philadelphia, in December of the same year, the Trustees and Faculty of the University sent resolutions of congratulation to Washington apprising him of their participation in the general joy and their special gratitude for the assurance his victory offers them for the development of the arts of peace. Washington and his family, the President and members of Congress, the President and Execu-

---

1 *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, January 1935.
tive Council of Pennsylvania, and the Minister of France and his family and attachés, all then present in Philadelphia, were invited guests at the Commencement of 1782. The next year the bonds with the Father of his Country were drawn still closer, for at the commencement held on July 4, 1783, with his consent the degree of LL.D. was conferred upon him, for "joining the wreath of Science to the Laurels of the Hero." The degree had to be conferred in absentia, for he was just then in New York, but he sent a graceful acknowledgment, and when he passed through Philadelphia on his way to Annapolis six months later to resign his commission to Congress, the diploma and address were presented to him and acknowledged by him in person.

Close upon the congratulations to Washington came a similar ascription of honors to Franklin, who at last, in September 1785, returned to Pennsylvania after his long diplomatic career abroad. Among the various groups in Philadelphia who presented him with their felicitations were the Faculty of the University, led by the Provost and Vice-Provost. With numerous allusions to his instrumentality in its foundation, and calling attention to its recent restoration to its original "broad and catholic bottom" as he had planned it, for so they described the legislation of 1779, they expressed the hope that they might enjoy his approval and continued patronage during this the eve of his long and distinguished life. Whether or not the old man smiled inwardly at hearing the same words used to him that he had heard long before applied so improperly, as he contended, to the Penns, and whether he interpreted the law of 1779 as they did, he answered with appreciation of their compliments and expressions of good wishes equal to theirs. But he did not take the seat on the Board of Trustees to which he had been named in the law of 1779. The next year his election as President of the Executive Council of the State made him in addition a Trustee ex officio; but there is no record of his attendance. Three years later, when his term as President had expired and the conservatives were in power, his name was dropped from the list of Trustees for non-attendance.

In December 1782 the honorary degree of LL.D. was conferred on two distinguished French travelers, the Chevalier de Chastellux, and François Barbé de Marbois, and of M.D. on a Dr. Coste,
Physician-General to the French army. Chastellux was one of those young French officers who came over with Rochambeau and the French troops in the summer of 1780. He saw much of Washington, admired him and became much attached to him. In addition to his military duties he made two journeys, one in the northern the other in the southern section of the country. On both excursions he visited Philadelphia and in his Voyages, written after his return to France, gives interesting observations made during his visit to the city. He met Ewing and Rittenhouse, visited the University, and was, as just remarked, given its highest degree. He was also elected a member of the Philosophical Society.

He was charmed with his treatment here and elsewhere in America and on his return to France he urged Count Vergennes to recommend to the King to send a gift of books for the library of the Philadelphia institution. He had visited and been honored in the same way at Williamsburg in Virginia and made a similar recommendation to Vergennes for William and Mary. The books arrived for both institutions the next year, 1784. There were a hundred handsome volumes for each. Those given to Pennsylvania were largely works by French writers on science and natural history, suggested presumably by the known interests of Franklin and by the reports of the French botanists who had visited America. There were thirty-three titles, one of them a collection of the works of Buffon in thirty volumes. The Trustees acknowledged the gift in a courteous, almost fulsome, letter, considering that it emanated from a group of newly made republicans. It expressed their recognition of the "honor his most Christian Majesty has done them by extending his Royal attention to the Advancement of Science ... with so magnificent a Donation." Chastellux was so proud of this correspondence, which he described as très élégante et éloquente, that he had it printed in the Mercure de France.¹

French politics were already extending to America, and the Courier de l'Amérique, an anti-royalist periodical started in Philadelphia in the very month of the receipt of the books, pub-

¹ See University of Pennsylvania Library Chronicle, Vol. II, Nos. 3 and 4, where a catalogue of the books is given.
lished a scornful but quite unmerited criticism of them. All but six volumes are still preserved in the University Library, although until quite recently they have been on the open shelves, and subject to depredation. The College of William and Mary has not been so fortunate; a destructive fire has left only one volume of the original one hundred.¹

Probably because of the semi-public character of the University, outside organizations felt more free to ask for the use of its rooms for their meetings, when they were not in use for purposes of instruction, than in the time of the College. Demands upon it in 1781 and again in 1784 by a group of Baptists, in 1782 by a German Lutheran congregation; by a congregation of Scots Presbyterians in 1786, are reminiscent of the original object of the building, though in so different a world. The American Philosophical Society, while awaiting the completion of its own building operations, was given the use of one of the University's rooms. The Constitutional Society in 1783 is allowed to meet in the Latin School, and Mr. Adgate's singing society in 1784 in the English School. The well-known interest in music in the Philadelphia of this period is reflected in demands on the University's rooms. Although the organ which had been installed in the old Hall in 1760 had broken down and was removed and sold for £25 in 1785, the Uranian Society, a musical organization, was, at the request of one of the Trustees, allowed to meet here in the winter of 1786; another Trustee, representing the Society for Promoting Psalmody, advocated, though unsuccessfully, the application of Mr. Adgate to become a regular teacher of music in the University.

From 1786 onward there appears to have been a rising movement of serious study among young men outside of the University circle but wanting to use its facilities. In January and February 1786 three societies, one of "young gentlemen of the law," another "the Medical Society," the third a group formed

¹ It is of interest to observe that the French Department of Education in 1937, 150 years after the royal gift, sent to Pennsylvania and to some other American colleges and universities which interest themselves especially in French literature, science, and art, an invitation to choose from an extensive list of French works up to the value of 20,000 francs as a gift from the Republic.
“for their mental improvement,” like Franklin’s Junto, were allowed various rooms in the University building. Most if not all of these groups met in the evening and therefore interfered little with the regular scholars. In 1787 a Junior Law Society asks permission to meet at the University. Their request is referred to the Chief Justice and a committee but no report is recorded. The Humane Society, formed to save people from drowning, obtains liberty to meet there in 1787, and an equally unexpected organization, the Agricultural Society, seeks permission to hear a short course of lectures on agriculture in 1788. At another time the Society for the Encouragement of Manufactures meets at the University.

There were frequent requests, some granted, some declined, for its use in the old field of “Experimental Philosophy”; at another time for the “Philosophy of Natural History.” One claimant wants to make use in his lectures of the University’s apparatus; but this, on advice of the Provost, is declined. There was more than one instance of use for a period of one of the rooms in the evening for an English, a French, or a German school. In June 1781 the managers of a Federal lottery seem to have established themselves in the hall, but they are ordered to remove their equipment before the next meeting of the Board.

Unusual interest attaches to the use of the rooms for two courses of lectures given in the winters of 1786 and 1787 by Noah Webster, of spelling book and dictionary fame. He obtained permission for their use and gave a course of lectures on the English language in February 1786, which was attended by about a hundred persons and at which the pupils of Mr. Adgate’s school sang as a chorus. March 15, 1786, he gave a lecture for the benefit of the Pennsylvania Hospital, the subject being “The connection between property and power . . . with remarks on slavery, climate, etc.” He left to lecture at Yale in June 1786. He then had some correspondence with Franklin on spelling reform and on the possibility of obtaining permanent employment in Philadelphia; he returned there in 1787 and lectured at the University again in the autumn. He pleaded for the maintenance of American speech as against the ways of speaking of British play-actors.
He says he was asked by Provost Ewing to become Professor of Oratory at the University but did not want to tie himself down to teaching.

It must have been somewhat earlier that Lindley Murray, the grammarian, a predecessor of Webster in the study of language, was for a time a student in the English School under Kinnersley, and said long afterward that he always looked back with pleasure to his stay there and with regret that it had not been longer.¹

It might have been expected that these varied contacts and kindly services would have made so friendly an atmosphere around the University that it could have secured sufficient funds for its modest needs. Besides, one of the complaints made against the old College had been its insufficient endowment, and the legislators who had created the University had intended to provide adequately for its support. For that purpose the law of 1779 had guaranteed to it all the existing property of the College and had ordered that sufficient charges should be made against confiscated estates to give it an income from them not beyond £1,500 a year. But their needs were inadequately met by these provisions. Of the property the old Trustees handed on to the new but little was income-bearing, as indicated in the College accounts of 1779. The pledges given to the College in its pre-Revolutionary campaign for funds were disavowed or disregarded by those who had made them, notwithstanding the appeals of a specially appointed committee. The returns from the confiscated estates came in slowly. Within the first month the Trustees were forced to appeal to the Assembly for a loan of £15,000 currency, to be repaid when they should be able; when this was not immediately forthcoming and the treasury was actually empty, they ask, some months later, more modestly for £2,000 to meet the present emergency and to be repaid when their funds will permit. A depreciated currency made all expenses high, £22 for a new bell-rope in 1780, £90 for a lock and key for the University buildings in 1781. It had been necessary to double the salaries of the professors just at the close of the old administration, and with the additions to the Faculty the salary list now amounted to £3,000
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a year. Soon a committee was sent to the state Assembly to represent the embarrassed condition of the University.

In 1781 the Trustees were in such straits that they returned to a long-abandoned policy and asked the Assembly to authorize a lottery for £750; at another time they were so poor that they were glad to borrow £300 from the Vice-Provost. There was great difficulty in collecting students' fees and the rents from the confiscated Tory estates which were now coming into their hands as provided for by the law. The agent engaged to collect these sums had so much trouble that in 1783 he kept a woman in prison for debt until the Trustees intervened to secure her release. In 1785 the promised confiscated estates were finally enumerated and the titles vested in the University. The dwelling houses that came to them in this way were in many cases in bad repair or subject to a ground rent that made them unprofitable as an investment. In such cases the property was sold. Much of the time of Trustees' meetings was for long periods devoted to discussion of the details of sales. Lots were thus sold to bring in an income of £1,300 in currency. The amounts realized seem in some cases to have been considerable, such as £1,050 for a lot on the corner of Race and Water streets. Doubtless there were substantial charges against these. It is hard to avoid a sigh of regret at these sales; much of the property in the heart of the city, Arch Street Wharf, for instance, or tracts in the outskirts, if they could have been held for later times, would have enriched the University by sums approaching the wealth of old landed corporations in European cities or Trinity Church, New York.

Nevertheless the budget was never balanced or running expenses paid. The salaries of the tutors especially seem to have been always in arrears; in their protests to the Trustees the gamut is run from pathetic appeals to threats of lawsuits. In 1787 they succeeded in obtaining a letter from Franklin urging that they be paid, the only communication he ever made to the Trustees. Instalments on professors' salaries were paid from time to time, but even they were never paid actually up to date.

One of the many committees which through the University's history have been instructed to devise a way to make its income

1 Statutes at Large of Pennsylvania, Chap. 1195, XII, 119-141.
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correspond to its expenditures submitted an unusually full and discouragingly clear report in August 1788. It showed a net annual income of some £2,200 and an average expenditure after all economies of about £2,800, the regular annual deficit therefore being £600. Among the various proposed remedies for this condition of affairs it is notable that there is no question of seeking further support from the government of the state. It is evident that a change had taken place in the Board itself corresponding to the political transformation that was taking place in the state. The idea of the University as a state institution was becoming more tenuous, its ambitions less lofty. The committee can only suggest that the salaries of the professors should be further reduced, that the number of students should be increased by giving greater attention to the more popular branches and less to the fields taught by the higher professors. This defeatist report and its ready acceptance by the Trustees were without doubt influenced by the knowledge that legislation was imminent that would deprive them of the control of much of their property, reduce their prestige, and make their continued existence as a state university more than doubtful. To understand this change in the fortunes of the University it is necessary to go back for a moment to the law establishing it in 1779.

THE RESTORATION OF THE COLLEGE
1779-1789

Provost Smith and the Trustees of the College never accepted their disfranchisement by the Act of 1779 as just or even as legal. To them their expulsion from their trust seemed mere forcible seizure of their estates, rights, and powers by a legislative body in which their political opponents happened to be in a majority. Dr. Smith was unmeasured in his denunciation of the new Trustees. They were "robbers," they had got the institution into their hands by "robbing the Original Owners." With a curious confusion between trusteeship and ownership, the most influential of later interpreters of this series of events speaks of efforts "to restore the College estates to their rightful owners." Another critic describes the law of 1779 as "transferring the property of
one set of men to the pockets of another," and with an equally curious blindness to trusteeship and to due process of law speaks of the action of the Trustees of the state University "during their usurpation," asserting that "the money they were using did not belong to them in law or morals." It certainly did not, nor did it belong to their predecessors; they were both Trustees for its use; the Legislature had simply directed its use by one set of Trustees in place of another. This, however, was not acknowledged either by the ex-Provost or by the more aggressive members of the old Board for whom he spoke. He kept up a continual protest against the actions of the University. Among the most frequent entries in their minutes are communications from Dr. Smith. He was their bête noire. Some of these communications, it is true, concern his accounts, or the disputed return of the College keys, or of his dwelling house, but others impugn the legality of the actions of those to whom they are addressed or of their very existence as Trustees of the old endowments. His communications were regularly laid on the table.

He made similar protests to the state Legislature and appealed for their consideration of arguments against his removal and that of the other members of the Faculty. Such an appeal appeared in the session of 1780 and again in 1781; it was read again in March 1782 and this time referred to the Committee on Grievances, but received no further attention. This happened again in the fall session of 1782 and in December 1783. The ex-Provost's petition was regularly accompanied by a memorial to the same effect signed by several of the old Trustees, couched, it may be said, in more moderate terms. By 1782 the political complexion of the Assembly was evidently changing; the party which had created the constitution of 1776 and removed the Trustees of the old College was losing its hold. The usual petition and memorial were considered therefore somewhat more sympathetically in 1784; they were read a first and second time, but were ultimately buried as usual by reference to a committee.

By this time, however, a third body had come into existence with which a protest might be lodged, possibly with more hope of success. This was the Council of Censors, a body provided for in the state constitution of 1776. It was to meet every seven years,
to be elected by popular vote to act as a sort of periodic supreme court with power to declare unconstitutional laws recently passed, to recommend legislation and, if necessary, to call a convention for the adoption of a new constitution. It was a democratic provision peculiar to Pennsylvania and Vermont. A petition for attention to his grievance was promptly presented to them by Dr. Smith and a memorial submitted signed by such substantial members of the old Board of Trustees as Thomas Mifflin, Robert Morris, James Wilson, and Rev. William White. The Council of Censors, its membership completed in 1784 by the same voters as had elected the Assembly of that year, reflected the new conservative majority. Its committee on the constitutionality of legislation therefore expressed some doubt whether the law of 1779 by which the old Trustees and Faculty of the College had been removed was not "a deviation from the constitution."

Their report gave occasion for a long debate, in which the petition of Dr. Smith and the memorial of the Trustees were brought up and read; but the Council refused by a majority of thirteen to declare the act unconstitutional. The reasons for this decision and a minority report in favor of the College are spread in full on the record of the Council of Censors, from which this account is taken. The committee declared its belief "that the great majority of the late Trustees of the College of Philadelphia were not only hostile to our independency but abettors of the cause of the king of Great Britain and totally disqualified for such a trust under our present government. . . . To remedy these defects . . . legislative interposition became absolutely necessary." In other words, there had been, what was not always remembered, a Revolution, of which the ouster of the old Trustees had been a part. The minority reiterated the old charges. The "case of the College" had by this time become a cause célèbre; it was discussed in the newspapers and furnishes to modern students an excellent test of the alternating aristocratic and popular tendencies of the early days of the Republic. The old Board represented aristocracy and conservatism, the University the more revolutionary and democratic spirit.

Encouraged by this approximation to success and by the knowl-
edge that the opposite party was steadily losing ground, the old petitions were reintroduced in the next Assembly, and three solid weeks of legislative time were devoted to threshing over old straw. As a result a bill for the restoration of the rights petitioned for was introduced and passed its first reading; but the conservative trend in the Assembly was broken by a sudden defection of what was now a minority. September 28, 1784, nineteen radical members, on a preconcerted signal, rushed from the meeting room in the State House, leaving no quorum for the rest of the session. Conditions were thus left in a stalemate, the effects of which we have seen in a slowing up of the educational efforts of the University. Dr. Smith, though not giving up his home in Philadelphia, was residing in Chestertown, Maryland, where with his usual adaptability he had found and developed an old school, obtained for it from the Legislature of Maryland a college charter and named it Washington College. He found his principal interest in this, in ecclesiastical affairs, and, like so many others at that time, in speculation in western lands.

The restoration of the old College had, however, become a party policy, and when in 1788 the victory of the conservatives in the state Legislature had become complete, a committee again recommended Dr. Smith's petition and the memorial of the old Trustees to the serious and favorable attention of the Legislature. Dr. Smith also returned to the fray by publishing in that year An Address to the General Assembly of Pennsylvania in the Case of the Violated Charter of the College. The report of this committee was favorable to the old College but unfortunately was based almost entirely on the grounds of constitutionality. It claimed that the Legislature in 1779 had taken action contrary to the intent of those clauses in the state constitution of 1776 which protected existing corporations in their property rights and privileges. The desirability or undesirability of having a state university, the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of that which was then in existence, were not discussed; its personnel and work were not mentioned, nor were those of the College to which it was proposed to hand back its property and privileges. The question settled was one of personal and property rights, not one of educational policy.
There had never been any anticipation of a complete repeal of the Revolutionary statute of 1779. The bill the committee formulated, which was now passed by a large majority March 6, 1789, did little more than repeal those parts of the act of ten years before that had deprived the Trustees and Faculty of the College of the control of the property they possessed at that time and of the exercise of the privileges granted to them under the original charters of 1753 and 1755. It was no more a regrant of the charters than the act of 1779 had been an abrogation of them. The charters had been in full vitality in the hands of the Trustees of the University; now the property and privileges under those charters of which the College Trustees and Faculty had been dispossessed were regranted to them. The line of continuity of chartered rights during this decade runs through the University, not through the group of dispossessed and protesting Trustees and Faculty. There never was a court decision on the question of constitutionality. The action of 1789, like that of 1779, was legislative, not judicial; they were no less authoritative on that account, perhaps more so.

Dr. Smith, in classic phrase and with characteristic use of an English example, proposed that the inscription that was set on Queen’s College, Oxford, at the Restoration, should be placed on the College building. Without burdening this text with the Latin, in translation it would read, “By the divine mercy and care this College, rescued as it were from a Babylonian captivity, is restored to its proper and legitimate Trustees.” This legend, like another famous inscription prepared for a modern restored university, that of Louvain, was never placed upon it. The College had more immediate needs and tasks.

THE TWO INSTITUTIONS
1789–1791

The restoration of 1789 was a handsome victory for Dr. Smith and the old Board of Trustees, and the wraith of the colonial College came back again to Fourth and Arch streets. Dr. Smith of course again became, or, as he would have put it, was again

---

1 Statutes at Large of Pennsylvania, Chap. 1393, XIII, 191–92.
acknowledged as Provost. Ewing moved out of the Provost's House that had now become almost an emblem of control, and Dr. Smith moved in. The vacancies that the Tory defections and the hand of death had caused in the Board of Trustees were filled by the election of ten new members. Of these, four were members of the Assembly prominent in obtaining the restoration of its estates and privileges to the College, two were graduates, all were wealthy and prominent citizens, and most of them had taken an active though a late-chosen part in the Revolution. In consideration of the weak health of Franklin the Trustees met regularly for some weeks at his home and he was chosen to his old position of President of the Board at their organization meeting, March 9, 1789.¹

Provost Smith taught the same subjects as before; James Davidson, the only other surviving member of the old Faculty, returned to his professorship of the classics. Rev. John Andrews, a graduate of the class of 1765 who had been Principal of the newly established Episcopal Academy in Philadelphia, was elected Professor of Moral Philosophy and Vice-Provost, and was given a portion of the old dormitory building for a dwelling.

Thus the College returned to its old quarters and undertook its old work. A newspaper notice of April 15, 1789, six weeks after the passage of the repeal law, announces that “the several schools of this seminary are now opened upon their ancient foundation.”

It is one of the anomalies of the time and the situation that, although the College was reëstablished upon its “ancient foundation,” the University still continued to exist, based upon the same foundation, if by that foundation is understood the charters of 1753 and 1755. The modern lawyer finds it hard to conceive of two corporations drawing their powers from the same incorporating charter, and the question naturally arises what right the University had to continue to function after the repeal act of 1789. Yet there is no doubt that it did so act and almost without change or question. The Trustees of the University continued to meet, the professors to teach, students to gather and recite; fees con-

¹ He is called in the minutes “the Venerable Dr. Benjamin Franklin, the Father and one of the first Founders of the Institution.”
tinued to be received, land to be conveyed, degrees to be conferred by them. There were two institutions, the University and the College, where there had been one before. The act of 1789, which had restored the old Board, the Willings and Hopkinsons, the Shippens and Cadwaladers, the newly elected members, and Dr. Smith to their rights and privileges was not considered to have deprived the new Board, the state officers, city clergymen, and "eminent citizens" of theirs. Only Dr. Smith, the implacable, in guarded terms in an undated letter, preserved among the University archives, suggests to his correspondent a list of possible imperfections in the claim of the University to continue to exist. But neither these questions nor any of similar import were openly asked at the time.

The explanation is doubtless to be found in the nature of the repeal act of 1789. It must be explained as having returned to the old Trustees and Faculty all they had control of when the "confirming" act of 1779 was passed, to have reinstated them in the position, powers, and property they had possessed at that time, but not to have divested the University of the rights which had been then accorded it or of the property it had subsequently acquired. The very advocates of restoration of its power to the old College contemplated the continuance of the new University. Whatever was true de jure, the University continued to exist de facto. It is necessary therefore to bear in mind that for a time, fortunately for a short time, a bare two years, from 1789 to 1791, there were two institutions, with the same origin, traditions, and objects, and to tell the history concurrently of both as best we may.

Since the College resumed possession of the Fourth and Arch Street building the University had to seek a new abode. They found momentarily a gathering place in "the Lodge in Lodge Alley," a building put up by the Masons twenty years before for their own uses, for a dance hall for the Assembly, and for such purposes. But the University soon secured more suitable quarters in the building being erected by the Philosophical Society on land given them by the state on what is now known as Independence Square, on Fifth Street just below Chestnut. The Philosophical Society, which had held its meetings in the hall of the University
in 1782 and 1783, now reciprocated by entering into an agree­ment by which the University should pay £85 a year rent for five years for the use of the building, repairing and completing it, receiving, however, credit for the expense of doing so, and leaving to the Society the use of the two southern rooms and the basement, which, it may be said parenthetically, are still in active and learned use by the Philosophical Society today. By vote of the Legislature they were allowed to use the State House bell when the Assembly was not in session, and at six, seven, eight, twelve, one, and five o’clock every day instead of ringing out liberty to all, it is to be feared it announced at least a temporary imprison­ment to a few score reluctant scholars.

On June 20, 1789, the newspapers advertised “The trustees of the University having fitted up the rooms of the Philosophi­cal Hall on Fifth Street, on the State House Square, for the ac­commodation of the several schools, the business of that Institu­tion will be hereafter carried on at that place, and the Students are desired to attend their respective Professors and Tutors on Monday next at eight o’clock in the morning.” The German School was set at six o’clock in the morning; and extra “schools” in mathematics and English were opened from six till nine in the evening.

For a while the two streams ran parallel, in friendly rivalry. Both tried to separate the upper classes, the College and the Uni­versity proper, from the lower classes, the Academic departments, to which they were so closely bound. The University Trustees had at one time ordered that no professor in the philosophical classes should give any instruction in the lower schools, but the adoption of the four-group system immediately afterward blurred the outlines of this distinction, and the lower and upper schools in the University still were intermingled. The College likewise tried, though with scarcely greater success, to make a clearer dis­crimination between Academy and College. Its Trustees passed a rule similar to that of the University forbidding any professor to teach both Academy and College classes, but could not enforce it; the disentanglement proved a long and difficult operation and was not completed till 1825.

A proposal was now made to unite the Latin School still more
closely to the College and at the same time to give greater separation to the English and Mathematical schools by giving them, in combination, the name of Academy and putting them under the separate control of a teacher of English and oratory. This subordination of the English School was distasteful to Franklin, the old advocate of a purely English college course, and although he was a member of two successive committees on the question which did nothing, in June 1789 he drew up a long and severe indictment of his colleagues past and present, which he headed Observations Relating to the Intentions of the Original Founders of the Academy in Philadelphia. In this he claimed that the subscriptions which he himself had solicited in 1749 had been "more liberal as well as more general" because of the expectation of most of the subscribers that the institution would be devoted principally to the carrying on of English studies. Instead of that the classical elements had been pampered, the English starved. He charged the poor success of the English School to the Trustees' "niggardly neglect of good masters," so that these were driven out of the school, their pupils following them. The numerous and good private schools at this time in the city were the product, he declares, of the poor management of the Trustees. The public were dissatisfied with the equipment and services provided in the field of English studies and the preference shown to the classics. He closed by suggesting that the English School be separated completely from the College and Latin School, with an equitable division of their joint stock. "We wish," he says, "to execute the plan they [the Trustees] have so long defeated and afford the public the means of a complete English education." This was with one exception his last literary composition. It closes with a pathetic paragraph:

I am the only one of the original trustees now living, and I am just stepping into the grave myself.—I seize this opportunity, the last I may possibly have, of bearing testimony against these deviations. I seem here to be surrounded by the ghosts of my dear departed friends, beckoning and urging me to use the only tongue now left us in demanding that justice to our grandchildren that to our children has been denied; and I hope they will not be sent away discontented.
It does not appear to whom Franklin refers as "we," though there is known to have been a dissatisfied group among the Trustees; nor indeed did this protest and appeal ever reach his colleagues. He sent it for consideration and advice to his friend Robert Hare, who had just been elected a Trustee and was also a member of the committee on the English School. Hare acknowledged it in a letter dated July 14, 1789, expressing his entire agreement with Franklin's strictures and judgments, but urging him not to attempt to make the separation he proposed. The attempt at this time would certainly fail; the prejudices of some of the Trustees, the opposition of Provost Smith, "his active, indefatigable character when engaged in measures on which he is intent," and the efforts against it of friends of the other professors would make an overwhelming opposition. He urges Franklin, however, first omitting the proposal for a separation, to print in a pamphlet his criticisms and demands for more attention to English subjects, and thus appeal from the Trustees to public opinion. Hare would have him hold his proposal over the Board in terrorem, not only at present but for the future; his pamphlets had always exercised great influence.

Before the aged statesman had answered this letter or asked for the return of the manuscript he had indeed "stepped into the grave," and Hare eventually returned the paper to the author's executors with the statement that he had shown it to no one. Although the English School was much discussed and successive committees were appointed to report upon it, no essential changes were made and the influences that controlled the College and its adjuncts still remained mainly classical.

April 1790 the Provosts, Vice-Provosts, and Trustees of both the College and the University, along with the Trustees of the Hospital and the Library, the Philosophical Society, the Cincinnati, and similar bodies, in a great procession of corporations, political organizations, clergymen, and distinguished citizens, followed the body of Franklin to his simple grave, not a stone's throw from the buildings occupied in turn by College and Uni-

versity, with the early days of which he had been so closely connected.

Both institutions drew up formal statements of their requirements for degrees in medicine, the only educational demand of the time that, in Philadelphia at least, was sufficiently pressing to justify serious attention. These rules were practically identical; those of the University, which had been drawn up in 1788, were now adopted on July 7, 1790. They had been under consideration during the whole preceding decade; they required three years of study, at least two of them in the University, three examinations, successively before the medical professors, the Trustees, and the public, the preparation and publication of a thesis. A candidate must be twenty-one years of age. These requirements were for the Bachelor of Medicine; for the Doctor of Medicine there were the same additional requirements as before. The requirements of the College, although they scarcely differed from these, and were also published in 1790, became basic for later times, for with some modifications they became the requirements for the degree of M.D., the only medical degree which was to be given in America after 1791.

On the re-establishment of the College three of the original four medical professors, Drs. Shippen, Kuhn, and Rush, had been invited to resume their old positions and had accepted; Dr. Morgan, still sulking in his tent, his wife dead, his own health impaired, his reputation half-forgotten and his fortune gone, although offered the opportunity to resume his place, made no reply, and October 15, 1789, he died. Dr. Rush was promoted to the chair of the practice of medicine and a week later, October 29, Dr. Caspar Wistar began his long and influential career. When Dr. Kuhn resigned, Dr. Griffiths was elected in his place. The reorganization of the group, abandonment of the preliminary degree of Bachelor of Medicine, and the establishment of new but scarcely changed rules for the grant of the traditional M.D. were, presumably, the work of Dr. Shippen. The lower degree was given up on the ground that young men, on the basis of holding it and of the knowledge that they had taken medical courses, would undertake regular practice too easily and while still inexperienced, and so reflect discredit on the College. The
new rules adopted March 17, 1789, which led to the degree of M.D., made no requirement of preparation for entering upon them beyond that of having attained the age of twenty-one. They demanded either two or three years of study, attendance on each of the courses of lectures offered in the Medical School, the usual series of three examinations and the writing, either in English or Latin, of a thesis, which must be successfully defended before the medical professors, and then published at the student's expense. There was to be a separate medical Commencement each year. At that held by the College in June 1790, however, the fourteen students who were graduated received only the bachelor's degree, the new requirements not yet having come into force.

A month later occurred the only Commencement for Arts students held by the restored College; at this seven students, who had received most of their instruction in the University but had subsequently enrolled in the College, were given their A.B.

The most distinctive achievement of the restored College during its brief life as a separate institution was the establishment of what was expected to be an annual series of law lectures. Philadelphia lawyers were already as famous as Philadelphia doctors, but as yet there were no regular courses in law similar to those in medicine. Lawyers still learned their profession, as physicians had formerly done, by work in a practitioner's office. Law students themselves, however, had already taken steps for mutual instruction. It will be remembered that in September of the year 1787 a petition from a "Junior Law Society" for the use of one of their rooms was presented to the Trustees of the University. Immediately on the reorganization of the College, in March 1789, a petition for the use of one of the rooms was presented by "a number of young gentlemen students in law," presumably the same organization. It was declared in one of the newspapers in 1790 that a law professorship had long been wanted. Such a proposal was evidently ripe for consideration. It was given definiteness by a recommendation presented to the Board of Trustees July 18, 1790, by Charles Smith, Esq., son of the Provost. He had graduated under his father at Washington College in 1783, during the interregnum, had studied law with an older brother,
and been admitted to the bar in Philadelphia, in 1786. Like his brothers and many young lawyers of the time, he had established himself in one of the county towns of the state, Sunbury, and had a good practice. At this time he was in Philadelphia as a delegate to the convention then framing the new constitution for the state adopted in that year. He was twenty-five years of age. In his memorial to the Trustees he points out the desirability of establishing a law lectureship in the College and offers himself to deliver such a course each winter. He would like to open the course the next winter under their auspices "as he has been encouraged to expect a considerable number of pupils"—or will begin it at his own risk, as a candidate for a future professorship.

The proposal gave rise to much discussion, and the suggestion of the grant of degrees in law was added to it. Finally in August a committee of the Trustees made a long and favorable report on the project; a resolution provided for the delivery of a course of at least twenty-four lectures each winter, and a prescription was made for the content of the course. Although the course was to include the canon law, civil law, maritime law, and the law merchant, it was really, as described, to be rather a course in political science and constitutional history than in either law or procedure. Having approved the scheme the Trustees proceeded to elect to the professorship not Mr. Smith, who must have been bitterly disappointed, but a much more eminent man, one of their own number, James Wilson. Fresh from his great services in the Constitutional Convention of 1787, and his many other forms of distinction culminating in his recent appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States, his willingness to become the first Professor of Law in the College, and indeed in the United States, was a matter of public satisfaction and congratulation. He resigned of course from the Board of Trustees. He was to be paid by the fees of his students, which he was himself to set, up to a limit of ten guineas—a sum which if actually charged must have excluded many young members of the Junior Law Society. But the course was conceived of as intended not so much for young law students as for "gentlemen of all professions, but especially legislators, magistrates, and other lawyers."
The introductory lecture of the course was given in the old hall of the College at six o'clock in the evening of December 15, 1790. No speaker could have wished a more distinguished audience. It included President and Mrs. Washington, Vice-President John Adams, members of both houses of Congress, the President and both houses of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, ladies and gentlemen, making, according to the newspaper account, "a most brilliant and respectable audience." The address was worthy of the occasion, learned and eloquent, and not too long. It was later published, along with the rest of the course of lectures that followed it in the ensuing weeks. A second course was begun in the fall of 1791 but not long continued. Judge Wilson's other occupations may have interfered—the reasons do not appear—but although he retained the title, and a School of Law was still for some years advertised as part of the University, there was not for many years any resumption of its life. In the meantime, however, in the new interest in law as an academic subject, the Trustees at the medical Commencement of December 1790, held in College Hall, conferred an honorary degree in law on Judges Wilson, Shippen, and Hopkinson.

A brave attempt was made by the University to carry on in its rooms in the American Philosophical Society's building. Commencements were held in 1789 and 1790 in the new German Lutheran church on Fourth Street in the square above the old College buildings. In the first of those years there were nine who took their degree of A.B., and eight of M.A. For the first time the degree of M.D. was given to twelve graduates of the medical courses, not, it is true, according to the new requirements adopted by the College, but to men who had previously taken degrees of Bachelor of Medicine and now came up for the Doctor's degree.

For the third time Washington appears on the University scene. In April 1789, when he arrived in Philadelphia to take up his duties as President, its Trustees met and proceeded to the City Tavern at Second and Chestnut streets—no long journey from the Philosophical Society building on Fifth Street—where they presented an address describing him as holding the "first office in the Federal Empire"; to which "His Excellencie" was
pleased to give, as usual, an excellent reply. It was unfortunate for the Trustees of the College that all this official recognition of the great ones of the new nation was by the University, not by them. It must have seemed to them especially unfortunate that they must hear of the congratulations offered by the University December 30, 1790, to General Mifflin on his becoming Governor of Pennsylvania under the newly adopted constitution of the state; for he was one of their own men, a graduate of the class of 1760, a Trustee under the old dispensation and the new, participant in almost every activity of the College, the University, the state, and the nation for a whole generation. The University in its address described itself, as the College could not have done, as “an institution which owes its existence to the legislature of the state,” and, what must have expressed either a desperate hope or a prophecy, “still relies on it for further support and encouragement.” It insists that “while every private seminary of learning within the state will undoubtedly experience your protection, the University of Pennsylvania will enjoy a special care and protection.” The reply of the Governor was sympathetic and judicious.

But all this must have been whistling to keep up their spirits, for already the Trustees had accepted and spread on their minutes their swan song in a report on their finances, their equipment, their achievements, and their teaching. A committee had been at work on this for more than a year with the help of a paid accountant for its financial statement. It was finally presented to the Assembly by the committee members in person in April 1791. It set forth that only three-fourths of the provision of £1,500 of yearly income from forfeited estates, promised on the formation of the University, had ever been paid; that they had been forced by the legislation of 1789 to turn over to the restored College, under specially unfavorable conditions, the original equipment and endowment of that body; and that they were consequently burdened with debts. They had nevertheless in the preceding twelve years annually carried through to graduation some ten to twenty men in arts and five to ten in medicine. Although the numbers of pupils in the lower schools had fallen off since the restoration of the old College in 1789, those in the
collegiate department had held their own or risen. They were daring enough to inform the Legislature that to do their work properly they needed two additional professors and several more tutors. A thousand pounds were needed for equipment of the laboratory and additions to the library.

This report was an apologia or a defense rather than a serious proposal, for long before it had been presented the University had voted for the abandonment of its separate existence altogether. It is a matter of interest, however, that the period in which Pennsylvania was a state university closed with no more discredit than was due to its restricted means and to the decay of the political party to which it owed its existence.

The finances of the College were in an equally bad condition. On its reestablishment in 1789 it had of course demanded back and received the buildings and securities it had possessed in 1779, but these were no more sufficient for its needs than they had been when they were lost to it. They asked John Penn to permit the sale of the Perkasie lands, and put the Norristown estate up for sale, and some of each of these were disposed of, but the College, like the University, looked to the state government for aid. In February 1790 the Trustees appointed two committees, one to solicit private subscriptions for a three-year period, the other to draw up an address to the Legislature describing their plight and asking for state assistance. While awaiting some return from these they authorized the treasurer to borrow £3,000 for immediate needs.

Scholastic conditions were scarcely more satisfactory. A committee reports that most of the Latin books the students use have English translations, which may be good for beginners, but "enable older scholars to deceive their masters"; there is great want of order and decorum; composition and oratory are little attended to; and geography, chronology, and history are not taught at all. The pupils pass from the Academy to the College at too early an age, and classes are dismissed at half past four whereas the rules require them to continue till five. The numbers at the Board meetings are small, seldom more than twelve of the twenty-four members attending—sometimes only three or four. In July 1791 a committee is ordered to report whether any professors
By the beginning of 1791 both groups of Trustees were ready to consider a combination. Its desirability, indeed its necessity, is obvious to the modern student. The existence of each of the two had been a difficult struggle, and although one academic institution in Philadelphia might in the future receive the state subsidies each felt to be requisite, certainly two could not. Nor could private support be relied on. Philadelphia was not essentially a college-going community. It was rich, commercial, ingenious, scientific, tolerant; it had produced its quota, perhaps more than its quota of able and even learned men; it had a certain appreciation of music, of art, of the drama. But it was not intellectual; it did not love or appreciate knowledge or things of the mind for their own sake. It seemed, it still seems to its critics, material in its interests. But one collegiate institution, and that with all the resources and prestige it could command, could at that time be supported in Philadelphia.

Unfortunately there was no educational leadership in sight to decide what shape this should take. Franklin was no more, Dr. Smith belonged to a past era, and was, besides, the center of too much conflict to play again his old rôle. Dr. Ewing was a follower, though a protesting one, not a leader in educational matters. University and College alike, whether separate or combined, must be dependent on the wisdom of a group of business and professional men, neither trained, nor, it is to be feared, very seriously interested in education as such. They had, however, wisely determined on union.

1791

The difficulty of deciding who first began any negotiation, friendly or hostile, is a familiar one. With a natural jealousy each institution now took pains to credit the other with the initiation of the plan for a union, because for each it meant a surrender. So far as the actual records go, it was the College that took the first step. On January 14, 1791, a resolution was passed
by the Board of Trustees of the College instructing their President to write to the University Trustees that they understood the University was contemplating appointing a committee to bring up the question of a union of the two institutions, and that the College would be responsive to such a suggestion. When this advance reached the University Board, February 9, 1791, they declared that they had not had the matter under consideration but were quite willing to discuss it with the College Trustees. Conferences were held during the succeeding summer. At these conferences held in the State House, which was considered neutral ground, during August and September, they played with a number of questions. The possible abandonment of the old title "Provost" is suggested by the use of the expression, "the principal officer of the University by whatever name he be called." The College, notwithstanding its tradition of private foundation, suggests that a union might make both institutions "more objects of legislative protection and encouragement." The Trustees of the College are willing "to surrender up their charters into the hands of the Legislature," but stipulate, of all things, the preservation of their Charity School. This may have had some obscure relation to their retention of their original home, so closely connected with the trust for that school. The College, moreover, was willing to concede the use of the name "University" but tried to retain the "Philadelphia." But the larger implications of the state title could not be abandoned by the Trustees of the University, though the permanent location in the city was agreed to by both.

By September, terms of union had been agreed upon that both College and University were ready to place before the Legislature, to be made the legal basis of the single institution that was to be the successor of both. Its main provisions were simple. The expression the "University of Pennsylvannia" had become so familiar, with the omission of the words "the State of," that its formal adoption was merely a mild concession by the College to its rival. The word "University" was, as it had long been, obviously suitable for an institution with both college and medical courses, and all the more so now that it professed to have a law course. The term was fast coming into general use through-
out the country even where it was not properly applicable. Three of the new states at the time of the Revolution provided in their constitution for universities at the head of their systems of education.

That somewhat grandiose term probably represented rather the exuberant attitude of the time than any specific claim or description. The Massachusetts Constitutional Convention refers repeatedly in 1779 and 1780 to Harvard as "the University at Cambridge," although Harvard College itself did not use the term till long afterward. The Chevalier de Chastellux who, as before stated, traveled in the United States in 1781 and 1782, called Princeton, Pennsylvania, Columbia, and William and Mary indiscriminately colleges and universities. Indeed President Witherspoon of Princeton took pains to explain to him that his was a genuine university, though it does not appear on what ground, as it had only the collegiate department.

The new Board of Trustees was to have the same number of members as each of the old boards. Twelve were to be elected by each. The new Board was to be self-perpetuating, without the ex officio or clerical elements of the old University Board. It retained only two traces of connection with the state government; the Governor of the state should always be President of the Board of Trustees, and the University was bound to lay a statement of its financial condition every year before the Legislature, which was believed by those who drew up the act of union to imply a promise of state financial support. Careful provisions were inserted to prevent partisanship in the election of Trustees and professors and precipitancy in the expulsion of the latter. The property of both institutions was to be turned over to the new body.

These arrangements were drawn up in the form of a statute, dated September 13, 1791, and adopted by the first Legislature elected under the new state constitution. By this act the agreement between the two Boards of Trustees was made statutory and the University was freshly incorporated, with all the usual rights of a corporation. The act of union and incorporation of 1791 comes nearer to bringing about the establishment of a new institution than does any other change in its history. But
neither this nor any other action, historically considered, has broken the line of continuity from the charters of 1753 and 1755 on which the powers of the University as an educational institution are based. There had been no time, except during the confusions of the Revolution, when it had not been engaged in administering property, giving instruction, carrying on examinations, and granting degrees.

The Trustees of the College elected from among themselves twelve members of the new Board in October, the Trustees of the University chose theirs in November. These twenty-four gentlemen were provided by their respective Boards with certificates of election, and were called together November 8, 1791, by Governor Mifflin in the office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth in the State House. Here the law under which they were to act and their certificates of election were read aloud, and the Governor then declared that they “shall be and they are hereby made and instituted a corporation and body politic in law and in fact, to have continuance forever by the aforesaid name, style and title of the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania.”

There appear from time to time in the formal and colorless minutes of the Board of Trustees that have furnished so much of the material for this story, the vague outlines of a picture that might, if skilfully filled in, go far to give the narrative a life to which the written word is inadequate. One such scene would be the gathering in Roberts’ Coffee House in February 1750, where the plain and pious Trustees of the New Building and the Charity School transferred these trusts to Logan, Franklin, and the twenty-two other representatives of wealthy and substantial Philadelphia. Another would be the procession in state of the Trustees and Faculty to the residence of Governor Morris in 1755, there to take the oaths of allegiance and succession and to make the declaration against transubstantiation required in the new charter that would enable them to hold their positions, and grant their degrees. Still another would be the scene of December 1779, when the President and Vice-President of the Executive Council of the State of Pennsylvania, the Attorney-General, the Treasurer and the Secretary, the Chief Justice and other state officials, the leading clergymen and appointed citizens met in
the old College hall to establish the first university under that name in the United States and to take their oaths of fidelity to a sovereign power less personal but not less authoritative than the King who ruled in 1755. Now it is another group of Trustees, meeting in the grave solemnity of Independence Hall under the presidency of the Governor, in November 1791, who present a scene no less picturesque than any of its predecessors though no oaths were taken and plainer costume was the order of the day.

The names of the twenty-four Trustees who now proceeded along with the Governor to organize themselves into the permanent Board of Trustees are, many of them, already familiar, others will be mentioned later. A writer far more conversant with the lines of social distinction in Philadelphia than this author can claim to be declares that the two strains, that of the old aristocracy and Anglicanism, represented in the Trustees elected by the College, and that of the new men and Presbyterianism, brought in by the University, can be clearly distinguished, and that unity in such a board was impossible. If this were true, so much the worse, for only in unity and some degree of responsiveness to the demands of the community was there any hope of solid achievement. The day had gone by, if it had ever existed, when a successful college or university in this city of different creeds and diversified interests could be built on the predominance of any one of them.

The union could not be considered complete until the Faculty as well as the body of Trustees had been reconstituted. This was accomplished in the early months of 1792. The work of the medical professors was most pressing. They had in fact already begun their winter courses in both the schools. Since one of them, Dr. Shippen, was already included in both Faculties, it was found possible to constitute a single Faculty by electing all the other professors from both to the new one. This gave a medical Faculty of seven men, with the familiar names of Shippen, Wistar, Kuhn, Rush, Hutchinson, Griffitts, and Barton. The union of the two medical schools was a success from the beginning. The medical

The union of the two Faculties in Arts presented greater difficulties. The salaries of the medical professors were drawn directly from the fees of their students; those of the professors in the College proper must be drawn from the College treasury. This made the size of the Faculty a matter of much question, of frequent committee reports and endless debates. Finally a Faculty of six, the same number and much the same composition as that of the old College, was decided upon. Both of the old Faculties had been recently so depleted that it proved possible to elect all their members but two. The difficulty was somewhat reduced by a letter from Vice-Provost Magaw, of the University, asking the Trustees that he be not placed on the new Faculty since it would preclude the appointment of his special friend, Dr. Andrews, Vice-Provost of the College; at the same time he expressed the hope that he might be appointed later to some teaching position.

The greatest difficulty was the decision what to do about Provost Smith. His election would necessitate dropping one or other of the older professors, each of whom had his friends. There was, besides, strong opposition to him from some of the Trustees. He found it hard to believe that he might actually be left out of the new institution, impossible to reconcile himself to it. Indeed it long seemed uncertain whether this would be. He could teach many subjects; it was not till late in April 1792 that in a vote for Professor of Greek and Latin Dr. Smith was defeated by Dr. Davidson, the old incumbent, in a vote of thirteen to eleven. His expostulations and bitter protests at this exclusion, in long letters spread on the Trustees' minutes or filed in the University archives gradually declined into appeals for the settlement of his accounts, concerning which there was considerable difference of opinion. These were, however, finally settled on what he must have considered satisfactory terms, for he and the four members of the committee signed them formally on April 21, 1795. He was paid £900 outright in satisfaction of all old claims; the yearly pension of £100 in the restored currency for the remainder of
his life, the reward of his old efforts in England; and he was confirmed in the occupancy of the Provost's House rent free for another year. No student of the career of the old Provost can fail to read with regret this contentious and somewhat humiliating record of his later life. He was, however, not in straitened circumstances; his investments in land had apparently turned out well, and he left successful and even distinguished descendants. The membership of the Faculty having been determined, Dr. Ewing, who had been Provost of the old University, was now elected Provost of the combined institution and Dr. Andrews, who had been Vice-Provost of the College, was elected to the same position in the University.

The Faculty had taken for granted that they would draw up the scheme of studies and promptly held a meeting and formulated a plan not differing materially from that previously in use, which was practically the old curriculum of Dr. Smith of 1754. They were surprised to learn that the Trustees intended to draw up the plan of instruction. This was sent to the Faculty in April 1792. It was a curious arrangement, the result of a number of committee reports, discussions, amendments, and compromises on the part of such Trustees as took an interest in the subject. It had no basis except a mixture of tradition and experiment. Each of the familiar fields, natural philosophy, moral philosophy, the classics, mathematics, English, and "German and Oriental Languages" was assigned to one of the six professors. These traditional terms were made to include a great number and variety of subjects, distributed among the professors with little reference to their knowledge or interest. Dr. Ewing, the Professor of Natural Philosophy, which corresponds to modern physics, was to teach also natural history, chemistry, and agriculture, with "so much of astronomy as applies to navigation and geography," along with the laws of matter and motion, mechanics and projectiles, and their application to gunnery and fortification, electricity, hydrostatics, hydraulics, pneumatics, and optics.

The Professor of Moral Philosophy must also teach rhetoric, composition, "and such parts of natural philosophy as the professor of that branch shall not be able to manage." The other professors, in addition to teaching the subjects from which their
professorships were named and other matters more or less germane to them, were each given charge of one of the lower schools: the classical professor, of the Latin School; the professor of belles lettres, of the English School. The latter must teach also not only rhetoric but logic and metaphysics to the older boys, including history and geography. The professor of mathematics must teach history and geography to the younger boys along with arithmetic, bookkeeping, and practical mathematics. Minute arrangements were made for methods of teaching, hours, keeping of rolls, and similar matters.

Dr. Ewing, acknowledging his election as Provost and speaking for the Faculty, assented to these arrangements for teaching, though insisting that the plan the Faculty had drawn up was much better, having been the result of long experience and “more for the reputation of the Institution and the Benefit of the Students.” This conflict of jurisdiction and difference between Trustees and Faculty as to what the curriculum should be remained a long and sometimes an embittered dispute.

SMITH AND FRANKLIN

Before passing on to a period in which the men who had played their parts in early times were to be so largely forgotten, it may be well to stop for a moment to consider the personalities of the two most eminent of them, and to estimate the influence of each. Except for the stubborn persistence of the ideas of Franklin the colonial College was what Provost William Smith made it. The Trustees seem to have been willing generally to accept his educational ideas and to have given him much freedom of action inside and outside the College. It was his tireless industry and activity of mind that gave him his influence. This made him a participant in every movement of the time and a speaker on every subject. He was alert-minded, versatile, indefatigable, eloquent; but his reasoning was not profound, and his arguments were not persuasive.

His acquaintance in Philadelphia and in Great Britain was wide; in addition to being “The Provost” he was a member of the Masons, of the Philosophical Society, of the Hand in Hand
Fire Company and of the vestry of Christ Church, all significant social connections in Philadelphia. He was an unwearied traveler, and in his repeated trips abroad made acquaintances that extended from the King, the archbishops and bishops, and the Penn family to a considerable number of his Scotch fellow countrymen. He was a ready writer but had no great body of knowledge to draw on. He had great power of formulating the familiar and the commonplace but little originality. His gifts for leadership were mediocre; he had no capacity for coöperation or ability to understand the views of other men.

He never really led a party, much less dominated one. His connection with the Penn family and his own predilection made him an advocate of the interests of the Proprietary party, but he was not its leader. He was a natural orator with a copious flow of words and readiness of allusion, and was much in demand for sermons on special occasions. He was admired but, outside of his family, neither loved nor trusted, and he had few, if any, intimate friends. With the Revolution his political and academic influence ceased. His hesitant attitude toward independence, though comprehensible and perhaps justifiable, cut him off from any political activity in the period immediately after the war, and he did not, like many others, seek a useful place under the new conditions. Instead, he speculated in western lands. However indispensable he had been to the colonial College, the two years of his second provostship were quite futile. He had none of the essential greatness of Franklin.

Franklin, on the other hand, was a great man by the gift of nature. His pervasive influence on almost all aspects of his time is unquestionable. It is our part to estimate only his influence on the College and the University. It is not easy to measure. A great man is not only superior in ability to the men around him, he is unique among them. Greatness is not just a matter of degree; it is a difference in kind. His influence must therefore be measured by its quality, not its quantity. No student of the history of the College and the University of Pennsylvania can fail to be impressed with the significance of Franklin in that history. But how shall it be measured? Not by the length of the period
in which that influence was effective; it was restricted to a period of seven years.

With the events of 1740 he had nothing to do; his plans of 1743 were stillborn. His connection began in 1749. He himself indicates its practical close in the letter written from London July 28, 1759, to his friend and colleague Professor Kinnersley, part of which has been already quoted. In this 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.

He had accordingly resigned the presidency of the Board of Trustees in 1756, and left for England on his mission for the Provincial Assembly in April 1757. He was after that date almost constantly abroad. In few letters addressed to him during that period was mention made of the College, and in still fewer does he ask about it.

Although named a member of the reconstructed Board of Trustees in 1779, he never took his seat in that body and communicated with it only twice. The meetings of the old Board after its reincarnation in 1789 were, it is true, held for a few weeks in his house, because of his extreme age and ill health, and under his presidency, but the only record of his activity during that year was the rather bitter protest against the policy of his colleagues, and the next year he died. For his active participation in the affairs of the College, we are therefore restricted to the short period from 1749 to 1756.

His financial contributions were small. After his first campaign to secure subscriptions, among which his own appears about midway between the largest and the smallest, and his successful appeal for a subsidy from the Philadelphia City Council, he neither gave to it from his own means or interested himself in securing support for it. He had no such claim to its gratitude for his financial efforts as Provost Smith obtained by his successful begging tours in England and the Carolinas. It was thought that he might have induced the provincial Assembly to appropriate money for the College in 1756, just as he had se-
cured from it a grant for the Hospital in 1752, but by that time parties had divided and the majority in the Legislature were in opposition to the College.

Nor was his influence over the choice of studies of its students predominant, as the analysis of its curriculum indicates. A scheme of studies that devoted two-thirds of the student’s time in his preparatory school and more than one-third of it in the College to the Greek and Latin classics cannot be considered to represent the educational ideals of one who was never weary of advocating the advantages of a purely English education, and wanted the style of students to be modeled on the Tatler, the Spectator, Pope, and Addison. Franklin’s own educational ideas are hard to discriminate from his concessions to “men of influence,” but in any case, we know that scholasticism was much more prominent in the course than he would have liked, and the drill in the use of English which he desired was subordinated to extended study of the classics.

It is the same with religion. Neither the cool deism of Franklin nor the fervor of the Whitefield Trustees characterized the religious life of the College. Most of its functions were carried on in the framework of Anglicanism. Prayers were read at the opening and closing of the day’s exercises, students learned the Church catechism; Commencements and other ceremonial occasions were usually opened with the Episcopal church service, read by Dr. Smith or Mr. Peters. He made no protest against these practices, but they certainly did not reflect his religious ideals.

How then shall the unquestioned influence of Franklin on this institution be estimated? If he did not dominate it through a long period of minute control as did Provost Smith, nor give or obtain for it any large endowment, or define its curriculum or its religion, to what is due that recognition of the impress of his hand upon it which every student of its history shares? The question may be answered partly in his own words: he had given it “the full advantage of my head, hands, heart and purse in getting through the first difficulties of the design.”

His first contribution was his origination of the idea of a college in Philadelphia: he complained that there was “no militia,
no college.” Of all the inchoate educational suggestions of the middle years of the eighteenth century it was Franklin’s plan, drawn up in 1743 and renewed in the Proposals of 1749, that formulated the idea of a college. Second was his diligence in the service of the Academy and College. There is no reason to doubt the substantial correctness of the account he gives in his Autobiography of the events of the years 1749–50. He conversed with leading men on the project of an Academy and College, he composed, with some advice, printed and distributed the Proposals; with Mr. Francis he drew up the constitutions; he took the leading part in the solicitation of funds and the selection of the group of twenty-four Trustees, negotiated for the purchase of the New Building, attended the joint meeting with the Whitefield Trustees at the Coffee House at which the old property was transferred. As President of the Board of Trustees he presided at the frequent meetings of its early years and took an active part in the physical reconstruction of the New Building, ordering and receipting for wood, nails, and planks, engaging contractors and workmen and advancing their wages; in 1751 and 1752 he carried on the negotiations for a head of the institution, first with Dr. Johnson and, on their failure, with Dr. Smith, who was his personal selection. During the next few years this restless activity continued. Franklin gave for a while most of the leisure resulting from his retirement from business to the Academy and College. Short as the period was, this devotion and intelligent industry were at that stage absolutely invaluable.

Franklin’s influence on the curriculum was, it is true, not predominant, but it was real; it was along two lines, larger recognition for science and more attention to the teaching of English. However inadequate and unsatisfactory these elements were in the actual curriculum of the College, that they were there at all was largely due to the initiation and insistence of Franklin. The prevailing classicism of Dr. Smith and the leading professor, Dr. Alison, was modified by the interest in English and physics of Franklin and his friend Professor Kinnersley.

There was a certain largeness in all Franklin’s ideas. Although the new institution in 1749 was only called an academy, it was
the non-existence of a college in Philadelphia that he deplored in 1743. Although it was only the establishment of their free school the Trustees of the New Building insisted on in transferring it to the new Board, they agreed that it might be used also as a college. Even in its earliest days Franklin described it as "a foundation for posterity to erect into a college or seminary of learning more extensive and suitable for future circumstances." He would have rejoiced greatly in its development in these latter days to conform to the vast requirements of these "future circumstances."

The country or the city or the institution is fortunate whose life has been touched by that of a great man. It rises to a higher plane to conform to his reputation. His greatness is a constant stimulus to it. Reason for its ambitions and incentive for its efforts are found in a sense of properly belonging in great company. As Franklin became a national, then an international, then a legendary figure, the institution with which he had been connected shared in this wider repute. The influence of Franklin has probably been greater since his death than during his lifetime, greater on the University than on the colonial College. After it and he had passed away there grew up a tradition of Franklin that has meant much. His spirit has brooded over the University of Pennsylvania. Over and over again in the last century proposals have gained weight from a recognition that they were in accordance with the ideas of Franklin. He has been a sort of secular patron saint of the University; his example and his teaching have justified action.

During a long period in the University's history, during the later years of the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth, the tradition of Franklin was almost non-existent, to its loss. As this narrative continues it will be observed that those periods in which the institution had only a local life, when its ambitions ran low, were those periods in which Franklin was forgotten. The ages in which he was admired and remembered have also been times of College and University progress. Short as was the period of his direct influence over College affairs, imperfectly as the curriculum and the spirit of the colonial College or even the early University reflected his ideas, and
slowly as they have come into greater correspondence, his has been on the whole the strongest individual influence on its history. The most conspicuous location on the University grounds is a natural and proper place for his statue.